

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HEARINGS BEFORE A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION ON **H. Res. 282**

TO INVESTIGATE (1) THE EXTENT, CHARACTER, AND OBJECTS OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, (2) THE DIFFUSION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OF SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA THAT IS INSTIGATED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES OR OF A DOMESTIC ORIGIN AND ATTACKS THE PRINCIPLE OF THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT AS GUARANTEED BY OUR CONSTITUTION, AND (3) ALL OTHER QUESTIONS IN RELATION THERETO THAT WOULD AID CONGRESS IN ANY NECESSARY REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

VOLUME 7 EXECUTIVE HEARINGS

MARCH 23, 29, 30, 31, APRIL 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 19, 1943

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



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1943

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
WASHINGTON, D. C.

MARTIN DIES, Texas, <i>Chairman</i>	
JOE STARNES, Alabama	NOAH M. MASON, Illinois
WIRT COURTNEY, Tennessee	J. PARNELL THOMAS, New Jersey
JOHN M. COSTELLO, California	KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota
HERMAN P. BERHARTER, Pennsylvania	

ROBERT E. STRIFLING, *Chief Investigator*
J. B. MATTHEWS, *Director of Research*
JANE ISBELL, *Editor*

CONTENTS

	Page
Alsberg, Henry Garfield.....	3574
Bisson, Thomas Arthur.....	3467
Dodd, William E., Jr.....	3366
Fahy, Jack Bradley.....	3453
Gellhorn, Walter.....	3548
Goldman, Marcus Isaac.....	3480
Goldschmidt, Arthur E.....	3407
Karr, David.....	3333
Koch, Lucien.....	3004
Lacy, William S. B.....	3583
Lever, Emil John.....	3193
Lovett, Robert Morss.....	3501
Mins, Leonard E.....	3415
Pickens, William.....	3300
Saposs, David J.....	3484
Schuman, Frederick L.....	3088, 3121
Stripling, Robert E.....	3398
Tippett, Thomas H.....	3339
Vincent, Merle D.....	3527
Wahl, David R.....	3438
Watson, Goodwin B.....	3236, 3275
Weyl, Nathaniel.....	3399

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:50 a. m., Hon. Joe Starnes (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. STARNES. The subcommittee appointed by the chairman on March 27, to complete the records in a number of cases which have been referred to the special subcommittee set up by the Appropriations Committee with reference to charges that have been made that certain Government employees have been members of subversive organizations or engaged in subversive activities, and so forth, and to take additional testimony in other cases, will come to order.

Let the minutes show that Mr. Starnes, chairman of the subcommittee, is present, and Mr. Mason, a member of the subcommittee of three, is also present; and in addition Mr. Courtney, a member of the full Special Committee Investigating Un-American Activities; Mr. Keefe, of Wisconsin, a member of the special committee set up in the Appropriations Committee to pass on these matters; together with Mr. Stripling, chief investigator, and Dr. Matthews, director of research.

The first witness we have this morning is Mr. Koch.

Mr. Koch, the subcommittee is sitting this morning for the purpose of giving you an opportunity to be heard with reference to charges or complaints, that have been made to the Special Committee Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities, that you are a member of or have been associated with organizations or groups which have been denominated as being subversive organizations, both by the special committee and by the Attorney General of the United States. This is an executive hearing. You will be given the fullest opportunity to be heard on any of the complaints that have been presented. You can make any statement that you wish in connection therewith.

Dr. Matthews will conduct the examination, and since it will be necessary for you, Dr. Matthews, to refer to, or probably identify, certain documents in question that are in the possession of the committee, it may be necessary also, and I think it should be proper, to swear you in at the same time, so I will ask you two gentlemen to hold up your right hands and be sworn.

Do you and each of you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the matter under investigation, so help you God?

Dr. MATTHEWS. I do.

Mr. KOCH. I do.

Now, Doctor, if you will permit me, I think I will ask just a few preliminary questions, and then you can go along with the examination.

TESTIMONY OF LUCIEN KOCH, MEMBER OF THE SHIPBUILDING COMMISSION, NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Mr. KOCH. I wonder if I can ask for some clarification. Is this the committee appointed by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. STARNES. It is the Special Committee Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities.

Mr. KOCH. As differentiated from the Dies committee?

Mr. STARNES. No; it is a special subcommittee of the so-called Dies committee, together with members of the Special Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KOCH. I see.

Mr. STARNES. That is what it is; it is both, although it is properly denominated, of course, as a hearing of the Special Committee Investigating Subversive and Un-American Activities.

The preliminary questions that I shall ask you are those we have propounded to all, and they are not intended to embarrass you in any fashion, although you may feel some embarrassment in being asked some of the questions.

Will you give us your full name and address, please?

Mr. KOCH. The name is Lucien Koch, and my residence is at 2311 West Mosher Street, Baltimore.

Mr. STARNES. Are you a native-born citizen?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I am, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Will you please give us, then, the date and the place of your birth?

Mr. KOCH. I was born on June 29, 1907, at Mount Scott, Oreg. Mount Scott is a suburb of Portland, Oreg.

Mr. STARNES. Will you give us your educational background, briefly?

Mr. KOCH. I attended grammar school at the Redlands School in Clatsop County, Oreg., and from there I went to the Oregon City High School, working my way through; and from there I went to Commonwealth College, which at the time was located at the Llano Cooperative Colony, at Leesville, La., and which subsequently moved to outside of Mena, Ark. From Commonwealth College I took post-graduate work at the University of Wisconsin and secured my master's degree there in 1931.

Mr. STARNES. Very good. What is your professional or business background?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I believe the answer to that would be teaching and serving as a representative of trade-unions.

Mr. STARNES. Will you give us your teaching background, please?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I taught at Commonwealth College and also served on the faculty of the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. STARNES. What chair did you occupy in the University of Wisconsin?

Mr. KOCH. I was instructor in economics.

Mr. STARNES. Does that constitute your whole background from the teaching standpoint?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; it does, from the teaching standpoint, except insofar, of course, as labor representatives are constantly carrying on educational work.

Mr. STARNES. Have you ever given lectures or helped to conduct a lecture course at any of the workers' schools throughout the country?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I have. I taught one summer at the Wisconsin Industrial Summer School, which was associated with the University of Wisconsin, and then I also took a job for the Affiliated Summer Schools, which was cooperating with the Workers' Education Section, I think, of the Works Progress Administration at that time, to establish a workers' education program in the anthracite district of Pennsylvania, and I served there, I believe, for 2 or 3 months setting up that program.

Mr. STARNES. Of what did that program consist?

Mr. KOCH. Well, we organized classes in trade-union problems, classes in dancing—I did not do that, but some of my colleagues did—and classes in current events, and there may have been others. That was back in 1932, I believe. That is quite a ways back.

Mr. STARNES. Was that later carried on under the auspices of the W. P. A. that type of work and training?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I assume it was.

Mr. STARNES. Did you ever deliver any lectures to the Workers' School in New York City?

Mr. KOCH. You mean the Communist school?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

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

Mr. STARNES. The Highlander Folk School, down in Tennessee?

Mr. KOCH. I never delivered any lectures there. I visited there once, very briefly.

Mr. STARNES. What was the nature of the visit, or the connection there, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. Why, it was a conference that was called in connection with the problems of the sharecroppers in eastern Arkansas.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall what year that was?

Mr. KOCH. I can't be sure about the year. I would guess around 1933 or '34.

Mr. STARNES. Can you give us the names of those who attended the conference, or do you know who called the conference?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know how it was called. I went along with Mr. Claude Williams, and I think Miles Horton was there. He was out sick at the time. I think he was connected with this group at the time. And there were some others; I don't know who they were.

Mr. STARNES. Have you ever had any connection with the Federal Government, been employed in any manner by the Federal Government?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. I took a position with the Federal Government in 1935, I believe in September or October of that year, and I continued my services for the Federal Government until April 1937, I believe.

Mr. STARNES. In what capacity, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. At first I was attached to the Consumers' Division of the N. R. A., and I think later that came under the Works Progress Ad-

ministration, and then after that was under the supervision or under the head, at least, of the United States Department of Labor, and known as the consumers' project under the W. P. A. and under the United States Department of Labor, and my title was economic analyst and field representative.

Mr. STARNES. In that capacity did you travel over the country visiting the various States?

Mr. KOCH. I did very little traveling. I took one trip—I think just one trip.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall where that was?

Mr. KOCH. That was in Cincinnati.

Mr. STARNES. And the occasion?

Mr. KOCH. It wasn't limited to Cincinnati. I think we went into Louisville, too. We had two or three different stops. The occasion was to visit—I am not sure of the exact title. I think they were referred to as county consumers' councils that were set up at that time. Anyway, it was to meet with those interested in consumer organizations and consumer problems.

Mr. STARNES. What was the salary range at that time, '35 to '37, if you recall?

Mr. KOCH. I was receiving \$3,200 at that time.

Mr. STARNES. And were you later promoted?

Mr. KOCH. No. I quit the job to take my present job with the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America.

Mr. STARNES. And you have been with that organization since '37?

Mr. KOCH. Since April '37; yes.

Mr. STARNES. Have you been connected in any capacity with the Federal Government since that time, since April '37, and if so, please state in what capacity and what your compensation was.

Mr. KOCH. Yes. At the present time I am serving as a member of the Shipbuilding Commission of the National War Labor Board, and I was nominated for that post by the national president of my organization, and that nomination was endorsed by the general executive board of my organization, and subsequent to my nomination, I was appointed by the National War Labor Board to serve on this Shipbuilding Commission.

So far as compensation is concerned, as yet I have not been compensated. I have drawn no money whatsoever from the National War Labor Board. But I understand that we are supposed to. There has been a delay. I assume there usually is. I am not a regular employee of the War Labor Board. I work on a per diem basis.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know what the stated compensation is?

Mr. KOCH. My understanding is that for the first few days we were to receive \$10 a day, which theoretically was to cover expenses, and then later I understand we are to receive a per diem rate of \$18.05 a day. As I say, I have received no money as yet.

Mr. STARNES. But you are connected officially with the Board?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; but not as a regular, full-time employee.

Mr. STARNES. I see. What are your duties and functions as a member of that Board?

Mr. KOCH. The Shipbuilding Commission of the War Labor Board was set up by order of the War Labor Board in January of this year, and it assumes all of the duties and functions of the War Labor Board for the shipbuilding industry. The Shipbuilding Commission was es-

established because it was felt that the shipbuilding industry had now in it very definite and special problems, and that they might best be handled, and the purposes of 9,250 cared for, by setting up a special commission.

Mr. STARNES. It deals, of course, with—I am assuming that it deals with—the question of wages and hours and working conditions, and so forth, of the employees of the shipbuilding industry.

Mr. KOCH. Yes; the wages, hours, working conditions, disputes of whatever character, and so forth.

Mr. STARNES. Who are the other members on the Board with you?

Mr. KOCH. Why, it is a seven-man commission. The Chairman of the Commission is Mr. Paul Porter; the representative of the Navy Department is Captain Atkins; the representative of the Maritime Commission is Mr. Van Riper; the representatives of the employers are, first, Mr. Middleton, and secondly, Mr. Roche. The labor members are Mr. Elmer Walker for the American Federation of Labor and myself for the C. I. O.

Mr. STARNES. Have you ever had any experience, practical or theoretical, in the field of shipbuilding or the merchant marine?

Mr. KOCH. Only in my association with this organization, but naturally over a period of approximately 6 years you learn considerable so far as shipbuilding is concerned, and the problems of shipbuilding.

Mr. STARNES. You have never been convicted of any crime of any character?

Mr. KOCH. No; I have never been convicted. I was arrested one time in eastern Arkansas for blocking streets and alleys, but that charge was dismissed by the court.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, you can take over at this point and conduct the examination.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated that you had received an M. A. degree at the University of Wisconsin in 1931. Where did you receive your B. A. degree, if you did receive such degree?

Mr. KOCH. I didn't receive a B. A. degree.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On what basis were you admitted to the University of Wisconsin for postgraduate study?

Mr. KOCH. My work at Commonwealth College was accepted as adequate to the work required for receiving the B. A. degree, and they took me on for postgraduate work.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please state the years when you attended Commonwealth College as a student?

Mr. KOCH. I first attended Commonwealth College in the fall of 1923, and continued to attend—I don't know just where the break is between the time I was a student and the time I started teaching at the school.

Mr. STARNES. Give your best recollection.

Mr. KOCH. I first attended in 1923, and went to the University of Wisconsin. That was in 1929 and '30 and '31. I studied for at least 4 of those years, and then I think I began doing some teaching at the college. During the summers I would be away earning money so I could return in the fall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you give the years during which you were the head of Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. I became the director of the college in 1931 and remained as director of the college until 1935.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then it would be correct to say that you taught at Commonwealth for a period of approximately 4 years prior to 1929?

Mr. KOCH. No; I think it would be closer to 2 years. You see, I was away 2 years at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was your title that of director at Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration as director of Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. Our staff members received no salary. Our remuneration was maintenance; that is, food, board, lodging, necessary incidental expenses, clothing, and so forth.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you enrolled as a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin from 1929 to 1931?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it during that period that you were an instructor in economics?

Mr. KOCH. I was an instructor in economics during 1930 and '31.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For a single academic year?

Mr. KOCH. For a single academic year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration in that position?

Mr. KOCH. I don't remember. Anyway, it was enough to take care of my expenses at the university and a little in addition.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many courses did you teach?

Mr. KOCH. I was teaching at the experimental college of the university, headed by Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, and during the year in which I was teaching we were devoting ourselves to the study of Greek civilization, and I devoted myself particularly to the economic and political life of Greece.

Mr. STARNES. Just at this moment, Doctor, let the record show that Mr. Mundt, of South Dakota, a member of the Special Committee Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities, is present.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you give formal instruction in classes?

Mr. KOCH. There was counselor work and we lectured before the student group.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your testimony that the remuneration was practically maintenance?

Mr. KOCH. No; it was in addition to that. I don't remember, it has been quite a while back, but there was a definite fixed salary connected with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have any approximate idea what it was?

Mr. KOCH. I would hate to guess. I should judge maybe around a thousand dollars, but that is just a guess.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A thousand dollars for the one academic year?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; as an instructor, part-time instructor. That is just a guess. I don't want it to be misleading.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say you taught under the auspices of the Affiliated Summer Schools, is that correct?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. Well—you are referring to the Affiliated Summer Schools for Workers, which was designated by the Workers' Education Division in W. P. A. at that time to establish classes in the anthracite area of Pennsylvania, and I was in there setting up that program. I did very little teaching. I did the administrative job rather than a teaching job.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you receive remuneration for that work?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall how much it was?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I don't exactly. I think—I don't remember exactly what that was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you teach at more than one of the schools under the auspices of the Affiliated Summer Schools for Workers?

Mr. KOCH. No; the only one I taught at was the Wisconsin Industrial Summer School.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What summer was that? Do you recall?

Mr. KOCH. I don't recall the exact year, no. It would be very easy to check, I think.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1937 you became an organizer for the Marine Workers' Industrial—

Mr. KOCH. For the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America. That is a long title.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you hold that position?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I have been with that organization since, and remain with the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration, or what has been your remuneration in that position?

Mr. KOCH. When I first went with the union I received \$40 a week, and then we all took a voluntary cut, I think of 10 percent, which brought it down to \$36 a week, and since that time we have had several increases. My present remuneration would be \$80 a week. Of course, if I draw money from the Federal Government I will not draw my salary from the union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But the last pay you received as an organizer for the union was \$80 a week, is that correct?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you last draw that pay?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I drew it last Saturday.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the date of your appointment as a Commission member of the Shipbuilding Commission of the War Labor Board?

Mr. KOCH. I don't remember. We held our first meeting on January 25. I don't remember the date on which I was notified of my appointment, but a few days preceding that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you say you have not yet drawn any pay whatever from your position as a member of the Shipbuilding Commission of the War Labor Board?

Mr. KOCH. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not drawn the \$10 a day per diem expenses?

Mr. KOCH. No; I have not, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you signed a voucher for the receipt of such funds?

Mr. KOCH. I haven't signed a voucher for the receipt of such funds, no. I filled out certain forms. That is not what you are referring to?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I am referring to the signing of a voucher which would be presented to the Treasury and payment made on the basis of the signing of such a voucher.

Mr. KOCH. No, I have not done that. I filled out certain forms, but I have not filled out a voucher.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Going back to Commonwealth College for a moment, would you state briefly the circumstances of the founding of Commonwealth College, if you happen to know the facts in the case?

Mr. KOCH. Of course, the college was started before I was associated with it. It was started by Dr. William Zeuch. He, I believe, received his Ph. D. at the University of Wisconsin. He started this college in conjunction with, or under the Llano Cooperative Colony, at Leesville, La., and I understand the reason it was started there was from the standpoint of maintenance. It made it easier for the students and the people, and for the college itself to support itself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long was it located in Louisiana?

Mr. KOCH. Either 1 or 2 years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Had it already moved to Arkansas when you entered the institution as a student?

Mr. KOCH. No; it hadn't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then the year of the founding of the institution must have been around 1922; was that it?

Mr. KOCH. I think so; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the connection of Kate Richards O'Hare with the founding of the institution?

Mr. KOCH. She was one of the prime movers. I think Mr. Zeuch interested her in the project also.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Kate Richards O'Hare?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I knew her. I met her at the school.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did she ever carry any title in relationship to the institution?

Mr. KOCH. I couldn't answer as to that, sir. I know she did some teaching.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether she was ever known as the head of the college?

Mr. KOCH. I am quite certain she wasn't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or the founder?

Mr. KOCH. She might have been referred to as one of the founders. Mr. Zeuch was the moving spirit behind it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not she was convicted on a charge of sedition during the First World War and served a prison term under that conviction?

Mr. KOCH. I couldn't speak as to that, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has she ever so stated in your presence?

Mr. KOCH. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or ever discussed the matter in your presence?

Mr. KOCH. No; not that I recall, she hasn't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what the original purpose of the institution was, as stated by its founders?

Mr. KOCH. Well, the purpose of the school, as I understand it, was to provide a liberal education to those who attended at moderate cost.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Approximately how many students were enrolled in the institution when you became a student yourself?

Mr. KOCH. I should think it approximated around 40 to 50, maybe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And how many instructors were there, approximately?

Mr. KOCH. I should think around four or five; something like that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the names of the instructors, or any of them?

Mr. KOCH. Dr. Zeuch was the main teacher, and a gentleman by the name of Goodhue, F. M. Goodhue, instructor in mathematical science.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the initial?

Mr. KOCH. I think it was F. M.; I am not sure. That is a long time ago. Those are the only two I recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Kate Richards O'Hare teach while you were there?

Mr. KOCH. I don't think she was there while I was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You had met her there, you said?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I met her after the school had moved.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was she connected with the school when it moved to Arkansas?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; she was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what capacity?

Mr. KOCH. Well, she was still one of the interested parties supporting the school.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did she live at the school?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; she lived at the school.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And she taught at the school?

Mr. KOCH. I think she did some teaching; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever take any courses under her?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the names of any other instructors during the period when you were a student?

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Harold Brown taught there; Mr. Benton—

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was his first name?

Mr. KOCH. I don't recall. He taught law.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Law?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. During your incumbency as director of Commonwealth College how was the institution financed?

Mr. KOCH. It was largely self-supported, and the financial budget that had to be raised was quite small. You see, the school owned, I think, roughly 320 acres of land, and most of the buildings were built by people on the school grounds, and the school operated a farm and the life was a rural life, which also made it relatively economical.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you receive contributions from interested persons?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any contributions from any foundations or organizations?

Mr. KOCH. While I was at the head of the college?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Can you name some of them?

Mr. KOCH. What is that group that helps support the New Republic?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mrs. Elmhurst?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; the Elmhurst fund.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Elmhurst fund?

Mr. KOCH. And the one Elizabeth Gilman is connected with, the Christian Social Justice Fund.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Cochrane, in Baltimore?

Mr. KOCH. I don't know whether he is connected with it or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He supplies the funds.

Mr. KOCH. I received small checks—unfortunately small checks—from both of those foundations. I think those were the only two funds.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mrs. Elmhurst's funds are known as the Willard Straight Foundation, are they not?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I believe that is it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever receive any funds from the so-called Garland fund?

Mr. KOCH. Not while I was at the college. By the way, we did receive money from the Carnegie endowment fund. We received some money from the Carnegie people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How much?

Mr. KOCH. I don't recall. I think it was a larger check than I ever got from either the Elmhurst fund or the Christian Social Justice fund.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said that no funds were received by the school from the Garland fund during your incumbency as director. Do you know whether or not the school received such funds at any other time?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, the school received a substantial amount of money from the fund for public service—

Mr. MATTHEWS. The American Fund for Public Service?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; in the beginning. I think it was largely because of that that the school was able to put up its first building and get on its feet. I think that happened approximately in '25, I would say, or '26. I am not sure of the date.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what the size of that sum was?

Mr. KOCH. I am not so sure, but I think it was approximately \$30,000. I am not too certain of the figure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know the general type of institutions that receive support from the Garland fund or the American Fund for Public Service? Do you, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. No; I do not. I know that Commonwealth did receive such funds, but that is all I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know, or have you heard, that the Daily Worker was the largest single beneficiary of the Garland fund?

Mr. KOCH. I hadn't heard that, no, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You haven't read the reports of the Garland fund itself?

Mr. KOCH. No, I have never seen them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Mr. William F. Cochrane, of Baltimore, whose money has established the Christian Social Justice fund?

Mr. KOCH. I met him for about 5 minutes fairly recently, in Baltimore.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you discuss Commonwealth College with him?

Mr. KOCH. No, I didn't know that he was ever interested in Commonwealth, or I should have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You didn't mention the fact that it was his money that established the Christian Social Justice fund?

Mr. KOCH. No, I didn't, and I don't know whether he knew that Commonwealth got any money from that fund.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You testified that it was Miss Gilman who sent you the money from the Christian Social Justice fund?

Mr. KOCH. She was the person that we contacted.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Miss Elizabeth Gilman, of Baltimore?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She is treasurer of the Christian Social Justice fund?

Mr. KOCH. I believe she was treasurer; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what her political connections in Baltimore are?

Mr. KOCH. No; I do not. She is known as one of the outstanding liberals in the city. I think she is the one that promoted the Baltimore Public Forum that we used to hear about in the past.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever address the Baltimore Public Forum?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not you have noticed that Miss Gilman has run for the governorship of Maryland or the United States Senate from Maryland on the Socialist ticket, for some 20 years?

Mr. KOCH. I wasn't aware of that fact, if she has done so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1935, or somewhere about that time, the Arkansas State Legislature conducted an investigation into the affairs of Commonwealth College, did it not?

Mr. KOCH. I don't think it should be referred to as an investigation. I think it should be referred to as a witch hunt.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the State legislature formally set up a committee to conduct this investigation?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, they formally established a committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did that investigation last?

Mr. KOCH. The proceedings lasted for a day, I believe. Just a day, so far as I recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was testimony taken from witnesses?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee?

Mr. KOCH. I was one of the witnesses that appeared at the proceedings, yes—appeared before the committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you give testimony before the committee?

Mr. KOCH. I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was a transcript made of that testimony?

Mr. KOCH. A transcript is purported to have been made.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was there a public stenographer present at the proceedings?

Mr. KOCH. There was a stenographer there, though she was certainly unqualified and highly incompetent.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the committee make a report to the legislature as a whole?

Mr. KOCH. I believe it did, yes. I believe it made a report clearing the school of the charges that it had investigated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you believe that?

Mr. KOCH. I never received a copy of the report, to my knowledge, or of the so-called transcript, although we asked for a copy, but the courtesy was not extended to us, even though it was promised.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What were the charges made against the school?

Mr. KOCH. Well, the school was accused of assisting sharecroppers in eastern Arkansas in organizing into a union, and with assisting them in getting their benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you say the school was cleared of that charge, it did not so assist?

Mr. KOCH. Well, as I say, I don't recall ever seeing a report that this committee rendered, if it did render such a report. But according to the stories that appeared at the time, it was the object of the committee to close the school down—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just a minute.

Mr. KOCH. And the school wasn't closed down.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said you believed that the school was cleared of the charges made against it. Is that your testimony?

Mr. KOCH. I believe so; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And then you stated that the charges were those of assisting sharecroppers?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And it is your belief that the legislature cleared the school of the charge of assisting sharecroppers?

Mr. KOCH. At least they didn't think that was cause for closing the school down.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the charge stated formally in those words as the legislature authorized the investigation?

Mr. KOCH. I don't know, sir. I don't remember seeing a copy of the charges, the formal charges.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you asked to appear as a witness?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you served a formal notice to appear as a witness?

Mr. KOCH. I don't believe I was; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you not apprised of the exact charges when you did appear?

Mr. KOCH. No; I don't recall that any charges were actually made. They just started asking questions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the substance of your testimony before that committee?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I don't recall it in detail. As I say, I never received a copy of the purported transcript.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the year 1935? Is that the year?

Mr. KOCH. I am not too sure of that. It was either 1934 or 1935.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know how long you were on the witness stand, approximately?

Mr. KOCH. I was on the witness stand for several hours.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many other witnesses appeared that day?

Mr. KOCH. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you hear their testimony?

Mr. KOCH. No. You see, I refer to this proceeding as a witch hunt rather than an investigation, and I think I do that fairly, because that proceeding was purely a one-sided proceeding. For instance, we asked the right to have counsel present, and that right was denied us. And we were very fearful of what might happen, so we

asked for the privilege of having a stenographer present, and that, too, was denied. So the whole proceedings were fraught with prejudice and hysteria, and it is for that reason that I didn't think it proper to refer to it as a legislative investigation, because an investigation presumably is based upon fairness and judicial processes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not request counsel to be present with you this morning, did you?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you did not request the presence of a stenographer?

Mr. KOCH. No; I placed my confidence in the committee, unless I have reason to do otherwise, and I hope I haven't. I think this is a different type of proceeding.

Mr. STARNES. I can assure you, Mr. Koch, you will have an opportunity to make any explanation or any statements you want to in connection, as I said, with the charges that have been presented to the committee in times past, that you had had some affiliation with un-American or subversive groups. You can make any statement you wish, free from any hysteria or any threats.

Mr. KOCH. Thank you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you sworn as a witness when you appeared before the committee?

Mr. KOCH. I don't recall whether I was or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having been asked this question in that proceeding of the committee of the Arkansas State Legislature: "Do you respect the American flag?"

Mr. KOCH. I might have been asked that question; I am not sure. As I say, that happened a long time ago, and we tried to get a copy of the so-called transcript and we were unable to. I might very well have been asked that question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it not your recollection that you were asked that, or a question very similar in wording to that?

Mr. KOCH. I think such a question, or a similar question, was asked.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Didn't you read a good deal of news comment on the fact that that question was among those asked?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; but sometimes such reproductions are not always accurate either.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall what your answer to the question, "Do you respect the American flag?" was?

Mr. KOCH. I assume I said that I respected it very highly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it refresh your recollection if a transcript of the Arkansas Legislature stated that your answer was, "I refuse to answer without advice of counsel"?

Mr. KOCH. As I explained, sir, I don't think you can rely upon that so-called transcript. I certainly dislike the insinuation that I might have said that, because I bow to no one in my feeling for America.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, if it is your purpose to ask Mr. Koch anything about the proceedings before the Legislative Committee of the State of Arkansas, do you have an actual transcript of the testimony in published form?

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is no published transcript of the proceedings, Congressman, as I understand the situation. What I have before me are excerpts from the alleged transcript, written by the Speaker of the

House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas, Mr. Harvey B. Thorn. This is not in the form of an affidavit, it is in the form of a simple statement made by Mr. Thorn. It generally coincides with published reports of the proceedings and the testimony given on the occasion. The committee is still making an effort to get an authenticated copy of the transcript from Little Rock.

MR. STARNES. I see.

MR. MATTHEWS. Would it be your testimony, Mr. Koch, that you did not answer the question, "Do you respect the American flag?" as follows: "I refuse to answer without advice of counsel"?

MR. KOCH. I certainly did not and would not make such a statement as that.

MR. MATTHEWS. Your testimony is that you did not answer the question in that form?

MR. KOCH. Yes, sir.

MR. MATTHEWS. Or in anything approximating that form?

MR. KOCH. Yes, sir.

MR. MATTHEWS. Did you have anything to say about symbols when you were asked that question, according to your recollection?

MR. KOCH. Well, I don't recall that I did, but again, in newspaper reports I know they stated that that remark was made.

MR. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having been asked this question: "Have you been teaching the overthrow of this Government?"

MR. KOCH. No; I don't recall being asked that question.

MR. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having been asked a question in wording similar to that?

MR. KOCH. The question might very well have been asked. I don't recollect it as of this time.

MR. MATTHEWS. According to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Arkansas Legislature, you were asked the question, "Have you been teaching the overthrow of this Government?" and your answer, according to the transcript, which he was following, was as follows: "I have presented that position and that point of view." Do you wish to deny that you gave such an answer to that or a similar question?

MR. KOCH. I certainly have never taught the overthrow of my Government.

MR. MATTHEWS. Then your answer is that you deny having given that kind of answer to that kind of question, is that correct?

MR. KOCH. That is correct.

MR. MATTHEWS. Were you asked questions about the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics during the proceedings?

MR. KOCH. Yes; I might have been questioned on that score. I don't know exactly what was asked.

MR. MATTHEWS. Were you asked anything about whether you had preference for the Soviet type of government as contrasted with the American type of government?

MR. KOCH. I don't know just what the nature of the questions might have been.

MR. MATTHEWS. Do you know what the nature of your answers was?

MR. KOCH. Well, I am not sure, sir, now, exactly, no.

MR. MATTHEWS. According to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Arkansas Legislature, you were asked the following

question: "Does the U. S. S. R. grant the right of freedom of speech and freedom of assemblage?" and you were alleged to have answered, "There is perhaps more freedom of speech and freedom of assemblage in the U. S. S. R. than in the United States." Do you recall that question and that answer?

Mr. KOCH. I do not, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having been asked any questions about religion or the Bible?

Mr. KOCH. I may have been asked such questions. If so, I don't recall just what they were.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you hear the testimony of Charlotte Moskowitz before the same committee of the State legislature?

Mr. KOCH. No. They wouldn't allow anyone else in there. They took people in one at a time, and wouldn't allow anyone else in.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you discuss with Charlotte Moskowitz her testimony before the committee?

Mr. KOCH. We may have discussed it at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By the way, who was Charlotte Moskowitz with respect to Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. She was the secretary of the college, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that she did appear as a witness before the committee?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, it is my recollection that she did.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, Dr. Matthews, I wonder if Mr. Koch knows whether or not Dr. Zeuch is or has been an employee of the Federal Government in any capacity during the past decade.

Mr. KOCH. Yes; he has been associated with some Government agencies. I don't believe he is now. I don't know just where he is now, but I think he did some work for some of the Government agencies.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall what those agencies were?

Mr. KOCH. I can't be too sure of it. I think possibly he was associated with the Resettlement Administration.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Charlotte Moskowitz ever connected with the Federal Government in any capacity?

Mr. KOCH. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know where Charlotte Moskowitz is at the present time?

Mr. KOCH. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When was your last contact with her?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I haven't seen her since I left Commonwealth, in 1935. I don't believe I have heard from her since then directly. I have heard indirectly occasionally about her.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Dr. Zeuch at all instrumental in helping you obtain a position in the Federal Government in Washington?

Mr. KOCH. No; he was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1935?

Mr. KOCH. He was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any contact with Dr. Zeuch after you came to Washington in 1935?

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had any contact with him since that time?

Mr. KOCH. I have not, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall who recommended you for a position in 1935, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. Well, not exactly. I knew a great many people. I used to see them regularly when I was traveling for the school.

Mr. STARNES. Did you apply for the place?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I applied for the position.

Mr. STARNES. Did you furnish any list of what we commonly call vouchers or list of persons who had known your background and training and so forth, as character recommendations?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I filled out the regular Government form, and I am quite certain I put down references at that time.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall who the references were?

Mr. KOCH. I can't be too sure. I am quite sure one of them was Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn. You see, it is pretty hard to refer back that far. It must be on file at the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STARNES. Did you put down the name of Dr. Zeuch as one of your references?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Charlotte Moskowitz tell you what she had answered in reply to any of the questions before the investigating committee of the Arkansas Legislature?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I don't remember. I assume we discussed it. We all discussed it at that time. I don't remember specifically what questions were asked and what answers were given.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the excerpts of the transcript which I have before me, she was asked the following question: "Do you respect that flag up there?", the questioner pointing to the flag on the wall, and her answer was, "I do not respect any symbol."

Mr. KOCH. It is very hard for me to believe she would make any such statement as that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She didn't tell you that she had answered in that tenor?

Mr. KOCH. I know she didn't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What courses did you teach at Commonwealth?

Mr. KOCH. I taught several courses. I taught a course in trade-union problems, trade-union history, public speaking, and parliamentary law, and I think I also taught a course for a time at least in American history and, of course—

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Mundt, a member of the committee from South Dakota, would like to ask you a question.

Mr. MUNDT. Before we leave those hearings entirely, you said no witness was allowed to hear what any other witness had to say. Were there representatives of the accredited press at the hearings?

Mr. KOCH. No; there were no representatives of the press there. They had to be satisfied with what they were told. No; it was a secret session. We couldn't have counsel, we couldn't have a stenographer, we couldn't have anybody sit in, including the press. As a matter of fact, as I recall, the press was somewhat friendly to the school at that time in the handling of that whole affair.

Some time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go into a little detail as to just why this witch hunt, as I feel I have been compelled to refer to it, took place, and that will be at your convenience.

Mr. STARNES. Prior to the time you finish the examination, or at any time, when it does not interrupt the regular examination, you may do so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. While we are on the subject, the statement is in order at the present time.

Mr. STARNES. You may make the statement now, if you desire.

Mr. KOCH. I think I should show to the committee why the feeling of prejudice and a spirit of hysteria existed. It grew out of the fact that the sharecroppers' organization in eastern Arkansas got in touch with Commonwealth College and asked for some assistance. The organization was formed shortly before then, and was known as the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, and we went over to eastern Arkansas to do what we could. We helped them to organize into the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, and then there was great complaint about the sharecroppers themselves not getting the full benefit from the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Their claim was that the benefit was going to the plantation interests rather than to themselves, and so we tried to look into that matter and to give some assistance on that matter too.

Naturally the State of Arkansas—I like the State of Arkansas, but I feel that I am compelled to explain this to you gentlemen—is pretty well dominated, politically and economically, by the plantation interests, and they would naturally resent, and did very strongly and bitterly resent, our activities in attempting to assist the sharecroppers in the eastern part of the State, and it is for that reason that this proceedings on the part of the State legislature was promulgated.

I just wanted to make that explanation.

Mr. STARNES. Do you feel that the country as a whole at that time, or prior to that time, had been dominated by what you would deem to be financial and industrial interests?

Mr. KOCH. The country as a whole?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. KOCH. No; I don't think so.

Mr. STARNES. I said at that time.

Mr. KOCH. No; I wouldn't think so—certainly not in the manner in which it was true of Arkansas at the time.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, you feel that the country at that time, and prior thereto, had not been dominated by financial and industrial interests, and that in the country as a whole at the time and prior thereto organized labor and unorganized labor had been fairly represented and had a fair voice and a fair share in the Government, and also in the economic benefits that come under our system of Government?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I wouldn't want to say that we were entirely satisfied then, and I assume we are not entirely satisfied now.

So far as I am personally concerned, I think great progress has been made in the last few years in extending benefits to the average American. Witness the Social Security Act and the National Labor Relations Act and so forth, the wages and hours law.

Mr. STARNES. You didn't have any of those prior to that time?

Mr. KOCH. No.

Mr. STARNES. Did you make the point in any of your talks or lectures at that time that the country was so dominated by financial and industrial interests at that time that the workers of America were not getting their fair share of the national income and did not have a fair proportion of the national wealth?

Mr. KOCH. I don't believe the workers and farmers were getting a fair share of the national income.

Mr. STARNES. Nationally?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. I don't feel that they were. There was great unemployment.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May I ask what period you are speaking for?

Mr. STARNES. I said at that time and prior thereto.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is 1935.

Mr. STARNES. That is right. At that time, and prior thereto.

Mr. KOCH. I was going back a little further than that. I was going back to 1933.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I want to check one or two dates.

Mr. KOCH. I was going back prior to the New Deal administration.

Mr. MASON. You stated in the beginning that you were born in 1907?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MASON. That you went to college in 1923, in Louisiana? That would be when you were 16?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MASON. That you became director of that same college after it was moved, in 1931?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MASON. That would mean, then, that you were director or head of the college when you were 24?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; and there was some publicity on it at the time, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were giving us a list of the courses that you taught at Commonwealth. You mentioned trade-union problems, trade-union history, American history possibly, you say?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I think I taught over some period American history, and I taught a course in economics, too.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you use any textbooks formally in connection with these courses?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall what textbook you used in trade-union problems?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I used Perlman's condensation of the work headed by John R. Commons and associates. John R. Commons' works are recognized as the basic works and one of his students at that time, Perlman, wrote a condensation of those works.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And what textbook did you use in trade-union history?

Mr. KOCH. Well, that is what you are talking about, aren't you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I first asked you about trade-union problems.

Mr. KOCH. Oh, trade-union problems.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you use the same textbook for both courses?

Mr. KOCH. We used the same, but we may have had some in addition. For instance, we used Lorwin's book on trade-union problems, and we

used a book by Simons, an old book, where he discusses the early development of our country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A. M. Simons?

Mr. KOCH. I believe so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have a textbook in American history?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall what that was?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; that would be professor Beard's book, *The Rise of American Civilization*.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Claude Williams teach at Commonwealth during your incumbency as director?

Mr. KOCH. No; he did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What were your associations with Williams? You spoke of having gone to Highlander Folk School with him.

Mr. KOCH. He was a minister and was very much interested in the sharecropper problem at that time, and he visited the school on one or two occasions, and I think it was he that suggested that I go along with him to this conference that was to be held at the Highlander Folk School.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where was he minister at that time?

Mr. KOCH. At Paris, Ark.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he later become head of Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; he later became director of Commonwealth College.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he ever discuss with you his membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. KOCH. No; he did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that he was a member of the Communist Party, do you not?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know that, and I would be very much surprised if he was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever read his biography, published in England?

Mr. KOCH. No; I haven't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you heard about his biography?

Mr. KOCH. I heard about it. I would like to get hold of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have a copy next door. Didn't you know that it tells in some detail of his allegiance to communism?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Didn't you know he was expelled from the Socialist Party because they found evidence of his Communist card?

Mr. STARNES. Do you have that biography of Williams?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. I am going to suggest that you insert excerpts from it. That is one of the reasons I had you sworn in the beginning, to implement the statements that you have to necessarily make in an examination of Mr. Koch with documentary evidence of that sort.

Mr. MATTHEWS. First I would like to ask Mr. Koch if Williams was his immediate successor as head of the Commonwealth College.

Mr. KOCH. No; he was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did he become head of the institution; do you know?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I am not sure. I think around '38 or '39, I believe. I left in 1935.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you closely associated with him in work among the sharecroppers in Arkansas?

Mr. KOCH. No; I wasn't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you did attend a conference at the Highlander Folk School with him?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. He drove over and I went along with him.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, is this man Williams, the minister you refer to, a native of England or of this country?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is a native of Tennessee, as I recall.

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I believe he is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. His biography for some reason was published in England, and we have a copy of it.

Mr. STARNES. A copy of it in our files?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Well now, is it a matter of record, Doctor—I am asking you—that the Garland fund did make a substantial contribution to the support of the Daily Worker? You asked Mr. Koch that question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct. It is a matter of record from the reports of the Garland fund itself that its largest single beneficiary was the Daily Worker.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. KOCH. Would that be true back in '24 or '25, when I think they made their allocation to Commonwealth?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker was founded in 1924. About that time there was a very substantial contribution, and through the succeeding years, from the Garland fund.

Mr. STARNES. You can insert those documents at the proper place in the record, too.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, Congressman, there is testimony before this committee already by numerous witnesses giving details concerning the contributions of the so-called Garland fund to numerous Communist enterprises.

Would it not be your opinion, Mr. Koch, that the Garland fund contributed its moneys exclusively to organizations which were, let us say, considered radical?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I didn't know anything about what the fund did with its money other than the American Fund for Public Service, which did, I understand, make a substantial contribution to Commonwealth in the early days, I think back in 1924 or 1925. Outside of that I don't know what the fund does with its money. I don't know to this day. I am interested in what you say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever a member of the Socialist Party?

Mr. KOCH. No; I was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it not come to your attention that the Socialist Party expelled Claude Williams from membership?

Mr. KOCH. No; it never came to my attention.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wish to state for the record, if I may, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has in its files the necessary documentary evidence, which is a matter of public record, that this man Claude Williams was expelled from the Socialist Party because the Socialist Party claimed to have found evidence of his Communist Party mem-

bership card. Norman Thomas was very much interested in the situation at Commonwealth, and gave some publicity to it.

Did you have members of the instructing faculty at Commonwealth who were publicly avowed members of the Communist Party?

Mr. KOCH. Not while I was there, and I don't know what happened since. I am not implying that that happened since.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have visiting lecturers from the Communist Party address the students?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; we did in one instance; at least, I assume she was. Mother Bloor passed through and addressed the student body.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know, of course, that she was a publicly avowed leader of the Communist Party?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did William Sentner visit the school during your incumbency?

Mr. KOCH. Not while I was present at the college.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Sentner?

Mr. KOCH. I heard of him. I think he was from St. Louis, wasn't he?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was at one time State secretary of the Communist Party in Missouri. Do you recall that?

Mr. KOCH. I don't recall that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is a matter of public record also. It is also a matter of public record that he frequently visited Commonwealth and addressed the students or discussed matters with the students. I don't say during your incumbency.

Mr. KOCH. He wasn't there to my knowledge while I was there. Of course, you must understand, you see, that I traveled for the school some, so even during the years I was there I wasn't there constantly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not it was a matter of repute in radical circles, ignoring for the moment what the outside press might say, that Commonwealth College had a distinct Communist tinge?

Mr. KOCH. I don't think that was true, sir, during my stay with the college. Of course, we never made it a point particularly to find out what the politics of the people were. But in one instance I know that the people who were supposed to be Communist Party people were very critical. They weren't friendly toward me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have avowed Communist students?

Mr. KOCH. Well, there were some that propounded that point of view; yes. Whether or not they were Communists I don't know. But they asked questions, and so forth?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Tucker Smith?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I have met him—formerly with Brookwood College?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Formerly head of Brookwood Labor College, at Katonah, N. Y.

I have here a carbon copy of a letter written by Tucker Smith, director of Brookwood Labor College, to Charlotte Moskowitz, Commonwealth College, Mena, Ark., under date of May 21, 1936. The letter has to do with holding a summer school at Commonwealth, a summer school devoted to the study of war and peace. I should like to read you what Tucker Smith said, in part, to Charlotte Moskowitz in this letter, and ask you if you think it is a fair comment for Tucker Smith to make.

Fred Libby, the most conservative man on the board, and one or two others, attacked our program on the ground that we had chosen Commonwealth for a southern summer school. I had expected this, as I wrote you previously, but they had the advantage of being able to argue economy along with communism.

I haven't the slightest objection to your seeing the whole letter. That is the substance of it.

Mr. KOCH. Tucker Smith was cooperating with Commonwealth in establishing such a summer school?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is right; a summer school devoted to the question of war and peace.

Mr. MUNDT. What year was that?

Mr. STARNES. '36.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May 21, 1936.

My point was whether, among radicals generally, such as Brookwood Labor College, from which the American Federation of Labor withdrew its support on the ground that it was a Communist institution, and Tucker Smith was director of it and he is writing the head of Commonwealth College that some conservative members of his peace board were objecting to a summer school being held at Commonwealth, because they had the unfair advantage of being able to argue communism.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, if I might, naturally I want to point out that I wasn't there during this period; and secondly, the letter is addressed to Charlotte Moskowitz, not the head of the school.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Wasn't she acting head of the school at that time?

Mr. KOCH. Well, it would be news to me if she was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who succeeded you as director?

Mr. KOCH. Richard Whitten succeeded me as director.

Mr. STARNES. You testified she was secretary of the school.

Mr. KOCH. Yes; and she was during part of my incumbency there.

Mr. STARNES. What type of a secretary?

Mr. KOCH. Well, she handled the mail and correspondence and kept the files in the office, and so forth.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, Dr. Matthews, you asked Mr. Koch a question in the earlier part of the examination in which he stated he had no personal knowledge of the facts as referred to in the question. It was about this woman Kate Richards O'Hare, in which you asked him if he knew that she was convicted of sedition in World War No. 1, and he said he didn't know. Is that a fact?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. I am quite sure, without trying to impute any knowledge to the witness, that he is aware of the fact that that was public knowledge, that she served a prison term.

Mr. KOCH. No; I knew Eugene V. Debs did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Kate Richards O'Hare was the most famous of all the women prisoners during World War No. 1. She wrote a book on the subject after she came out of prison, and lectured widely all over the United States.

Mr. STARNES. Let me suggest, then, that you, for the committee, obtain the necessary authenticated information to that effect, and include it in the record.

Mr. MATTHEWS. We have a copy of her autobiography, in which she relates her prison experiences and she describes herself as founder of Commonwealth College.

A copy of Kate Richards O'Hare's book on her prison experiences is in the Library of Congress. The title of the book is "In Prison," and it was copyrighted in 1920 by F. P. O'Hare. According to the author's own statements in her book, she was sentenced to a prison term for sedition in 1919 by Judge Martin J. Wade in Federal court at Bismarck, N. Dak. Furthermore she states that she was a Federal prisoner in the Missouri State Penitentiary from April 14, 1919, to May 30, 1920.

Mr. STARNES. When the witness says he doesn't have any knowledge of it, that doesn't make it testimony so far as this committee is concerned. If we have in our possession her autobiography, or if we have authenticated proof of the fact that she was—I am not trying to be too technical, but I am trying to build this record, because there is another committee which will pass on certain matters later. I want the record affirmatively to show that those things are true, so they won't have to go to the trouble and expense of turning around and having to have that authenticated proof themselves. So kindly place an excerpt from her autobiography in the record at the proper point. We will also obtain—of course we can do that from the Department of Justice—the necessary proof of this fact. Then this other committee doesn't have to go chasing around and obtaining that information and that proof.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would once more like to ask the witness if it is likely that in view of the fact that Kate Richards O'Hare was so widely known in the labor movement—all over the United States that it slipped his memory that she served this term?

Mr. KOCH. Well, it certainly did slip my memory, and still does, though now, as you talk about it, it seems to me I recall hearing some discussion. But understand that I was rather young during the last war, see? I think I was around 7, and she was at Commonwealth very little, so I had very little opportunity to talk to her. She wasn't there, I don't believe, for a 6-month period.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She was in residence, however, at Commonwealth?

Mr. KOCH. Just temporarily; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know what the nature of her lectures was as she went out from Commonwealth over the country?

Mr. KOCH. I didn't hear her deliver any of her lectures. I knew she was supposed to be a Socialist, so I assumed she would be interested in that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Richard Babb Whitten personally?

Mr. KOCH. Slightly, only.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And he was your successor at Commonwealth?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I think I spoke to you before he went in, as a matter of fact. Maybe I didn't; maybe that was before that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he well known as a Socialist leader in New Orleans?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. Well, now, let's see. I want to be fair here. I knew he was supposed to have Socialist leanings. I didn't know him as an outstanding leader of the Socialist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know him as the secretary of the Socialist Party in New Orleans?

Mr. KOCH. No; I didn't know him in that capacity.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is also a matter of record, Mr. Chairman.

Did you know that he had some difficulty with the Socialist Party on the ground that he was charged with being secretly affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. KOCH. No; I was not aware of that. You see, I left actually, before he came in, a matter of 2 or 3 weeks before he actually came in.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have a board of trustees or any corresponding body at Commonwealth during your incumbency as director?

Mr. KOCH. We had an advisory board, that had a rather indefinite existence so far as the college was concerned. It was not actually a board of trustees.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it some kind of presiding committee?

Mr. KOCH. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many members were there on it?

Mr. KOCH. The ruling body of the school was the Commonwealth College Association, and that was made up purely of people who were on the campus.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What did you call that board?

Mr. KOCH. Advisory board, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You called it the advisory board?

Mr. KOCH. I think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many members were there on it?

Mr. KOCH. I don't recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall any of the members, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. I would have to check this. I think Roger Baldwin was one.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have a list of the members, Doctor?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Covering certain periods, but not any particular date assigned to them. We have one list of a so-called executive committee, and a nonresident board, as it is described in our information.

Mr. KOCH. That was after my incumbency.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then there was also a national advisory committee, which included Roger Baldwin?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Donald Henderson on your national advisory committee?

Mr. KOCH. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Donald Henderson?

Mr. KOCH. I met him once or twice after I came to Washington, in connection with the sharecropper matters.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Didn't you meet him in connection with the sharecroppers in Arkansas?

Mr. KOCH. He wasn't around. I didn't know who he was at that time.

Mr. STARNES. Did you have any connection with him in your Consumers' League work?

Mr. KOCH. No; none whatever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that Donald Henderson, of course, is a publicly avowed Communist?

Mr. KOCH. I heard people say that. I never heard him say that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He has published official reports under the name of the Communist Party in the Communist magazine.

Mr. KOCH. I wasn't aware of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is no secret about his Communist Party membership.

On this particular list of the national advisory committee Donald Henderson was a member, and I am quite sure the witness is correct in saying that it was in 1936, or subsequent to his incumbency, that Donald Henderson went to Arkansas and became very active in the sharecroppers movement, and, due to that, undoubtedly became a member of the national advisory committee of Commonwealth College.

Grace Lumkin is also listed here as a member of the national advisory committee. She had been treasurer of the Communist Party in New York.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know Grace Lumpkin, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. I have never met her. I don't believe she was on the national advisory committee while I was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know who she is?

Mr. KOCH. I know she published a book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you also know that she is a publicly avowed member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KOCH. I didn't know that; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She was treasurer of the party in New York at one time.

Granville Hicks was at this time on the national advisory committee. Was he on the national advisory committee during your period of administration?

Mr. KOCH. I don't believe so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Granville Hicks, shortly after this, resigned from the Communist Party, as you may recall, Mr. Chairman. That testimony has been introduced before the committee.

Mr. STARNES. I believe the witness said they had a national advisory committee and then also had an executive board.

Mr. KOCH. We had a Commonwealth College Association, which is the body that ran the school. It was made up of resident members of the school, faculty members and the members of the industrial community, those who operated the farm, and so forth. That was the governing board of the school. Then we had a national advisory board, just to let people know who was supporting us, who thought we were doing a pretty good job, but they actually didn't govern the school or run the school in any way.

Mr. STARNES. All right, Doctor; you can proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to know if the witness can recall even two names from his national advisory board during his own administration of the school. He has mentioned Roger Baldwin.

Mr. KOCH. Yes. That is a long time ago. If I had some letterheads of that period—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have letterheads?

Mr. KOCH. No. I think the national advisory board was carried on the letter head at that time, as I recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make it a point to have representatives of the various "left wing" or revolutionary political parties on your advisory board?

Mr. KOCH. No; we did not; not while I was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you state that there were no avowed—

Mr. KOCH. The school was strictly a nonpartisan, nonsectarian school while I was there, and it may have been after I left, but I can't speak for what happened after I left.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your testimony that you did not have any avowed Communist Party leaders on the national advisory board during your directorship?

Mr. KOCH. No member of the national advisory board, so far as I know, was a member of the Communist Party or an avowed Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you weren't quite positive on whether or not Ella Reeve Bloor was a Communist?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I think I was rather definite about that. I know she was considered to be one of their spokesmen.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But about Donald Henderson you weren't at all sure whether he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KOCH. Not then, certainly, when I met him. I have heard reports since.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you appear as a witness before a Massachusetts State Legislature investigating committee in 1938, or thereabouts?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you working in Boston with the Shipbuilding Union?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I was the regional director of New England and was living at Quincy, Mass.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know about the investigation by the Massachusetts State Legislature at that time?

Mr. KOCH. I am not aware of the fact that they conducted any regular investigation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you in Massachusetts in 1938?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you there in 1937, or part of 1937?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. I went up there in the latter part of April. You are not referring to the Sybil Holmes committee, are you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oh, yes. Sybil Holmes was the chairman of it, but it was a commission of the Massachusetts State Legislature.

Mr. KOCH. I never appeared before that committee; no; but I do know of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Sybil Holmes was the chairman of the committee which bore the title "Special Commission to Investigate the Activities Within the Commonwealth of Communistic, Fascist, Nazi, and Other Subversive Organizations, So-called."

This final report was issued on May 27, 1938.

Mr. KOCH. I am familiar with the fact that that committee was operating. I never appeared before it as a witness.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you familiar with the fact that the committee report dealt with you?

Mr. KOCH. I am acquainted with the fact that it had reference to me; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Maybe running two or three pages?

Mr. KOCH. I never saw it, but a little item appeared in a paper, three or four lines, and the item is attributed to this committee. I never saw the report itself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reading from the report of the committee of the State Legislature of Massachusetts, I find the following—

Mr. MASON. Page?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Page 320.

An Arkansas legislative committee investigated this school in 1935. Koch was then the director of the college and was a witness before the legislative committee. The following are excerpts from his testimony in that proceeding:

"Q. Do you believe in capitalism, as you understand it?

"A. I do not.

"Q. Do you respect the flag of the United States Government?

"A. I personally am not a worshipper of symbols, and I consider flags to be symbols.

"Q. Do you have a higher regard for other governments than the regard you have for the American Government?

"A. I believe that the Government of the United Socialist Soviet Republics is in many ways superior to that of the American Government."

That is the end of that particular quotation. Had that come to your attention in Massachusetts?

Mr. KOCH. No; it did not; not in that form. As I say, there was just a very brief story in a paper. I wish to point out, sir, that that, of course, purports to quote the so-called transcript of the legislative proceedings in Arkansas, and I certainly did not make those statements attributed to me there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You deny having made the statements attributed to you in this question?

Mr. KOCH. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reading again from the report:

In 1935 Koch was appointed to a commission in the consumers' division of the National Recovery Administration and later became an employee for the Federal Department of Labor. He came to Massachusetts as a Congress of Industrial Organizations organizer directly from the latter position to organize shipyard workers for the Congress of Industrial Organizations. He had never worked in a shipyard. There was already in this field another Congress of Industrial Organizations organizer named Michael Woodford, who was a member of the National Executive Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America. Woodford protested Koch's assignment to Green, national head of the aforesaid union, basing his protestations on Koch's communistic background. Green overruled the protest, and Koch has been in this territory since that time organizing workers in the shipyards at Quincy, East Boston, and Bath, Maine.

Have you any comments to make on any particular portion of that statement?

Mr. KOCH. Well, of course, Mr. Woodford got his information from an article that appeared in the Liberty Magazine, and that article, in turn, purported to quote from the transcript that was taken at the time of that witch hunt. He was an honest working man, but made the objection before he discussed it with me, on the basis of the article itself, took it at face value. Later, when we talked about that, he realized that he probably shouldn't have believed it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did he say to you that he realized he shouldn't have believed it?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; he accepted the answer and explanation I gave him as to why it was unreliable.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reading further from the report of the Massachusetts committee:

Koch was a delegate to the Congress of Industrial Organizations convention held in Boston November 20-21, 1937. He was accredited from East Boston

Local No. 25. This commission has evidence that a delegate from another union there present met Koch on the floor of the convention and said to him, "Why, you are a Communist, a Red," and that Koch replied, "I am proud of it."

Is there any foundation for that?

Mr. KOCH. No foundation whatsoever. I may have attended the State convention, but I certainly made no such statement as that. As a matter of fact, that is the part that appeared in the newspaper story, and I wrote a letter to Sybil Holmes, stating that this story appeared in the paper, and asked who the witness was, what his name was, what evidence or proof she has or he has. I always thought she was a woman. And I got a letter back which did not offer to let me examine the evidence or to send the evidence to me. In other words, it is entirely an unsupported statement, the type of stuff that was typical during the situation in Arkansas.

I think perhaps I have that letter I wrote here, and a copy of her reply, or a letter I wrote him and a copy of his reply.

Mr. MUNDT. In that letter did you ask to appear before the committee?

Mr. KOCH. The hearings were over then. I think maybe I did. I think maybe I have that with me, if the committee would be interested in it.

Mr. STARNES. Let the record show that Mr. Courtney, of Tennessee, and Mr. Eberharter, of Pennsylvania, members of the special committee, are present and attending the hearings.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I have here a copy of a letter I sent to Sybil Holmes, 15 State Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MADAM—

Mr. STARNES. What is the date of that?

Mr. KOCH. This letter is dated August 2.

Mr. STARNES. 1938?

Mr. KOCH. 1938.

Mr. STARNES. You can make that a part of your testimony, if you wish. You can insert it in the record.

Mr. KOCH. Unfortunately it is the only copy I have. If this stuff is going to come up all the time, maybe I had better be in a position to keep copies, anyway. So what would you advise?

Mr. STARNES. You can take a receipt for it and let the reporter return it to you, as soon as he has copied it in the record.

Mr. KOCH. It is not very long.

Mr. STARNES. Go ahead and read it.

Mr. KOCH (reading):

On page 320 of the report of the proceedings of the special commission to investigate the activities within this Commonwealth of Communist, Fascist, Nazi, and other subversive organizations, so-called, this statement appears:

"This commission has evidence that a delegate from another union there present met Koch on the floor of the convention and said to him, 'Why, you are a Communist, a Red,' and that Koch replied, 'I am proud of it.'"

This statement, which an unknown delegate attributes to me, was never made by me. I am not and never have been a Communist. However, in view of the fact that this statement may be seized upon by those unfriendly to organized labor, I feel that you owe me further explanation concerning it, especially since you say the commission has evidence.

Will you, therefore, forward to me immediately the name of the delegate who purports to quote me, and will you also send me copies of any other evidence you may possess relating to this statement? I feel that this request is a very reasonable one since I was never called or testified before your commission,

although during the course of its proceeding I was within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and available for testimony.

May I hear from you at your earliest convenience?

She writes back:

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 2.

This commission was created by the legislature to make an investigation of certain activities and report thereon to it. The duties of the commission have been fulfilled and it has no further comment to make. I regret that it is not possible for me to go into greater detail concerning the matter of which you write.

Very truly yours,

In other words, I asked to appear before the commission after the little story appeared in the paper, and wasn't given an opportunity. At the same time I was not allowed to examine the evidence.

I want to point out that an attorney gave me this citation from the report of the special commission. I was in his office at the time. I, myself, never saw the report and never read it, but I did read this in the paper, and he said you had to tie it down to the commission's proceedings, and gave me that citation, which I incorporated in the letter.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Matthews, how much time do you think it will take to conclude the examination?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would say approximately half an hour.

Mr. STARNES. It is already getting quite late.

(Discussion was off the record.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will state the nature of the remaining material. They are bulletins issued by Commonwealth College, and these happen to coincide with the period of Mr. Koch's directorship of the school. They contain articles in high praise of such outstanding Communists as Ella Reeve Bloor, who is described as "young, cheerful, forceful, alert, lovable Mother Bloor, who had the whole campus on its toes during the last 2 weeks of August."

Mr. KOCH. What year was that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. '35.

Mr. KOCH. Thank you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are listed as having presided at the meeting:

Mr. Lucien Koch was master of ceremonies. The speakers were Mrs. Bloor, her husband, Andrew Omholt, her granddaughter, Herta Ware, and Joe Jones, who is a professed Communist.

The bulletins would seem to indicate that there was a good deal of sympathy for communism on the campus.

Mr. STARNES. If the committee wishes to stay and hear it, and if you are sure you can conclude in thirty minutes, all right, but I do not want to drag it out into 1½ or 2 hours.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wouldn't want to hazard a guess on how long the witness might want to speak.

Mr. STARNES. Let us recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

The subcommittee reconvened at 2 p. m., upon the expiration of the recess.

Mr. STARNES (presiding). The subcommittee will resume its sessions. Dr. Matthews, you may resume your examination of the witness.

TESTIMONY OF LUCIEN KOCH—Resumed

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congressman Starnes, I wish to offer as Exhibit 1 a copy of the Commonwealth College Fortnightly dated August 1, 1935 and as Exhibit 2 a copy of the Commonwealth College Fortnightly dated September 15, 1935.

Mr. STARNES. Without objection, they will be made part of the record.

(Articles from the two publications which were introduced as Exhibits 1 and 2 are as follows:)

WRITER GOES TO TEST DOWNS LAW**CONROY, SENTNER, AND RODGERS SUMMER LECTURERS FOR FORTNIGHT**

When Jack Conroy, novelist and Guggenheim fellow who spent the 2 weeks of July 13 to 28 lecturing at Commonwealth, left the campus last Thursday he was on his way to get arrested in Alabama.

In the company of Bruce Crawford, Nelson Algren, Alfred H. Hirsch, and other well-known writers commissioned by the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners, Conroy is going to Birmingham, Ala., to test the Downs law and arouse public opinion against it.

The Downs law is a Birmingham city ordinance which makes the mere possession of more than a single copy of any radical periodical a crime subject to \$100 fine and 6 months' imprisonment.

The group expects also to see Governor Eugene Talmadge, of Georgia, on the case of Angelo Herndon, and an effort will be made to have the Governor use his influence to bring about the repeal of the law under which Herndon was convicted.

Conroy was preceded on the Commonwealth lecture schedule by Bill Sentner, district organizer of the Communist Party, and followed by Ward Rodgers, member of the State executive committee of the Socialist Party and organizer of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union. Sentner delivered a series of lectures on the Negro problem, and Rodgers is leading discussion groups on the southern sharecropper.

Accompanying Rodgers for a brief visit to the school was J. R. Butler, president of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union and Arkansas chairman of the Socialist Party. Butler has been a part of the midwestern labor movement for years, and was a member of the old Working Class Union which participated in the green corn rebellion.

Lectures were also given by John Gould Fletcher, one of the best known of American poets. Mr. Fletcher lives at Little Rock, Ark. (Commonwealth College Fortnightly, Mena, Ark., Aug. 1, 1935, p. 1, 4.)

FOREMOST ARTIST ON SUMMER SCHEDULE**JOE JONES WILL BE SPECIAL LECTURER FROM AUGUST 5 TO 19**

Joe Jones, one of America's outstanding revolutionary artists, has been added to the schedule of special lecturers for the Commonwealth summer session. Jones will be at the school from August 5 to 19, and will lecture on proletarian art and culture.

Jones has been teaching art to unemployed workers in St. Louis for several years. It was his students who painted the murals on the walls of the old St. Louis courthouse and fought the efforts of the indignant property owners of St. Louis to demolish them.

Jones' own work was exhibited recently at the A. C. A. gallery in New York City and brought a great deal of comment. Of the canvases exhibited, consisting of murals, landscapes, and current scenes, those dealing directly with the class struggle attracted the most attention.

Jones' lectures at Commonwealth on art will supplement Virginia Donaldson's class in drawing, composition, and poster design, which is a regular course, and the lectures given by Pauline Schindler on architecture and modern design. (Commonwealth College Fortnightly, Mena, Ark., Aug. 1, 1935, p. 1.)

STATE CONVENTION TURNS REACTIONARY

FRATERNAL DELEGATES REFUSED SEATS BY ARKANSAS FEDERATION

A Salutatory example of Fascist tendencies in labor union officialdom was given at the recent annual convention of the Arkansas Federation of Labor in Paris, when a reactionary machine reversed completely the progressive stand of the Federation 1 year ago.

Commonwealth Local 194 of the American Federation of Teachers was represented by Horace Bryan, delegate, and Lucien Koch, alternate.

Machine-controlled speakers, who called for "harmony" and aggressively raised the red scare, had a virtual monopoly of the platform throughout the convention. Rank and filers who attempted to speak were unceremoniously ruled out of order. The specially organized cheering section, led by the newly elected president, who has cordial relations with the Fort Smith Chamber of Commerce and its vigilante committees, kept up a bombardment of applause for the reactionaries.

The first real fight came over the seating of fraternal delegates. Vincent Miles, state commander of the American Legion, who helped crush the workers' relief strike in Fort Smith, who fought hard for the passage of state sedition bills, and who was recently regarded by a Rooseveltian appointment to the Social Security Board, was seated by a large majority. But those fraternal delegates from Commonwealth College, the Workers' Alliance, and the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, were fought viciously by the machine and were not seated. With a few exceptions the forward-looking resolutions were also attacked and killed.

At many times during the convention a murmur of protest welled from the rank-and-file delegates. They came unprepared to fight the bludgeoning tactics employed by the opposition. It was their first experience of such Hitler methods. They spoke of the convention as "their lesson" and vowed to come back next year with a program and organization of their own. (Commonwealth College Fortnightly, Mena, Ark., September 15, 1935, pp. 1, 4.)

MURAL DEDICATED TO WORKING CLASS

JOE JONES, MOTHER BLOOR, ANDREW OMHOLT, ASSIST IN DELIGHTFUL CEREMONIES

"This mural is made possible only through my affiliation with and my attitude toward my class, and by the subject matter drawn from that class; whatever is here that is good comes from my class, the working class. In dedicating this mural I give it back to them, and particularly to the working class of the entire south." Thus spoke Joe Jones to the group gathered in the commons, Saturday evening, August 31, to celebrate the completion of the mural and the visits of Jones and Mother Bloor to Commonwealth.

With Lucien Koch as master of ceremonies, the speakers of the evening were Mother Bloor, her husband Andrew Omholt, her granddaughter Herta Ware, and Joe Jones. The latter gave a complete explanation of his technique and his interpretation of the huge painting, which he was able to finish during his short stay of 3 weeks.

The lighter side of the entertainment was in the form of a sage of the departing guests, about whom limericks were composed and sung by every person on the campus. Games and dancing concluded.

The gala day, 1 week before the end of the summer session, marked the high point of one of the most successful quarters in Commonwealth's history. The more than 100 people who attended the regular classes also heard and associated with the following visiting lecturers, specialists in their respective fields: Mother Bloor, Joe Jones, Eleanor Risley, Bill Reich, Carl Haessler, Ralph Compere, David Englestein, Jack Conroy, Ward Rodgers, and John Gould Fletcher.

Mother Bloor and Jones left the following day to make a joint speaking tour of Arkansas before leaving the State. They are bound for Jones' home town St. Louis, from where Mother Bloor continues her speaking trip. (Commonwealth College Fortnightly, Mena, Ark., September 15, 1935, p. 1.)

MYRA PAGE COMES TO COMMONWEALTH

PETER FRYE JOINS NEW COLLEGE STAFF IN CAPACITY OF DRAMATICS DIRECTOR

Two new members for the growing teaching staff, making its total faculty membership 13, bring Commonwealth College face to face with the September 30 fall quarter armed with the finest equipment for workers' education that it has ever had.

Commonwealth's three new strengths are (1) its new director, Richard Whitten, who will lead the school in broadening its service to southern labor, (2) its finest and largest faculty, and (3) physical improvements: an enlarged and reorganized labor library, a new larger classroom, and completion of the housing program of repairing and refurnishing the dormitories and other school buildings.

Myra Page, novelist, and Peter Frye, dramatics director, are the latest teachers to join the group.

The wife of John Barnett, new Marxian instructor here, Myra Page, is well known as a proletarian writer. Among her works are *Gathering Storm*, a novel of southern textile workers, and, published this year, the much-discussed *Moscow Yankee*. She will conduct the course in proletarian literature.

With a background of seven years of varied theatrical experience (four of them spent in teaching), Peter Frye comes to direct Commonwealth dramatics "keenly interested in experimentation along the line of finding new American theater forms, in the light of the political need for more articulate dramatic expression." One of his first projects here will be the organization of dramatic troupes to travel the south representing labor education and building working-class forces against such tendencies as were manifested in the recent Arkansas Federation of Labor convention.

Other new teachers who will begin September 30 are: John Barnett, lecturer, experienced in workers' education for 10 years; John Herrmann, Scribner's short novel contest winner and member of the Farmers National Committee for Action. Elmer Hamm, trade-union teacher and active in silkworkers' organization in Paterson, New Jersey; Stella Mathews, teacher of effective writing.

The final outline of the fall quarter curriculum will appear in the October 1 Fortnightly. (Commonwealth College Fortnightly, Mena, Ark., September 15, 1935, pp. 1, 4.)

"I'LL STAY A MONTH NEXT TIME"—MOTHER BLOOR

Two special lectures at the college for neighbors and residents of Mena, and a series of five lectures on Russia featured the sixteen talks given by Mother Ella Reeve Bloor, nationally known farm and labor organizer. Her originally scheduled stay of 1 week had been extended to 2 weeks.

Her talks on Russia, considered by the students her finest and most inspiring, were mainly eye-witness accounts of socialist construction there since 1921. She gave an excellent picture of the achievements in the developments of the youth and in the field of education.

In announcing her intention to return to Commonwealth next summer, "Unless I'm in jail," Mother Bloor said: "This is the first time I have been at a place like this, where I feel that in talking to you all and in being here I have learned just as much as you have." (Commonwealth College Fortnightly, Mena, Ark., September 15, 1935, p. 1.)

COMMONWEALTH COURSES

DRAWING, COMPOSITION, AND POSTER DESIGN, VIRGINIA DONALDSON, INSTRUCTOR

The Marxist-Leninist philosophy has often emphasized the fact that art is a very specific instrument for the perception and reflection of reality. And by reflecting the reality of today, art performs a very important function in the labor movement.

That function is two-fold. Art's utility is obvious as it presents argument, guidance, and leadership for working-class organization through posters, cartoons, and illustrations. It is in the form of such mediums as murals, paintings, sculpture, and theatrical scenery that this instrument is wielded as a more subtle and yet more powerful force, portraying reality to evoke the feeling for, as well as intellectual realization of, the movement and direction of social change.

With this in mind, in 1934 Commonwealth decided to broaden the curriculum to include an art class.

The class in drawing, composition, and poster design is by necessity broad and is arranged to meet the needs of individual students, taking beginners as well as those more advanced. Separate guidance and criticism is given several times a week on work done in class so that the student interested in different phases of art such as fine arts, poster or cartoons can receive the help they most need. At Commonwealth and in the nearby neighborhood is an abundance of material for quick sketching. Quick sketching is stressed as valuable training because only by the facility for rapid work can the artist take advantage of active material. The majority of the class periods are spent in learning to draw. Pupils interested in lettered posters to be used in organization may spend their full time at this work.

This class is not taught from an academic point of view, which so often kills originality and leads to stereotyped production. So the student is encouraged to work for character and action rather than photographic technique. Pupils are expected to do compositions outside of class. These compositions may take any form the student wishes. One day each week is devoted to collective class criticism of this work. This method of criticism builds initiative and stimulates the student to criticize his own work competently.

Assuming that the potential Burck, Jones, and Riveras are ideologically prepared, the course aims to add to their equipment a grasp of technique, so that these students may most effectively experience and re-create the reality about them.

The class of the fall quarter is in need of the gift or loan of the reading material listed here: Three books by Walter Pach, *Ananias, An Hour of Art, Makers of Modern Art*; by Solomon Reiwach, *Appolo*; by Ellie Faure, *History of Art* (four volumes); a subscription to the New York publication *Art Front*. (Commonwealth College Fortnightly, Mena, Ark., September 15, 1935, p. 2.)

SOCIETY NOTES

Young, cheerful, forceful, alert, lovable Mother Bloor had the whole campus high on its toes during the last 2 weeks of August. From the moment she came it seemed that this energetic 73-year-old never stopped talking, and every member of the group never stopped listening, including the loquacious pair, Matt Mackie and Mother Bloor's own husband, Andy Omholt, the big Swede. Andy hung around the shop of Mackie, the Finn carpenter, most of the time he was here. The two enjoyed some wonderful silences together as they worked at producing benches for more listeners to sit on during the fall and subsequent quarters. Whenever Mother spoke, the two who hung upon every word were her granddaughter Herta (a charming young lady) and Andy, who have listened to her talks all over the country. To be specific, what is this strange power? Marve Sanford, tycoon of labor history and journalism, was tickled breathless when Mother spoke to the neighboring townspeople and farmers. As she mentioned the Soviet Republic—"they have states there just like ours"—she juggled the imaginary little states in her little cupped hands as though they were that many little children's building blocks. And listen to Charlotte Moskowitz, postmistress and ex officio executive secretary: "If we had only a hundred like her!"

The Fortnightly retracts. In its previous issue it allowed itself to be flippant about painter Joe Jones in a manner that savored suspiciously of "urbanity." This was in regard to Joe's alleged inquiry about hoeing, made previous to his departure for Commonwealth. (The circumstance of this departure is itself moot and to be taken up later.) Because after Jones finished the mural he made another inquiry that should be examined beside his first (alleged) remark, and examined closely. Many witnesses heard him speak after he had for 3 weeks massaged with a size quadruple A paint brush (in contradistinction to size triple E) 353 square feet of wall "covered with something special." What Jones said was: "May I please go out and hoe some peanuts?" But Jones himself has left and cannot be interviewed.

Last Sunday's trip to rob a bee tree, led by gardner Charley Brown, woodsman par excellence, proved to be an affair for the society page and then some. It was educational, even. You can't get away from it. Anyway, the bunch hiked 5 miles to the house of the upland farmer who had spotted the bees, parked

the lunch, and gritted their teeth for another "mile" to the tree itself. There was the knothole high up the tree where the bees transacted business, invisible to the city eye. * * * The 2-foot beech was felled, cleared of branches, and, with "smokers" used for protection, Charley took charge of chopping out sections of the hollow trunk. These smokers are bellows contraptions that burn rags, or say bark, and keep puffs of smoke between the robber and the robbed bee. When the store of honey was exposed and everyone's face was sticky with "wild honey" someone remarked, "Just like the capitalistic system. The bees do all the work and—" "But they don't have to come and get it; we workers bring it to 'them.'" "Besides, we haven't got any stingers." * * * "Oh yeah?" And a longer silence followed. So, loaded with saw and ax and smoker, and cans and pail of honey, the expedition marched back to the farm and ate like big game hunters. Casualties: two stings.

On his regular biweekly errand to the college printshop, the Fortnightly's copy boy found the Gutenberg-of-the-day distraught. He had been disappointed in having his regular chat, at this time, with some campus celebrity, the subject for the usual illustration in a neighboring column, who has nothing to lose but his modesty, and so complains about the likeness. Virginia Donaldson also has her little travails as she tries to make a slab of linoleum look like a pen-and-ink sketch, but this particular fortnight heard not one single murmur of complaint. (Commonwealth College Fortnightly, Mena, Ark., September 15, 1935, p. 2, 3.)

WILLIAM GREEN BALKED BY TEACHERS' CONVENTION

RANK AND FILERS GO LEFT IN NEW YORK CITY'S STRUGGLE TO HOLD A. F. OF L. CHARTER

The recent Cleveland convention of the American Federation of Teachers can be recorded as a historic one. Until now labeled least militant union of the American Federation of Labor, the delegates overruled president William Green's command to expel the New York local, in the face of his threat to kick out the whole federation of 16,000 members. Green charged, not that Local 5 harbored members of political parties, but that some of these were members of radical political parties.

David Englestein represented Commonwealth Local 194 at Cleveland. (Commonwealth College Fortnightly, Mena, Ark., September 15, 1935, p. 4.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should like to ask the witness if he has ever seen these copies of the Commonwealth College Fortnightly.

Mr. KOCH. I can't say definitely that I have ever seen them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied with the authenticity of the publications as shown?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I have no doubt that they were published in Commonwealth College, particularly this issue of September. I don't believe at that time—after I left the college, I never received any copies of the Fortnightly.

Mr. STARNES. That was the college publication, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; the Fortnightly was the college publication.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the exact date of your departure from Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know the exact date.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the month?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I would not even know the month. I think it was September—August or September. I think I got my job here—the first job in Washington—I think in October; I am not sure of the date.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did your last official connection with the college cover the summer course of 1935?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know that I was there for the full summer. I was oftentimes away from the college.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; but your official connection with the college covered that?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was the way in which I asked the question. It covered the summer term of 1935?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the period—the summer term of the college—which is covered largely by these two issues of the Commonwealth College Fortnightly. I say that because the articles here refer to happenings during the summer session. For example: "Foremost Artist on Summer Schedule. Joe Jones will be special lecturer from August 5 to 19" and so on and so forth.

Mr. KOCH. I do not believe I was there when he was there. I was not at the college.

Mr. STARNES. Is that the same Joe Jones to which reference was made in the testimony this morning?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. State for the record again his official connection with the Communist Party, if any.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the August 1 issue before me, Joe Jones was special lecturer at Commonwealth College for a period of 2 weeks from August 5 to 19. During that period it appears that there was a mural dedicated at the college. The news account of the occasion, given in the Fortnightly of September 15, 1935, states that Lucien Koch was master of ceremonies at the dedication and that the speakers of the evening were Mother Bloor, her husband, Andrew Omholt, her granddaughter Herta Ware, and Joe Jones. According to this account, Mr. Koch was present and did preside at the dedication of that mural.

What was the mural, by the way?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know how to describe it. I think it purports to show the struggle of the miners, and so forth, for better conditions. I am not an artist; I don't know the language.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having presided at the dedication of the mural?

Mr. KOCH. No; the funny thing is I don't recall that, and I should think I would on an occasion of that kind.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the visit of Mother Bloor to the campus?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I know Mother Bloor was there, and I know Mr. Jones was invited to be there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall introducing those four speakers at the time of the dedication?

Mr. KOCH. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Can you offer an explanation as to why the college bulletin might have stated that you were master of ceremonies that evening, when you were not present?

Mr. KOCH. No; I could not, except that I was head of the college, and it may have so stated for that reason.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many lectures did Mother Bloor give at the college on the occasion of her visit in August of 1935?

Mr. KOCH. I would not know. I think she was there a week or so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did she give a number of lectures?

Mr. KOCH. She gave more than one, yes; she gave several.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you hear her give any of her lectures?

Mr. KOCH. I heard her on one or two occasions; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say that she gave a course of 16 lectures?

Mr. KOCH. I would be surprised if there were that many lectures involved.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The bulletin for September 15, 1935, states that Mother Bloor was a special lecturer at the college and that in her course of 16 lectures she included 5 on Russia.

Mr. KOCH. You see, I am not at all sure that I was there at that time. That was the summer in which I left.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The news account in the issue of September 15 says: "Her originally scheduled stay of 1 week has been extended to 2 weeks." Did she visit the college on some other occasions?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; she visited there 2 years—2 different years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And was a special lecturer each time?

Mr. KOCH. And was a special lecturer each time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By whose invitation did she appear as special lecturer at Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. On the invitation of the college.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You would be the person to forward the invitation?

Mr. KOCH. I am not at all sure. I think the secretary may have taken care of that. You see, this was purely routine stuff.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you oppose her appearance as lecturer at the college?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not oppose her appearance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You favored her appearance?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I did not see anything particularly out of the way very well that Scott Nearing was a lecturer at the University of Wisconsin they had lecturers there of every type. For instance, I recall very well that Scott Nearing was a lecturer at the University of Wisconsin, and that he was supposed to be a Communist or something or other. From an educational viewpoint, I did not see that it was any different for Commonwealth to have them than any other college or university.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your testimony this morning you stated that you were aware of the fact that Mother Bloor was one of the prominent Communist leaders in America, did you not?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; she was an avowed Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were fully apprised of her connections?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you apprised of the fact that Andrew Omholt was one of her succession of husbands?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he not appear on the campus with her as her husband?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; he did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you mean that at the time he was there you did not know he was her husband?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I did not know she had had other husbands, though.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, she picked up the name Bloor from somewhere. She is the mother of Karl Reeve, State secretary of the Communist Party in Pennsylvania; she is the mother of Herta and Hamil-

ton Ware; so, at least, according to the records, she had been married to Mr. Reeve, Mr. Ware, Mr. Bloor, and Mr. Omholt.

Mr. KOCH. You know much more about her than I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know that Andrew Omholt was also a Communist Party member at the time he came with his wife?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not know that.-

Mr. MATTHEWS. You could have assumed as much, could you not?

Mr. KOCH. Well, not necessarily. He did not take any active part at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having met Herta Ware on the occasion of this dedication, when you are alleged to have presided?

Mr. KOCH. No; I do not recall that at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not know her as a Communist, publicly avowed as such?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not. I don't remember meeting her at all, although the story says I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not Joe Jones was an avowed Communist?

Mr. KOCH. I do not. It was my definite understanding that he was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the Fortnightly for August 1, 1935, on the front page, it states:

FOREMOST ARTIST ON SUMMER SCHEDULE—JOE JONES WILL BE SPECIAL LECTURER
FROM AUGUST 5 TO 19

Joe Jones, one of America's outstanding revolutionary artists, has been added to the schedule of special lecturers for the Commonwealth summer session. Jones will be at the school from August 5 to 19, and will lecture on proletarian art and culture.

What political views did Jones have, according to your information?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know what his political views were. I know he was friendly to labor and liberal movements.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Liberal movements?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Why was he described as a revolutionary artist?

Mr. KOCH. I don't know. That can be a very broad term. The New Deal was supposed to be revolutionary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Commonwealth College Fortnightly ever describe the New Deal as revolutionary?

Mr. KOCH. I do not think so; I hope not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you not satisfied that Joe Jones was a Communist?

Mr. KOCH. No; absolutely, I am not satisfied of my own personal knowledge.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know just what the witness means to cover by the phrase "personal knowledge." If that means having seen the membership cards of any of these individuals, we might assume he does not have personal knowledge. But it is a matter of public record that all four of the speakers on the occasion of the dedication of this mural, over which dedication Mr. Koch is said by his own school to have presided, were Communist Party members. They are Ella Reeve Bloor, Andrew Omholt, Herta Ware, and Joe Jones.

I should like to ask the witness if he can offer any reasonable explanation as to why an occasion supposedly as important as the dedication of a college mural would concentrate on Communist Party speakers to the exclusion, apparently, of speakers representing any other type of thought.

Mr. KOCH. Well, as I say, I had no knowledge, with the exception of Mother Bloor, that they were supposed to be Communist Party members. If you have information to that effect, of course, you are better off than I am. As I say, I don't remember presiding at that meeting. Is there any assurance that there were not other speakers, for that matter?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am going only by the statement which appears in the Fortnightly, which, to quote it exactly, is: "With Lucien Koch as master of ceremonies, the speakers of the evening were Mother Bloor, her husband Andrew Omholt, her granddaughter Herta Ware, and Joe Jones."

Mr. KOCH. You see, what may have happened, for instance—that program might have been arranged, you see, and then maybe I left the school and didn't actually take part in it. Seems to me I would have recalled having taken part in it.

Mr. STARNES. I understood a moment ago, though, that you said you remembered Mother Bloor, and Joe Jones, and also remembered the ceremonies in connection with the presentation of the mural.

Mr. KOCH. No; I do not think I said I remembered them. I do know that there was a mural there and that it was painted by Jones, whom I knew as an artist in St. Louis. I mean I did not know him before I came to the campus, but I understood he was an artist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who recommended Mr. Jones to you, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know for sure. I assume someone wrote in something.

Mr. STARNES. Surely, though, you did not employ Mr. Jones to paint this mural for you without being satisfied as to his professional skill, knowledge, and ability to do the job for the college in an acceptable manner?

Mr. KOCH. Of course, we did not employ him. He came down and offered to do it, as I recall it, see? We did know him as quite an artist. I think he did some of the work in some of the public buildings in St. Louis, didn't he? It seems to me he did some work of that kind.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know how he came there and under what auspices or how it was you happened to employ him for this particular purpose? That is what the committee would like to know.

Mr. KOCH. You see, at the college we had the summer session, and lecturers were invited in for the summer session. Some stayed a few days, some stayed a week, and some stayed 2 weeks. They were not on the staff of the college at all, even. They were people who just dropped in.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the names of any other lecturers at that particular summer session? Would it refresh your recollection if I asked you if Carl Haessler was one of the lecturers?

Mr. KOCH. He may have been there. He was there during some of the summers, at least.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know Carl Haessler?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the Fortnightly bulletin of September 15, 1935, Carl Haessler is listed with Mother Bloor as one of the visiting lecturers during the summer session. Do you know whether or not Mr. Haessler is a professed Communist?

Mr. KOCH. He is not, according to my information.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not he has had extensive connections with Communist Party organizations and front groups of the Communist Party?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know exactly what you mean. I never understood that he was a Communist. I think I have heard him deny it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what his connection was with Federated Press?

Mr. KOCH. He was manager of Federated Press. It was my understanding that that was not a Communist outfit.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not consider Federated Press a Communist outfit?

Mr. KOCH. Well, at the time I knew something about it; I don't know what the situation is now.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The records will show substantial testimony to the effect that Federated Press was a Communist-dominated group, including on its board of managers William Z. Foster and other prominent Communists. There is a very extensive record on Carl Haessler's Communist views and connections.

I should like to ask the witness whether he recalls Bill Reich as one of the visiting lecturers in the summer of 1935 at Commonwealth College.

Mr. KOCH. I do not know whether or not he was. I know he was down there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Bill Reich?

Mr. KOCH. I know him slightly; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you know him?

Mr. KOCH. I knew him at Commonwealth. I understood he was—I think he was a teacher in St. Louis, or something.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever know that he was connected with the movement led by A. J. Muste, known as the American Workers Party?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I take it your answer would have to be "No"?

Mr. KOCH. In this case.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know that Bill Reich issued a public manifesto, together with Arnold Johnson, resigning from the American Workers Party and announcing their intention of becoming Communist Party members?

Mr. KOCH. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that that occurred at least a year before he was a visiting lecturer at Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. I have no information on that. I don't know who this Johnson is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Arnold Johnson is State secretary of the Communist Party of Ohio at the present time.

Mr. KOCH. Things happen.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Johnson and Reich signed a joint manifesto resigning from the group led by A. J. Muste on the ground that the Com-

munist International was the only adequate leader of the working class in the world, or words to that effect, as things are usually stated in their jargon.

Did you interest yourself, Mr. Koch, in the political background of the people who taught and lectured at Commonwealth?

Mr. KOCH. Not particularly, no. As I say, this particular summer here I was not playing a very active part in the school, knowing I had made up my mind to leave.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever interest yourself in the matter of the political views and political connections of the teachers and lecturers at Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. We did not examine into them very thoroughly. I mean they would be people who would be recommended by some one or other.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Myra Page?

Mr. KOCH. No; she wrote a book too?

Mr. MATTHEWS. She wrote a book called Gathering Storm.

Mr. KOCH. I never met her at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Myra Page was on the faculty of Commonwealth College. She is described here as a novelist. You knew that, at least, she had written a book?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Myra Page has been a prominent Communist Party leader for some 15 or 20 years. She was at one time editor of the Communist publication for children known as The New Pioneer. That was back in 1931. She has been a frequent contributor to The Communist, which is the official theoretical organ of the Communist Party. She has been a frequent contributor to The New Masses. She has been on the staff of the Daily Worker for the last 15 years and down to the present time. Would you approve of the employment of such a Communist?

Mr. KOCH. Not as a member of the staff, no. She wasn't—was she at the school?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. KOCH. Not when I was there. She was not there. She was never there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She joined at the time you left, according to the news account.

Mr. KOCH. There were quite a few changes that might have taken place when I left.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But Joe Jones and Mother Bloor were special lecturers when you were there?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I wouldn't say I was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, you were administrator?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, I was administrator.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So, there was no break in the continuity of policy during the time you were there, and after you left they kept on employing Communists?

Mr. KOCH. Except that I did not take too much part in the affairs during the last summer, because I knew I was leaving. My impression was that I wasn't there much of the time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Virginia Donaldson?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. I think she was a student there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She is listed as being an instructor at Commonwealth College during your incumbency. Was she?

Mr. KOCH. Oh, in art. She did some work in art.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She is listed as an instructor in art.

Mr. KOCH. I do not know how much art work she did. She did some wood cuts, I think, and linoleum cuts.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall that she was instructor in art while you were there?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I didn't know she was an instructor. I knew she was a student. I remember her making some linoleum cuts. I don't remember her having a course in art.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to your bulletin here, she taught classes in art.

Mr. KOCH. Was that during the summer session?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; continuously.

Mr. KOCH. Oh, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that Joe Jones came to assist her.

Mr. KOCH. We did not have any regular art class while I was there. She might have been during that summer session.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the August 1, 1935, issue of the Commonwealth College fortnightly it is stated: "Jones' lectures at Commonwealth on art will supplement Virginia Donaldson's class in drawing, composition, and poster design, which is a regular course."

Mr. KOCH. Maybe it was the regular course thereafter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was in August.

Mr. KOCH. We had some work in leaflets.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; but the point I would like to get at is, was Virginia Donaldson a member of the teaching staff of Commonwealth, or was she not?

Mr. KOCH. While I was there she was not a member of the staff. Now, she may have—this summer session may have started in, and I don't know what happened at that time. But we didn't have any courses in art. I may have been there for a few days.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were there at the summer session? I do not mean that you were physically on the campus, but you were director of the school?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. During your directorship of the school, Virginia Donaldson was on the teaching staff, or else the record is falsified by the school's own publication. Is not that a fair statement?

Mr. KOCH. You have to make a distinction between summer sessions and the regular course of the college.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you director during the summer session?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I was director during the summer session.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then why the distinction?

Mr. KOCH. They were interim sessions, and you had lectures and people coming down for vacation. You didn't have any regular class work, necessarily; it was very informal.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She is described as having "a regular course." That is the exact phrase used here.

Mr. KOCH. Regular course?

Mr. MATTHEWS. A regular course given by Virginia Donaldson, according to the bulletin. How long was Virginia Donaldson at the school?

Mr. KOCH. I don't know how long she was there. She was there first as a student, is my recollection. I don't know when she left. She was there when I left.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And before?

Mr. KOCH. She was there sometime before; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Virginia Donaldson herself contributed an article to the September 15, 1935, issue of Commonwealth College Fortnightly entitled, "Commonwealth Courses. Drawing, Composition, and Poster Design. Virginia Donaldson, Instructor." I will ask you to identify that article as written by her.

Mr. KOCH. I don't know. That is the fall term there. I wasn't around there during the fall term.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This reference here cannot possibly be to the fall term. The reference may be false, but the reference is not to the fall term; it is to the summer term. It states that Joe Jones is going to assist Virginia Donaldson from August 5 to 19. That is the summer session referred to?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; now, what was this other article?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the September 15, 1935, issue she simply wrote an article for that bulletin about drawing, composition, and poster design. She was a member of the staff.

Mr. KOCH. This is an article on art.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, by Virginia Donaldson. Was she not a member of the staff of Commonwealth? At least, the bulletin says so.

Mr. KOCH. I see the bulletin says so, yes; but I don't think I was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From your experience with the bulletin—and you had experience with it for 4 years?

Mr. KOCH. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it customarily falsify facts concerning college life?

Mr. KOCH. No; I don't think so. I do not want you to force me into a position when I have to speak about something I have no knowledge of. I don't know exactly when I left, but I know I left in the fall, and I have the impression I wasn't there very much in the summer, because I knew I was severing my connection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The point I am getting at is that in the article by Virginia Donaldson appearing in the September 15, 1935, issue of the Commonwealth College Fortnightly, she begins her article with this sentence:

The Marxist-Leninist philosophy has often emphasized the fact that art is a very specific instrument for the perception and reflection of reality. And by reflecting the reality of today art performs a very important function in the labor movement.

Then:

With this in mind in 1934 Commonwealth decided to broaden the curriculum to include an art class.

Is that last sentence correct in fact?

Mr. KOCH. According to my knowledge, it is not correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not have any art class?

Mr. KOCH. I do not recall having any art class. We had a class in leaflets—mimeographed leaflets—stenciling, and that sort of thing; but we didn't have an art class, to my recollection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are a person, Mr. Koch, informed in the political philosophies of the left wing, are you not?

Mr. KOCH. I am afraid not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You taught courses, did you not, in those philosophies at Commonwealth?

Mr. KOCH. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, from your knowledge, whatever it is, whether it is profound or superficial, or however you want to qualify it, when a person begins an article in this manner, citing as the authority for a particular policy the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, would you have any slight doubt on the face of the earth where that person was politically at home?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I would have some doubt; yes. I would like to know what it means myself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have read some Socialist writings, have you not?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever read a writing by a Socialist Party member who quoted as authority for his particular line the Marxist-Leninist philosophy?

Mr. KOCH. I do not recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it not a perfectly reasonable deduction that persons who cite such an authority are Communists, and mean in the clearest way possible to assert publicly that they are Communists?

Mr. KOCH. I would not say so necessarily; no. I think you are drawing a conclusion that is not necessarily justified.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do not Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, and all the other Communist writers in the world customarily introduce their writing with that phrase, "Marxist-Leninist philosophy"?

Mr. KOCH. I could not say as to that. I apparently have not read as widely as you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know that they set themselves apart from Socialists by adding the word "Leninist" to "Marxist"?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know that; no. I thought they were both supposed to come from Marx.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is precisely the point I was making. They both stem from Marx, and the Communists, in order to differentiate themselves from Socialists, add the word "Leninist."

Mr. KOCH. Well, I was not aware of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, you did not have any particular significance which you attached to this philosophy of Virginia Donaldson when she wrote it?

Mr. KOCH. I don't know what she means, and I don't know if she does.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Marxist-Leninist line is a clearly elaborated line or philosophy. Hundreds of authors have written in the field of what they call Marxist-Leninist philosophy. The Workers School, in New York, states in its catalog that it is a Marxist-Leninist school. In fact, that is the customary phraseology used by the Communist Party in describing its philosophy.

Mr. KOCH. That may be; I have never seen it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Furthermore, the Communist Party never calls itself simply Marxist, but it invariably calls itself Marxist-Leninist.

Mr. KOCH. You see, that is not my field of interest at all. My field of interest is trade-unionism, and I think this is far afield.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Toward the end of this article Virginia Donaldson writes:

Assuming that the potential Burcks, Jones, and Riveras are ideologically prepared, the course aims to add to their equipment a grasp of technique, so that these students may most effectively experience and re-create the reality about them.

Do you know who is referred to there by Burck?

Mr. KOCH. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know that Burck is one of the original Communist cartoonists, who has published hundreds of cartoons in the Daily Worker and other Communist publications?

Mr. KOCH. No. Diego Rivera I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that he was at one time the Communist International representative in Mexico, do you not?

Mr. KOCH. No; I didn't know that. I know of his murals and paintings.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that Leon Trotsky lived in his home for a number of years in Mexico City, do you not?

Mr. KOCH. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is, after he, Rivera, had ceased to be a member of the Stalinist Communist group. The Jones referred to is presumably the Joe Jones whom we have already identified.

Concerning this visit of Mother Bloor to the campus of Commonwealth, the Commonwealth College Fortnightly states:

"As she mentioned the Soviet Republic"—this is referring to Mother Bloor's speech—"Charlotte Moskowitz, postmistress and ex officio executive secretary"—I presume the word "said" is left out—"If we had only a hundred like her."

Would you say that that would reflect Charlotte Moskowitz's view of Mother Bloor?

Mr. KOCH. I don't know. I have never discussed Mother Bloor with Charlotte Moskowitz.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was not Charlotte Moskowitz on the association's staff?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; she was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you not sit jointly and decide whether or not to invite Mother Bloor?

Mr. KOCH. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thought you so testified. Who did invite her?

Mr. KOCH. The college invited her, no doubt.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who is "the college"?

Mr. KOCH. Well, the college was made up of members of the association.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was not Charlotte Moskowitz a member of the association?

Mr. KOCH. Charlotte Moskowitz was a member of the association. She is probably the one who wrote the letter inviting her down. That would fall in the field of her duties.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would she do that without a meeting of the board?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, surely. There would not have to be any meeting of the board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mother Bloor is discussed again in another article on the first page of the September 15, 1935, issue. The headline states, "I'll stay a month next time"—Mother Bloor." The article reads in part as follows:

Her talks on Russia, considered by the students her finest and most inspiring, were mainly eye-witness accounts of Socialist construction there since 1921. She gave an excellent picture of the achievements in the development of the youth and in the field of education. In announcing her intention to return to Commonwealth next summer, "unless I'm in jail," Mother Bloor said, "This is the first time I have been at a place like this, where I feel that in talking to you all and in being here I have learned just as much as you have."

You would assume, without hearing Mother Bloor, that her lectures were highly enthusiastic and favorable to communism, would you not?

Mr. KOCH. I would so assume.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you find any significance in the statement in the bulletin that her statement on Russia was the finest and most inspiring which was delivered to the students?

Mr. KOCH. Apparently she impressed the one who wrote the article.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did you hear any of the lectures on Russia?

Mr. KOCH. No, I did not hear any of the lectures on Russia.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You heard some of the others?

Mr. KOCH. I recall her lecturing on farmers, once—farm problems.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was she introduced to the surrounding farmers by anyone at the college?

Mr. KOCH. Oh, yes. As I recall there was a meeting held for the surrounding farmers, and I think I was present there at the time, too—a holiday crowd—and apparently she was quite impressed then. She does not necessarily inject her politics into all her talks. Her discussion of the farm problem, as I remember it, was not very political; it was a discussion of the problems.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who is Marve Sanford? Was he on your staff?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; he was for a while. He taught journalism. He came to us, I think, from the Llano Cooperative Colony.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the bulletin, "Marve Sanford, tycoon of labor history and journalism, was tickled breathless when Mother spoke to the neighboring townspeople and farmers." You say he was instructor in journalism?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; he was a printer and also instructed in journalism.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But he seems to have been enthusiastic about presenting Mother Bloor.

Mr. KOCH. Yes, which was very amazing, as I know Marve, unless he has changed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, you would say that this is another case of the doubtful accuracy of the college paper?

Mr. KOCH. Well, it certainly does not conform with my understanding of how Sanford felt about such things.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This morning, Mr. Koch, we mentioned the name of Claude Williams, and I asked you if you knew that Claude Williams had been expelled from the Socialist Party. I believe your answer was that you had not heard of that.

Mr. KOCH. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You worked a good deal with the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, did you not, while you were at Commonwealth?

Mr. KOCH. No, not nearly as much as I would like to have. I was over there 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were arrested at Lepanto, were you not, when you worked with the Southern Tenant Farmers Union?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have had continual interest, have you, in the Southern Tenant Farmers Union?

Mr. KOCH. I have been very much out of touch, ever since even before I left Commonwealth.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to ask you if you have heard that Claude Williams was expelled from the Southern Tenant Farmers Union because of the Communist Party documents which were discovered in his possession.

Mr. KOCH. Not until you mentioned it to me a few moments ago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The committee has a complete transcript of the proceedings of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union meeting held on September 16 and 17, 1938, which was supplied to the committee by an official of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union. It gives a detailed account of the discovery of the Communist Party documents in the possession of Claude Williams, who was director of Commonwealth College a little later—

Mr. KOCH. Quite a little later.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Three years at the most.

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You may place in the record such pertinent excerpts as will give a true history of that proceeding. If it is necessary to place the entire document in the record in order to do that, you may do so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think it will not be necessary to include the entire document.

Mr. STARNES. Whatever is necessary to give a true and connected story, you may place in the record.

(The document referred to as having been found in the possession of Claude Williams while he was director of Commonwealth College is reproduced in its entirety below. In several places in the document, "the Center" is referred to. "The Center" is the highest body of the Communist Party in the United States, and its headquarters are in New York. The document was found in Claude Williams' possession by J. R. Butler who was at the time head of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union. At a formal trial of Williams, the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union held that the document was authentic and on the basis of that finding Williams was expelled from the union.)

(Exact Copy of Document Discovered by Butler)

A meeting was held last night at Commonwealth College of 20 faculty, Maintenance and Administration workers who are Party members. The total number of Faculty, Maintenance and Administration workers at the College is 25.

A visitor to the College, also a Party member, said: "If we think of the United States as a war map on which flags are stuck as the troops move in to new territory, then clearly it is time our Party stuck a flag in at Mena, Arkansas."

A committee was appointed to draw up a report to Party headquarters on the present situation at Commonwealth. This report follows:

1. The situation from a Party standpoint at Commonwealth is known to the District Organizer at St. Louis, with whom the College has been working closely. But we wish to draw the attention of national headquarters to the very great national importance of the College to our Party at the present time.

2. Since the reorganization of the school in August 1937, when a Party member became director of the school (Claude Williams), there has been on the campus complete political unity, an absence of such outside or disturbing elements as previously existed, and a conscientious adherence to the Party program in all the educational and field work. The figures quoted in par. I, above show the numerical situation in faculty and administration, and it may correctly be said that students who are not members when they arrive almost invariably become members either here or immediately after they leave.

3. Since the reorganization the School, in addition to unifying and strengthening its resident program, has greatly developed its working relationship with the Southern labor and democratic movements.

(a). Claude Williams is a member of the National Executive Council of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, has played a decisive part in insisting upon progressive union policies, and has carried the need for a militantly progressive program to thousands of rank-and-file members who have the greatest confidence in him.

(b). The school has not only given resident instruction to members of the STFU but has conducted field classes as well (for example an interracial institute for preacher members of the union was held at Little Rock from July 27 to August 1).

(c). The school has the full support of the Arkansas State office of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union. Two students have been commissioned as organizers and the school has conducted an extensive educational and organizational campaign on behalf of—and financed by—the union.

(d). For several months the school supported two persons to work full time in the labor movement at Fort Smith, the industrial center of this area.

(e). The Commonwealth College Association, governing body of the school was expanded to include nine leading union officials of this area.

(f). Under direction of the District Organizer the school played a leading part in organizing the Arkansas Conference for Economic and Social Justice held in Little Rock July 23rd. Party members who took responsibility for setting up this Conference—the most important step to date in building the Democratic Front in Arkansas—were trained at Commonwealth, used it as their headquarters, and received financial assistance from the school.

4. In Commonwealth College the Party has a unique institution of national value and importance. Commonwealth owns the best and best-maintained labor library in the country, and a 320 acre tract in a location enabling it to serve both industrial and agricultural workers. The natural facilities of the plant are used to foster democratic responsibility for maintenance and keep operating costs at a minimum. Students develop labor discipline in their work in farm, laundry, kitchen, etc.

5. The school has been operating under ceaseless financial stress. The ever-broadening scope of the work presents more and more opportunities which could be seized and followed up if money were available. The work is entirely dependent on voluntary donations.

6. A situation has now arisen which offers us an extraordinary opportunity to move into the most important organization in the agricultural South: the STFU. H. L. Mitchell, secretary of the STFU, who has been consistently opposed to the International with which that union is affiliated, to the Party and to Commonwealth, is on a leave of absence from his office. The President of the Union (J. R. Butler) and other members of the Executive Council who are friendly to us have invited us to conduct an intensive program of mass meetings throughout Arkansas and Missouri, beginning August 21st. At these meetings Claude Williams would be the principal speaker and a play which our school has in readiness for the purpose of dramatizing the union's needs could be presented. If this program could be carried out we believe it would place us in a position to capture the union for our line at the next convention. This is an opportunity for establishing a real party base in the STFU.

7. The situation is that we cannot undertake this program in the STFU without immediate financial assistance. We would not make an appeal to the Party if we were not assured of the paramount importance and urgency of carrying out

such a program. As the Center knows, Claude Williams has traveled from east to west coasts soliciting contributions to Commonwealth. Last year he went to the Center for the first time and asked only for an entree to the Hollywood group, which was given, and of which he was most appreciative. It was estimated at the Center that he could raise \$3,000 in Hollywood but the net amount collected on the whole Pacific coast was \$1,300. The reason for this is simply that most Hollywood progressives who are sympathetic to Commonwealth's present program are Party members and are committed to give all they can spare direct to the Party.

8. Commonwealth is possibly the Party's most strategic position from which to work at this time in the South, where the danger of Fascism is greatest. We do not pretend that it is the only important phase but it is a very important one. We believe the problem of our Party work in the South needs to be approached on a broad basis, that the importance of our Southern work should be carefully appraised and that a sum of money from the National funds should be allocated to it, so that not only Commonwealth but all other Party activities in the South may be assured of a definite income. We recommend to this end the calling of a southwide conference of Party workers in the field. We are convinced that as a result of such a conference the Center would allocate funds for the South where they are so sorely needed.

At the present time, however, we wish to draw special attention to the immediate problem of financing the STFU program above described, which cannot be undertaken unless funds can be raised before the end of next week. The program could be undertaken for \$500 and we ask the Center to give most careful study to our request for that sum. Another like opportunity is hardly likely to occur.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congressman, during the noon recess the committee was able to obtain an authentic transcript of the hearings before a committee of the Arkansas State Legislature in 1935—to be specific, on the 16th day of February—at which proceedings the witness, Lucien Koch, was one of those who testified. This document which I have here, or this transcript, is a copy of the original transcript and was obtained by Naval Intelligence from the State authorities in Arkansas. I ask that it be received by the committee, as an exhibit, and I think it will be well for you to pass upon the question of incorporating this record in the committee's proceedings.

Mr. MASON. Would it be necessary to incorporate the whole of this or just that part that pertains to Mr. Koch?

Mr. STARNES. I do not think it will be necessary to incorporate anything other than what would be pertinent to the character and background of Commonwealth College and what the hearings disclosed to have been testified to with reference to the organization, background, and control of the college, together with Mr. Koch's testimony. I do not think it is necessary to place any other testimony at all in the record. We could bring here the other witnesses, if they are alive, and let them testify, just as we have done in the case of Mr. Koch.

(The testimony of the witness Lucien Koch at the hearings held before a committee of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, referred to, is as follows:)

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ACTING UNDER HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NUMBER 12

The joint committee of the Fiftieth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, composed of three members of the house of representatives and two members of the senate, namely: Representatives Marcus Miller, John G. Rye, and Minor Milwee, and Senators J. L. Shaver and Clyde Ellis, authorized and appointed under House Concurrent Resolution No. 12, to make an investigation of the activities of Com-

monwealth College at Mena, Ark., met in the Polk County courthouse in Mena on the 16th day of February, 1935, at 12 m. and proceeded to organize.

Representative Miller, of Polk County, was duly elected chairman of said committee, at which time the committee was organized and Lucien E. Coleman and Joe E. Beck, Jr., were duly elected as clerks of said committee. The committee voted that they go into executive session, and immediately thereafter began the taking of testimony.

The testimony follows:

STATE OF ARKANSAS,

County of Polk, ss:

The testimony of Lucien Koch, L. H. Shepherd, Henry Black, T. J. Thomas, Mildred Price Coy, and J. C. Turner taken on the 16th day of February 1935 in Mena, Polk County, Ark., at the Polk County Courthouse before a joint legislative committee as authorized and appointed under House Concurrent Resolution No. 12 by Miller of Polk, of the Fiftieth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, composed of the following members, to wit: Representative Marcus Miller, chairman, Representative John G. Rye, and Representative Minor Milwee, and Senators J. L. Shaver and Clyde Ellis, to be submitted as a part of the composite findings of said committee in their report to the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas.

LUCIEN KOCH, first having been duly sworn upon his oath, testifies as follows, to wit:

By Mr. Shaver:

Q. What is your name?—A. Lucien Koch.

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Koch?—A. Commonwealth College, Mena, Ark.

Q. How old are you?—A. 27.

Q. Where were you born?—A. Portland, Oreg.

Q. Of what descent?—A. My mother is Swiss and my father is German. They came over here as children, one at the age of 6 and other at the age of 9.

Q. How long did you live at Portland, Oreg.?—A. I am told that I was there just 7 days, then moved to a farm near Oregon City, 26 miles out and settled at Weideness there.

Q. Where were you educated?—A. My formal education was in Clackamas County, Oreg., in a little country school, 3 miles from home. I then went to Oregon City, working my way through high school as a printer's devil and at the end of my educational year in high school I entered Commonwealth College as a student.

Q. How old were you then?—A. I was between 15 and 16 years. Commonwealth was located in Louisiana and after attending Commonwealth as a student and student-teacher, I entered the University of Wisconsin as a post-graduate student, specializing in economics and labor. During my second year there I was a member of the staff of the University of Wisconsin, and also completed requirements for my master's degree. That concludes my formal education.

Q. Did you teach any subjects in the University of Wisconsin?—A. I taught Greek sociology. I specialized in the social and political and economical problems of Greek faction.

Q. How long did you teach there? And why did you not teach any longer?—A. Because I left to assume my duties at Commonwealth at Mena, Ark.

Q. Your services were satisfactory there, were they not?—A. Yes; I was back there later teaching during the summer session.

Q. How long have you been teaching at the Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark.?—A. I taught 1 year before going to the University of Wisconsin and then I have taught since 1931, so altogether, I have taught about 5 years or between 5 and 6 years.

Q. When was the Commonwealth College at Mena established?—A. Commonwealth was established in 1923 at Leesville, La., and moved to its present location in the spring of 1925.

Q. Who founded it in Louisiana?—A. There were three people primarily responsible for the founding of Commonwealth, the person providing most of the initiative was Dr. W. E. Zeuch, and associate founders were Kate Richards O'Hare, now named Mrs. Kathleen Cunningham, and the third person was Harold V. Brown. They were responsible for organizing the school and contacting the other teachers and getting the students.

Q. This school operated in Louisiana for how long?—A. For about a year and a half. They left Louisiana and came to Mena, Ark., because of a break between those responsible for the school of Commonwealth and those responsible for Llano Colony. The school had a contractual relationship with the colony. It was never an organic part of the colony, and it left the colony during the Christmas of 1924 because of differences which developed between the college and the colony.

Q. Where is Dr. Zeuch?—A. Dr. Zeuch is now chief of the Planning Division of the Subsistence Homestead of the Department of Interior in Washington, one of the brain trusts.

Q. Where is Kate Richards O'Hare, known as Mrs. Kathleen Cunningham?—A. Now living in California, and the last I knew was living in Pasadena.

Q. Where is Harold V. Brown?—A. He is dead.

Q. Did Dr. W. E. Zeuch move here to Mena and become interested in Commonwealth College here.—A. No; he was interested in such a college before he established Commonwealth at Llano Colony, because of his experience in rural academic schools, he felt that there was need for such a school as Commonwealth. He taught 5 or 6 years at Commonwealth before he founded Commonwealth.

Q. Did he found this college here?—A. No; he founded it at Louisiana and it was later moved to Mena.

Q. Did he break with the College here at Mena?—A. No; he continued his connection with the college when it moved to Mena, and served as the director up to July 1931.

Q. Then what position did he take after that?—A. At that time he left on a Guggenheim Fellowship for Europe and that marked his permanent break with the Commonwealth College.

Q. Was he ever President of the College?—A. The director is synonymous with the president.

Q. Now, you say when he left that signified his break with the Commonwealth College.—A. Yes; that marked his permanent break with Commonwealth College.

Q. Do you use the word advisedly?—A. No; I use it legally.

Q. Then, I want to know if there was a difference of opinion with reference to Commonwealth College and if so what was the difference that caused this break?—A. Dr. Zeuch was forced out of the Commonwealth College Association because there were differences between himself and the other members of the civil group. Namely, members of the Commonwealth Association. The major difference of opinion was Zeuch's inability to work with other people. This caused the other members to become satisfied and to act in such a manner as to sever completely his connection with the school.

Q. Would you illustrate as to what some of the examples of the differences of opinion that caused the break were?—A. I wish to state that while this was taking place I was in the University of Wisconsin, and any information I give will be second-handed.

Q. Then will you state how you got the second-hand information?—A. I got it in conversation with those on the campus, but I could not tell from which particular individual the conversation came, as I don't recall that. Zeuch realized that a majority of the group was not willing to follow his leadership because of his commanding mannerisms. He tried to keep control of the association by attempting to expel those members unfriendly to him. They postponed final decision until I returned from the University of Wisconsin. After returning I spent the first 2 days with Zeuch trying to bring about some understanding between him and the other members of the group. I valued his friendship highly and did not want to see any break come to a crisis, because it would destroy our friendship and be damaging to the school. It was impossible to make a compromise.

Q. Now, what is signified by the use of the name of Commonwealth College? How did it get its name?—A. I don't know just who proposed this name, or how this name of "Commonwealth" was accepted. I presume the three people I named, decided upon this name. I am not sure of the significance that the three had in their mind, but probably it worked toward a greater equality in the distribution of our national wealth.

Q. Is the Commonwealth College incorporated?—A. Yes; by our articles of incorporation, which is made out by the circuit clerk downstairs. I have a copy.

Q. May I see a copy?—A. It is the only copy we have in the office, I would like to have it back. I have not read that myself for a good many years.

Q. Will you file a copy of these articles of incorporation as exhibit A to your testimony? We will prepare that.—A. Yes.

Q. I notice that the college was established on the 30th (?) day of February 1925 on the present location.—A. Yes.

Q. Now the articles provide that you have a board of trustees.—A. I have a copy of our constitution here: would you like to see it? They tell of our government that I am willing to leave.

Q. Will you file a copy of your constitution of the Commonwealth College as exhibit B to your testimony?—A. Yes.

Q. I notice the college was formed nonprofit for teaching certain educational subjects. Is that true?—A. Yes.

Q. Now your college is located in which direction from Mena, where and how far?—A. It is located on the Tallihiana Highway, which I believe is west of Mena about 11 miles from Mena.

Q. What does your physical plant consist of? Will you file as exhibit C to your deposition what is entitled "Commonwealth College Association Financial Report for 1934"?—A. This is not a complete report and if there are copies available I would like to file in addition a complete financial report. Here I notice our physical plant is not listed.

Q. It is understood then that a completely itemized statement of your plant will be filed as exhibit D?—A. Yes.

Q. How many acres of land do you have out there?—A. Three hundred and twenty.

Q. And how many buildings do you have?—A. Approximately two dozen, including dormitories, library, classrooms, laundry, kitchen, Commonwealth store, et cetera.

Q. Is the plant fully paid for?—A. Yes; there is no indebtedness on our plant.

Q. How was it paid for?—A. Through donations, through tuitions, through subscriptions to our college paper, and to the contribution of the labors of the students and teachers. Now I could go into more detail if you want me to.

Q. When you say contributions, do you have any organizations contributing to your school?—A. Yes; several individuals and organizations of various types contributed to the school.

Q. Would you state the organizations contributing to the school?—A. The large grant, I believe, approximated \$27,000 came from the fund for public service with offices in New York City; Carnegie fund of New York contributed \$5,000, and several contributions were made by Mrs. Leonard Elmhurst committee, and several grants were made by the ———. Contributions were also forthcoming from several local and national trade unions.

Q. Please name them.—A. International Ladies Garment Workers Union, Hosiery Workers Union, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. There are others too, but I do not recall them right now. I might also say that contributions have been made by the Workingmen's Circle.

Q. Were there any contributions to your school by what is known as the Garland fund?—A. The Garland fund is a fund for public service.

Q. Were there any contributions made by the Garland fund?—A. That is not the proper name of the fund, the proper name is the "fund for public service." We have received contributions from the fund for public service.

Q. When and how much?—A. I stated previously that we received approximately \$27,000, I believe in the year 1925. We could check on this. We are receiving from the fund for public service \$500 this year.

Q. Does the sum of \$27,500 comprise the complete contributions of the public-service fund to your college?—A. The public-service fund has made two contributions to Commonwealth College. One around the year 1925, and the other in the year 1935.

Q. In what sums?—A. The first sum approximated as I recall \$27,000; the sum contributed for 1935 is \$500.

Q. Did I ask you how much land you had out there?—A. Yes.

Q. What was your answer?—A. Three hundred and twenty acres.

Q. How many acres of that land is in cultivation?—A. Approximately 150.

Q. How many students are there out there at this time?—A. Around 30, which includes tuition paying students, and maintenance students.

Q. What qualifications do students have to have in order to be eligible to enter?—A. They need have no formal academic qualifications, since formal qualifications frequently mean nothing. We require two things of our students on enrolling at Commonwealth. Namely, they must have intelligence and be able to handle the college work and they must have an alert interest in social problems confronting the countries of the world.

Q. Do you have a list of your students together with their names and addresses that are now enrolled in your college?—A. I do not have them with me.

Q. Mr. Koch, may I hand you what we understand purports to be a correct list of the students together with their addresses who are now enrolled in the Commonwealth College? Please state whether that list is correct in all particulars.—A. It is my belief that this constitutes a list of the Commonwealth students and indicates the States from which they came.

Q. I notice that there is only one student in your college from Arkansas?—A. Yes, that would be James Fulks. We have another student that is omitted from this list; that is Isabella Carson from Arkansas.

Q. Why is that most of your students and practically all of your students are from other States?—A. Because the school is better known in other States and because respective students of other States are more aware and more interested in social problems dealt with at Commonwealth.

Q. Are any of these students financed by any organizations that contribute to your college?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please take this list and slowly and carefully state the name of the organization that is sending this student to college and what compensation that organization is contributing toward the education of this student?—A. I cannot answer that in detail because I do not have the facts in mind, but the F. E. R. A. at the present time is financing four scholarships at Commonwealth College. Commonwealth College is also providing some; scholarships are being provided by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. Those are the organizations as I recall them.

Q. Will you inspect your records when you get back to the college and prepare a list showing the names, the addresses, and the organization or individual that is financing the various students at your college, and the amounts of money contributed to the funds for such education?—A. I would like to ask the committee for the privilege of taking up this matter with the individuals involved and see whether or not they make any objection.

Q. Do you have any objections to furnishing it?—A. Personally, I do not.

Q. We will grant that request; however, unless you object to furnishing it, we will insist upon it being furnished.

A. I would not object, but if the individual objects then would it be necessary for me to furnish it.

Q. Yes; however, if you wish to consult an attorney, of course that right will be granted.—A. Thank you.

Q. I will state further that I will expect a reply from you within a reasonable time, addressing your letter to Mr. Marcus Miller, House of Representatives, Little Rock, Ark.—A. I would be glad to make a decision on that this afternoon, providing the committee stays long enough, and I can get back to the college.

Q. I wish you would introduce the list of the names of students in your college as exhibit E to your testimony.—A. I will do that.

Q. Are you a member of any church?—A. I was brought up in the Presbyterian Church, but at the present time do not consider myself a member of any church, although I sometimes attend church when I consider the lecturer has something interesting to say.

Q. Why did you quit the Presbyterian Church?—A. I did not simply quit the Presbyterian Church; it was a gradual development during which time my interest in attending church was substituted by other and more compelling interests.

Q. Where did you join the Presbyterian Church?—A. I do not know what procedure you have to go through to join, all I did was to attend. I attended Sunday School and have a Bible given me by the superintendent of the Sunday School.

Q. Do you believe in the Bible?—A. I am interested in the Bible as a social document.

Q. Do you believe in the Bible?—A. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the Bible to state whether or not I believe in the Bible, I believe, however, I would have many disagreements with passages contained in the Bible.

Q. Do you believe in a God?—A. No.

Q. You do not believe in a God?—A. I am giving my personal opinion, and I am not representing the position of the school.

Q. To get a further background, may I ask do you believe in the Constitution of the United States?—A. I am convinced that I believe in it more thoroughly than the planters of the eastern part of Arkansas.

Q. Do you believe in the Constitution of the United States?—A. I answered that question.

Q. Then that is the only answer you will give?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you believe in the American form of government?—A. I believe in the American form of government insofar as the will of the people is compatible with it.

Q. Do you believe that the people of America have the constitutional right to change any form of government?—A. I am convinced that that is the case.

Q. Do you respect the American flag?—A. I refuse to answer because I consider it as having no bearing on the investigation. I refuse to answer without advice of counsel.

Q. You understand that I am trying to be perfectly fair in regard to my examination and accord you that right? You made the statement a few moments ago that you believed in the Constitution more than the planters of eastern Arkansas; would you please explain that statement?—A. My experience with the eastern part of Arkansas convinced me that the planters had little respect for any provision of the Constitution. Particularly did they invade the right granted American citizens in the Bill of Rights.

Q. In what respect?—A. By breaking up meetings, jailing individuals on trumped up charges. Beating peaceful citizens who were conducting themselves within the law of the land.

Q. What do you teach at Commonwealth College?—A. At the present time I am teaching a course in labor history and sponsoring a course in public speaking. I also deliver some of the lectures in the orientation course.

Q. Do you teach in that college that there is no God?—A. No.

Q. Is there any study of the Bible made there at your college?—A. Incidentally, there was a study of the Bible made in connection with some of the courses. I should not say Bible, just some of the passages of the Bible. There is a Bible in the library, I believe, several of them.

Q. Do you teach that there is a God at your school?—A. No. And I would like to make here the explanation that the school considers religion purely a matter for every individual to handle as he sees fit. There are, I understand, 13 denominational churches in the city of Mena; there are also many country churches. Anyone interested is free to attend and sometimes do attend these churches.

Q. You are the guiding head of that school, are you not?—A. I am director of the college.

Q. Is that the highest official position the college has?—A. Yes.

Q. And, as director of the college, do you go out over the country and solicit funds for the college?—A. Yes.

Q. In what name?—A. It is, of course, necessary for Commonwealth to have some funds. The job of raising most of which is usually assigned to me. Every year since 1931 I have spent several months in the field, for the purpose of raising money, contacting students, teachers, friends, et cetera. Donors are obtained through contacting individuals, organizations, and foundations, either collectively or individually.

Q. How many teachers do you have at your college?—A. At the present time, I believe between 8 and 10. I can give you an exact figure if you want me to check on that.

Q. Suppose you read into the record slowly a list of the teachers, their homes, and where they were born, and the subjects they teach.—A. I cannot give you all of that information offhand, but I will give all the information I have at the present time and will give additional information:

William Cunningham, born in Oklahoma; teaches economics and writing.

Mildred Price, born in North Carolina; teaches current events and directs the orientation course.

Henry Black, born in Illinois; teaches course in fascism and social revolution.

Charlotte Moskowitz, born in New York; teaches typing.

Clarice Cunningham, born in Oklahoma; teaches shorthand.

Rose Brown, I don't know what State in United States he was born; teaches English and effective writing.

Bob Brown, born in Illinois; teaches creative writing.

Marvin Sanford, I believe born in California; teaches journalism.

Carl Parker, I don't know what State in which he was born; teaches farm problems and farm work.

Raymond Koch, born in Oregon, who is now on leave, teaches social psychology.

Lucien Koch, born in Oregon; teaches labor history and problems and teaches public speaking.

That makes a total of 11, I believe. I think that is all.

Q. How much do these teachers receive as pay for their services?—A. They receive no salary. They get only their bare maintenance, including room, board, laundry, and other minimum necessities.

Q. Well, how is it that these teachers will come from other parts of the United States and teach for just their sustenance?—A. Because they are interested in the type of experimental education Commonwealth is conducting and because they are vitally interested in rural education. Their reward is their interest in the work that they do.

Q. In your opinion, does the teaching of your college conflict with the Constitution of the United States?—A. Decidedly not.

Q. Do you believe in the Constitution of the United States?—A. I have already answered that question.

Q. Do you refuse to further elucidate on this answer?—A. I have already elucidated on it. I have answered the question originally. I think I expressed that on the existing form of government based on the Constitution.

Q. Have you ever been out of the United States?—A. No. Our subjects include a field of social study. Of course, labor problems is one interesting aspect of that entire field.

Q. Do you believe in communism?—A. I have an intellectual curiosity toward communism, as I have an intellectual curiosity toward all other opinions, including capitalism, fascism, et cetera.

Q. Do you believe in capitalism?—A. I do not believe in capitalism, as it is now operated.

Q. Do you teach as a principle in your school, communism?—A. Just what do you mean by communism? Do you mean do we present the position of the Communistic Party?

Q. Yes.—A. We present the position of the Communistic Party along with the positions of all other political organizations, including the Republican and Democratic Parties. In other words, Commonwealth is a cross-section of free speech, public opinion, and free public discussion. We believe in the fearless pursuit in the truth arrived at on the basis of all evidence available.

Q. Do you present the theory of capitalism in your school?—A. We do.

Q. Do you believe in capitalism, as you understand it?—A. I do not.

Q. What is communism?—A. Communism is a philosophy or a school of thought which had its origin with the rise of Karl Marx.

Q. Is that your answer?—A. Yes; is that satisfactory?

Q. It is not. Would you care to elucidate on your personal view of communism with reference to social equality, with reference to the downfall of capitalism and to ownership of property?—A. Communism is an indefinite term; therefore, I think it will be more helpful to shift the discussion to the Communistic Party. The Communistic Party is a legal party, as is the Democratic Party. It believes in social and economic equality. It believes in the downfall of capitalism and in the establishment of a workers' union. I am not a member of the Communistic Party, but I am very much interested in its program and in its position, as I am interested in all other political organizations.

Q. What party are you a member of?—A. I am a member of no political party.

Q. Who did you support in the last Presidential election?—A. I did not cast a vote.

Q. Have you ever voted?—A. I have not.

Q. Do you own any property individually, and do you believe in the individual ownership of property?—A. I own very little property individually. I believe that the time has come when there must be more collective ownership of property for our civilization to be preserved and future developed.

Q. And who would be the collective individuals owning the property?—A. The people.

Q. How would you establish a collective ownership of property, and what people do you have reference to when you say "the people"?—A. I have no personal belief as to how the establishment of collectivization of property will come about. By the "people" I mean the people who produce wealth in the first place.

Q. Do you mean by the people who produce wealth, the working class of people?—A. I mean all production workers, whether they work manually or mentally.

Q. In other words, if I have worked and saved up money and bought a farm and own a farm, is it your belief, that I should not own that farm, even though

I do not actually work upon the farm?—A. I think that ownership should be associated with use and occupancy.

Q. Can you answer that question directly that I asked you?—A. I have given a direct answer.

Q. May I put the question this way? Even though I do not live on the farm, do you teach in your college that ownership should be to the man that actually uses, cultivates, and occupies the farm?—A. There ought to be no unified teaching on that question. So far as the teaching where Commonwealth is concerned, since the school is nonfactional, any point of view on that problem is likely to be presented. If you are inquiring about my personal opinion, I will say, since I think that is what you have in mind, that I am opposed to the plantation system because of the misery and oppression which results among the great masses involved in the plantation system.

Q. I will ask you to answer the question that I asked. If I own a farm and do not live on the farm, or occupy same, or cultivate same, is it your opinion that the working class of people should own that property and use and occupy same?—A. I have no clear programmatic approach to the agricultural problem. However, I am not in favor of one individual owning thousands of acres of land and cultivating that land, if it is done under the plantation system.

Q. Is that all you care to say about that matter?—A. Yes, my viewpoint is really not clearly developed on it.

Q. Is the agricultural problem more difficult than some of the other economic problems?—A. I have more definite views on the plantation system because I have seen the misery there, and I am not so clear as to the small individual farms.

Q. You being against the plantation system, what program do you advocate among the working class of people, and what program have you advocated in eastern Arkansas with reference to the situation as you see it?—A. In my activities in eastern Arkansas, I did not present any program which would bring about the elimination of the plantation system. I was interested merely in having the workers invoke section 7A of the N. R. A. by working themselves into a union. Then I confined myself to the immediate problems confronted by the union, which were concerned with alleviating the advances of the plantation system, rather than working for its speedy elimination. However, the final aim of the union is to abolish the plantation system. I do not think the union is clear as to the program which will bring this about.

Q. How many trips have you made to eastern Arkansas in an attempt to form this union?—A. I would like to intersperse this question, do you think my activities in eastern Arkansas are significantly associated with the investigation of Commonwealth College, now in progress?

Q. I am seeking to get your background in order to arrive at your beliefs, and I am of the opinion that when I can arrive at your beliefs, they will not be contrary to those in your college.—A. I hope your committee will not consider my beliefs to be the beliefs of the college. I want to stress again that because this school is nonfactional, you will find many opinions on every problem that comes up for consideration. We believe in free discussion, which means we believe in the freedom of the people who have different opinions.

Q. Now you answer the original question.—A. You don't have to have this question.

Q. As I have stated I am trying to be fair in this examination of you as a director. I realize this is your personal opinion, and I appreciate it.—A. I have been in eastern Arkansas three times, the first time last year, and the second time for 2 or 3 days last August or during August of last year, and the third time I went over as a member of the delegation sent by Commonwealth College to investigate conditions there at first hand, and to give what assistance possible to the sharecroppers, day laborers, and small farmers, who were attempting to build a local-chartered and legal union, Southern Tenant Farmers Union. The other two members of the delegation were Bob Reed and Atley Delaney, students at Commonwealth College. Commonwealth College is naturally very much interested in the sharecropper situation, since it is a school for workers and has the interest of all workers at heart.

Q. Who financed your trip to eastern Arkansas in attempting to aid the formation of the Union?—A. We went on a shoestring. What money we had was raised by contributions of the group and from the school.

Q. Where is the Southern Tenant Farmers Union incorporated?—A. As I recall the Southern Tenant Farmers Union received its charter and was legally incorporated on July 29 of last summer. The articles of incorporation are on

file in the courthouse of White County. I would like to state here that I am not a member of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, but I am very much interested in the progress and successful development of this union.

Q. Who are the officers of the union?—A. They are composed of the executive committee. I believe at the present time that there are seven, or something like that.

Q. Who are they?—A. I don't recall all of the names; two officers are H. L. Mitchell, of Memphis, Tenn., and Ward H. Rodgers. I am sure you can get additional information by communicating with H. L. Mitchell, who is the executive secretary of the union.

Q. Then the purpose of the union and as fostered by the Commonwealth College is to better conditions of the tenant farmer and working class and eventually bring about the downfall of the plantation system, is that correct?—A. The Southern Tenant Farmers Union was not fostered by Commonwealth; merely assisted by Commonwealth College. Its purpose is to improve the conditions of the share-croppers and day laborers and small farmers through invoking section 7A of the N. R. A., by organizing the union. The ultimate aim of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union is the abolition of the plantation system, which is an ugly, in-human hangover of feudal economy.

Q. Does your college print what is known as the Commonwealth College Fortnightly?—A. It does.

Q. Is that an official paper of your college?—A. It is.

Q. Is this paper I hand you a copy of the Commonwealth College Fortnightly, published on February 13, 1935?—A. It is.

Q. Were those publications contained therein authorized by you?—A. They were not. At the time this came out, I believe I was in the Lepanto city jail.

Q. Were the things contained in the statement, "Delegation Back With Lynch Rope" written by you while in jail at Lepanto?—A. With the exception of a few revisions it is a letter which I sent to the college while in the Lepanto jail.

Q. Is that statement in the main true?—A. It is.

Q. I notice the date of the paper is February 15, 1935; where were you on February 15?—A. I was back in the college.

Q. You approved the publication of the article, did you not?—A. I did not see the paper until it was off the press. I wish to withdraw the statement that I was in eastern Arkansas at the time the paper came off the press. I remember now that I had already returned to the college.

Q. What circulation does this paper have in regard to number?—A. Approximately 6,000.

Q. How many in Arkansas?—A. I don't have that information.

Q. Would you say approximately, or could you?—A. I would if I had the information; I would be glad to give it to you.

Q. This is the official organ of the Commonwealth College?—A. It is.

Q. Who is the editor?—A. The editor is William Cunningham.

Q. Is he on your staff?—A. He is.

Q. We talked about the plantation system and collective ownership of property. Does your school teach this principle?—A. It presents that point of view along with all other points of view. The school is nonfactional.

Q. The college is willing to assist in the building of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union?—A. The college is very desirous, I believe, although this could be taken up at a group meeting before it is final. They are doing all in their power to assist in the building of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, which is a legally chartered organization and which is merely following out the provisions of section 7A of N. R. A.

Q. Does the college teach or advocate social, political, and economical equality of whites and Negroes?—A. My answer to that question also is that different points of view are presented; there is no unified opinion on that matter. This I know from listening to discussions on the campus.

Q. Now, you stated that three members of the college were sent to eastern Arkansas to assist the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, did you not, and in the issue of February 15, 1935, in which was a letter written by you, is, among other things, the following: "The meeting was arranged in a church house by a Negro organizer (one of the outstanding courageous Negro leaders. Names must be omitted. Two double-barreled shotguns and a revolver are in his room. He is ready to lay down his life if the Negroes and whites remain united)." Did you write that statement, and is that statement true?—A. I wrote that statement, and I believe that statement is true. There is nothing unlawful in the possession of firearms. I wish to add in addition that the Southern Tenant Farmers Union

is not interested in the labor problem: it is interested in the economic problem. It realizes that there are both Negro and white cotton workers, and that both suffer from the same exploitation: therefore, their problem is a common one and must be met in common. Unless it is met in common, I believe, on the basis of my acquaintance with the situation, serious trouble is apt to develop there. The union, and I personally, am very much interested in preventing any violence and loss of life. Insofar as violence has so far occurred in eastern Arkansas, it has been precipitated by the planters, their agents, and hired thugs.

Q. Would you resort to violence in order to carry out the principles of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union?—A. If the principles of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union are carried out there can be no violence. Violence, if it comes, can only come from the planters, their agents, and hired thugs.

Q. Will you resort to violence to put in the principles of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union?—A. Well, no. But if I was attacked unlawfully and illegally I would do the utmost to defend myself.

Q. Do you have a Socialist faction in your college?—A. We do.

Q. Do you have a communistic faction in your college?—A. We do.

Q. Do you have a Fascist faction in your college?—A. We do not. At the present time the Fascist faction seems to be in eastern Arkansas.

Q. Why is it then you do not teach socialism and communism when you do teach fascism and social revolution?—A. We do teach socialism and communism; in other words, we present the position of the Socialist and Communist Parties along with the position of other organizations.

Q. What daily papers does your college take there in its library, insofar as current papers are concerned?—A. I don't know if I remember them all. I do know we take the Mena Star, we have just subscribed to the Arkansas Gazette, we receive the Press Scimitar, we receive the Daily Worker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the New York Times.

Q. Do you receive the Negro Liberator?—A. Is that a newspaper or a magazine? I don't recall, but I know we do have magazines dealing with the Negro problem.

Q. Do you take the Daily Worker? Of what organization is that paper?—A. Yes; it is the official organ of the Communist Party.

Q. Where are the headquarters of the Communist Party?—A. In New York City.

Q. Does the Communist Party contribute anything to Commonwealth College?—A. No; although occasionally members of the party come down as students. That is when I say "no," I mean financially, but I wish they did, because money has purchasing power, regardless of its source.

Q. I asked you awhile ago, did you advocate the principles of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, and I believe your answer is "yes."—A. I did not make that answer. I stated that I was very much interested in the success of the union and wanted to do all in my power to see it developed successfully.

Q. Do you believe in the social, political, and economic equality of the white and black race?—A. I am simply studying that problem. I can state definitely that I believe in the political and economic equality of both races.

Q. Do you state that you do not believe definitely in the social equality of both races?—A. I will make no such statement, since I am still studying the problem.

Q. Now I notice here in the Commonwealth College Fortnightly under date of February 15, 1935, an item headed "United Front Formed at Commonwealth." It is stated therein among other things, that "an all-inclusive United Front for work in the State of Arkansas and vicinity was formed recently at Commonwealth without a dissenting vote." The purpose of the United Front is first to work with the Southern Tenant Farmers Union; is that true?—A. I believe such United Front was agreed to, although the question of forming the United Front was handled at the time I was in the eastern part of the State.

Q. The sixth item says this: "To build revolutionary student and teacher organizations in the colleges of the State." That is one of the issues, according to the article appearing in the Fortnightly, for which the United Front was formed?—A. I am not certain that the United Front has been formally agreed upon.

Q. Now, may I ask you to identify this paper as exhibit "F" and file same as part of your testimony to be the official publication of your school?—A. I do.

Q. Does your school advocate revolution in order to carry out its principles; if so, what kind of a revolution?—A. The school presents a point of view of the revolutionary groups in the United States along with the points of view of

other groups. As an institution, Commonwealth is not advocating any type of revolution. Such discussion is engaged in by the individuals on the campus, and the opinion or points of view of such individuals are varied.

Q. Will you state what are the other revolutionary groups that you mentioned in your previous answer?—A. They are the Workers Party, Communist Party, Communist Party Opposition, Proletarian Party, Socialist Party. I do not believe this list is inclusive, but it is indicative. We are interested in knowing what all those group propose, and we are also interested in knowing what the nonrevolutionary groups propose.

Q. When your statement is used in this paper, "To build revolutionary student and teacher organizations in the colleges of the State," did you propose to overthrow the present Government?—A. I do not know what specific program such organization as established under the United Front would propose.

Q. Your groups do propose a revolution?—A. What groups?

Q. The groups as stated in the Commonwealth College Fortnightly on the front page under article "United Front formed at Commonwealth," which you have identified as exhibit "F" to your testimony. I will read the following: "Organizations participating are the Commonwealth College Association, which is the governing body of the school, made up mostly of teachers, the Socialist local and the Communist faction on the campus."—A. To my knowledge, no such groups have as yet been formed, but according to the program if carried out, they will be formed. However, I am not entirely clear as to what you mean by revolutionary student groups. Such groups exist nationally, and have existed for years. They have the same legality as the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Q. Your articles state: "To build revolutionary student and teacher organizations in the colleges of the State;" now, if this is your official paper, may I ask you what you mean by "revolutionary student and teacher organizations in the colleges of the State"?—A. I was not present at the time the United Front agreement was drawn up; consequently, I am not aware of the discussion which took place, so do not know what those responsible for that provision in United Front agreement had in mind specifically.

Q. Who were the ones responsible for organizing the United Front agreement in your college?—A. I do not know who all of the people are who participated in it. I believe William Cunningham acted in behalf of the association, Henry Black in behalf of the Socialist, and Bill Andrews in behalf of the Communist.

Q. You have not disaffirmed or disavowed this principle, have you?—A. Certainly not, that I have not disavowed the United Front agreement in its entirety.

Q. Do you agree with the United Front agreement as set forth in this paper and as formed in your college?—A. As I understand it, I do, although as I said previously, I would want to know more about various purposes proposed in the agreement.

Q. Now, is this agreement in writing?—A. I could not answer. I do not have the information. You could ask some of the others participating.

Q. Did you cause to be published a supplement to the February 15 issue of the Fortnightly "Commonwealth to be Investigated"?—A. I advised that such supplement be inserted in Fortnightly.

Q. Will you inspect what is termed "supplement" and advise whether your statements contained therein are authorized by your college?—A. They were.

Q. Will you file same as exhibit "G" to your deposition?—A. I do that at this time.

Q. Thank you.

Mr. KOCH. I would like to ask this, if you are in a position to answer; whether you believe this investigation is associated with activities of the Commonwealth delegation in the eastern part of the State?

Mr. SHAVER. Personally, I have no information about it, and did not know that I was going to be upon this committee, and I have only the desire to carry out the terms of the resolution and to be fair to all parties.

Mr. KOCH. You do not believe the resolution was inspired by the activity of the Commonwealth delegation in the eastern part of the State?

Mr. SHAVER. I do not.

Q. Do you respect the flag of the United States Government?—A. You asked me that previously, and I stated I did not care to answer because I do not believe that question is germane for the purpose of the investigation.

Q. Do you have any higher respect for any other flag of any other country than you do the United States flag?—A. I personally am not a worshipper of symbols and I consider flags to be only symbols.

Q. Do you have a higher regard for other governments than the regard you have for the American Government?—A. I believe that the Government of the U. S. S. R. is in many ways superior to that of the American Government, because the United Socialist Soviet Republic does not suffer from such things as unemployment, plantation system, great economic inequality, and so forth. For that reason I have a healthy curiosity in the differences which are occurring in the U. S. S. R. I believe it has great social significance to the world.

Q. Now, do you believe in that to such an extent that you would attempt to overthrow the American form of government if it should be necessary in order to arrive at that principle?—A. My view is that of a teacher; I am interested in examining all proposals and in seeing that other people know and understand same proposals. I am not a member of any political party. Consequently, I have no personal specific program.

Q. Will you answer my question—yes or no?—A. To do that would be unfair to your question.

Q. Is that all that you care to say?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you believe in marriage as now believed in and carried on under the American Government?—A. Yes, I do.

Q. Are you a married man?—A. I am.

Q. Is your wife with you at the college?—A. She is.

Q. Do you believe in what is commonly called free love?—A. I do not.

Q. Is free love practiced at your school?—A. What do you mean by free love?

Q. I mean the kind where the marriage relation is lived, as husband and wife, without being married.—A. No. According to that free love is not practiced. According to your explanation, I would like to go on to state that on the basis of my experience at various universities in various States according to practices carried on there, relations between the sexes at Commonwealth is ultraconservative and conventional.

Q. Is free love practiced at all in your college, whether under the supervision of the college or with your knowledge?—A. It is not.

Q. Do you know of any instances where that has happened in your college or on the college grounds?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you know that it has not happened?—A. I feel certain that it has not happened. On the basis of my information and contacts I make that statement.

Q. In regard to sexual life out there, is it conducted on the same principles that the average American citizen's life is conducted, so far as your knowledge is concerned; that is, people living together out there are husband and wife?—A. Yes.

Q. There is nobody living together out there as husband and wife but what are married?—A. That is true, according to my knowledge.

Q. Are you familiar with the doctrines of the U. S. S. R. with reference to marriage?—A. Yes; I have had occasion to read articles on the institution of marriage in the U. S. S. R., and on the basis of those articles I gathered the information that the home life in Russia was far happier and that there are fewer divorces in the U. S. S. R. than there are in the United States.

Q. What are the doctrines of the U. S. S. R. as to marriage?—A. I am not very well informed on that. I know only the general ideas of the institution; namely, that the home life is far happier and there are fewer divorces there than in the United States. I am very much interested in that phenomenal. I would be glad to get any additional information possible explaining that phenomenal.

Q. What are the differences in the principles of marriage in the U. S. S. R. and the American principles of marriage?—A. I don't have enough information to answer that question. I am more familiar with the institution of marriage in his country than I am with the institution of marriage in Russia. But if you provide me with more information on the institution of marriage in Russia, I will be very glad to answer that question.

Q. You, therefore, do not have sufficient information of the Russian Government in regard to marriage to form an opinion?—A. Any opinion I have must be general and somewhat superficial, because I do not have detailed information on the institution of marriage in Russia.

Q. What is the general opinion that you have?—A. I have only made the general comparison between the two.

Q. Do you know why the relationship of marriage is happier, in your opinion, in Russia than it is in the United States?—A. No. I don't know the reason why;

I merely indicate that that is the case because there are fewer divorces in Russia than in the United States, according to my information.

Q. Do you know whether the U. S. S. R. advocates trial petitions for living together to see whether each party is suited for the other?—A. I do not know whether or not that is the case. I would be glad to have any information on that that I might be offered.

Q. Do you believe in what we people believe in as "Sunday," and do you rest and worship on Sunday?—A. What do you mean by believing in Sunday?

Q. Do you observe Sunday at your college?—A. Yes; we do.

Q. How?—A. We have no institutional work except for the necessary work to carry on the maintenance, and there are no classes on Sunday, and Sunday is a day of recreation, hikes, games, swimming, and also a free day during which time we can catch up on the back work accumulated during the week.

Q. Do you have any kind of service at your college on Sunday, worshipping God?—A. We have no chapel or religious service at the college. We have lectures in the forum every Sunday evening and we have singing.

Q. Is it a religious lecture?—A. It might be religious if the lecture is on religion, for sometimes we invite out a traveling preacher, an evangelical preacher, and have him talk to the college and then have him answer questions submitted him by the group.

Q. Could you name some preachers that have been there?—A. Yes; Professor Wadell.

Q. Where does he live?—A. He stated that he had attended the University of Wisconsin; I don't know whether this is true or not. Another Bible student had the name of Mr. Green. He was out there more than once.

Q. Where was he from?—A. I don't know. Most of these are traveling preachers.

Q. Any others?—A. Those are the only two names I recall.

Q. What is your purpose for inviting these preachers out?—A. Because we are very much interested in religion and want to get their point of view, as we want to get all other points of view, and one of the ways to get the religious point of view is to have people come out and lecture who are supposed to be specialists in that field.

Q. Do you individually recognize the 4th of July and other national holidays?—A. Personally, I am usually so busy I cannot take time off for holidays.

Q. Do you feel like that you owe allegiance to this Government where you live?—A. Part of that allegiance would be living up to the Constitution, which gives me the right of freedom of speech and freedom of writing, et cetera, which may be of a critical character.

Q. Can you answer yes or no?—A. No. It would be unfair to your question for me to answer it that abruptly.

Q. You are of the opinion that the Government of the U. S. S. R. is more desirable than the form of government that we have?—A. You are interpreting my opinion improperly and wrongly. I stated that I thought the Government of the U. S. S. R. had some features which were superior to the American Government, because in the U. S. S. R. there is no unemployment, no plantation system, and no class inequality in the distribution of the Nation's wealth.

Q. Do you believe in freedom of speech as granted by our Constitution, and are you of the opinion that that freedom of speech is such that would permit you to advocate the U. S. S. R. Government?—A. That freedom which is granted me arouses me to be critical of any form of government, whether in the United States or elsewhere.

Q. Do you think that freedom permits you to teach the overthrow of this Government?—A. That freedom arouses that point of view to be expressed along with all other points of view.

Q. Have you been teaching the overthrow of this Government?—A. I have presented that position, that point of view, along with other points of view. I think it is important that the American citizens be acquainted with the various points of view, because only then are they in position to make up their minds individually, and I think this matter of drawing conclusions is not up to the teachers, but up to the individuals in the class.

Q. Well, do you teach that doctrine in the Commonwealth College?—A. That point of view is discussed at Commonwealth College along with all other points of view.

Q. In your article that you wrote while in jail in Lepanto with reference to this Negro organizer, you stated that he had two double-barreled shotguns and a revolver in his room. Did you go in his room, and see those weapons?—A. I did not go into his room and see those weapons.

Q. Where did you get this information?—A. I got the information indirectly.

Q. Does Mr. C. T. Carpenter represent this union?—A. Mr. Carpenter represents American Civil Liberties Union, which is handling legal matters for the Southern Tenant Farmers Union.

Q. What is the American Civil Liberties Union?—A. It is a nonpartisan organization, which is primarily interested in seeing the retention of civil liberties in the United States, in other words, interested in seeing that constitutional rights are observed and granted.

Q. Now, in your effort to aid the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, you made speeches in eastern Arkansas in an attempt to organize the working class of people, did you not?—A. I made talks in the eastern part of Arkansas for the purpose of building the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, the membership of which is made up of sharecroppers and small farmers.

Q. What is the principal thing the Southern Tenant Farmers Union is striving to achieve?—A. The Southern Tenant Farmers Union is attempting to exercise the right to exist, which was granted and made part of the law of the land through section 7A of the N. R. A.

Q. What is necessary for a tenant farmer to become a member of the union?—A. If he is a sharecropper, a day laborer, or small farmer, he is eligible to join the union.

Q. Does he have to pay any money to join?—A. Yes, he is supposed to pay money. Some of them are unable to pay anything; however. I think all of them pay something. Three dollars is the dues for the year. But a majority of them are unable to raise \$3 because the average income of a sharecropper generally is \$262, according to a survey made by reliable people, and after he settles his account at the plantation commissary, he not only has no cash but he is usually in debt. Consequently, the \$3 is not usually available.

Q. What becomes of the money when it is paid? Does it go to the college?—A. The college has not and will not receive a cent of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union. The money is distributed between the committee council, the district council, and the national executive council.

Q. Are you a member of any of those councils?—A. I am in no way organizationally connected with any of them nor with the Southern Tenants Farmers Union.

Q. Have you received directly or indirectly any of the funds paid by the farmers when joining this union?—A. Perhaps two or three dollars came from the union for the purpose of buying gas and I am not certain that that is the case.

Q. Can either blacks or whites join this union if they came within the class that you stated could join?—A. They not only can join but are encouraged to join, and it is very essential that they do join, because the Negro worker and the white worker experience exploitation of the plantation system, and unless both race groups belong to the union, the planters are apt to provoke a race war, which the union will do everything in its power to prevent.

Q. In your speeches have you openly advised the tenants not to move off of plantations where they had no contracts?—A. We pointed out to the sharecroppers that, under the cotton-acreage reduction plan, the planters cannot legally evict them from their homes.

Q. You are familiar with the rule of the A. A. A. recently held in which it has been ruled that it is not necessary to keep the same tenant?—A. I am not familiar with that rule. I am certain there was no official ruling at the time we were in the eastern part of the State. That point of view was considered by the planters as a means for rationalizing evictions that they were responsible for.

Q. You know of such a ruling, do you not?—A. I do not. There may be such a ruling, and I will be gracious for any information concerning it.

Q. It is, therefore, your firm conviction now that tenants or sharecroppers who have no contract to stay on land can lawfully hold said lands for the year 1935?—A. That is a leading question. I object to it. It is not in keeping with any expression that I have made.

Q. Have you advocated directly or indirectly the bearing of firearms or the use of force to prevent eviction of sharecroppers?—A. I have merely protested against the carrying of arms by planters, their agents and hired thugs, especially when they were in a drunken condition.

Q. Now, will you answer my question?—A. I have answered it. I at no time advocated to the union to forcibly resist eviction, and it would be foolhardy for me to advocate such a thing, because the union would not by any stretch of the imagination use force to prevent eviction.

Q. Have you ever advocated the use directly or indirectly for the purpose of persuading the members of the said union or any other people in order to carry

out this idea of the proper form of government?—A. As a student of facts on social problems, I have merely pointed out that some organizations do believe some use of force may be necessary in the case of self-defense.

Q. Have you ever advocated the bearing of arms by any person or persons at any time?—A. Well, I think I suggested that when people come out to hunt rabbits, it is well to carry firearms. I have always opposed the carrying of arms in individuals and imperialistic wars, because such wars are destructive to our civilization and to the best interest of the majority of the people.

Q. What is the Third (3d) International of the U. S. S. R.?—A. The Third International is an organization made up of the various national Communist Parties.

Q. Do you advocate their form of government in this country?—A. Their form?

Q. Of the Third International?—A. I present the point of view in the program proposed in the Third International along with the points of view of any other organization or parties just as I do the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Q. In presenting that point of view is the Third International presented as a preference to the Democratic and Republican Parties?—A. Well, the amount of discussion which is given to these various programs vary from time to time, depending upon the composition of the group at that particular time.

Q. Do you prefer the principles advocated by the Third International of the U. S. S. R. over the principles advocated by the Government of the Democratic and Republican Parties?—A. Well, I think I have about an equal interest in all points of view.

Q. Then you do not have a preference?—A. No. My attitude predominant is one of intellectual curiosity for information about all these things.

Q. Do you state this just by having that intellectual curiosity or do you teach a preference in regard to those three different principles?—A. Well, the amount of discussion which is devoted to these three organizations varies with the composition of the group which changes from time to time. Most of the teaching at Commonwealth is carried on under the discussion method.

Q. Will you now state further, do you or do you not have a preference with reference to these three principles of government?—A. Well, I am an eclectic and since that is the case I am about equally interested in all kinds of government.

Q. Do you have any groups in your college that advocate the capitalistic form of government?—A. No. No groups.

Q. Do you have any person there that desires it?—A. Yes; we have people who present that point of view of capitalism. I am one of those persons.

Mr. JOHN GORDON RYE takes the witness:

Q. Mr. Koch, in the Arkansas Gazette, under date of December 14, 1934, there was an Associated Press story attributed to you, which invited students who had been expelled from universities over the entire country for their radicalism to come to Commonwealth; what is your view point in inviting that class of students to attend the school of which you are the head?—A. These students that you are referring to were expelled because of their fight against fascism. This fight against fascism fights to preserve our civilization, therefore, instead of being expelled they should have been honored and certainly the least recognition Commonwealth could give to their services was to invite them to enroll as students of the school.

Q. Do you extend this invitation to any student?—A. No; we extend this invitation only to students who would likely become desirable students at Commonwealth College.

Q. Desirable along what lines?—A. Desirable insofar as they have native intelligence and are able to handle college work and desirable also because of their interest in social problems.

Q. What particular useful functions do you attempt to prepare those students who have been and who will be expelled from other universities by expressing radical views?—A. Those students who are expelled from universities because they have acted in a manner to preserve our civilization are admitted to Commonwealth on the same basis as any other desirable student are and given the same course of study.

Q. For what particular use after they have graduated and gone out into the world?—A. That is for the student to decide; the school does not tell the student what to do. He makes up his own mind. It is our hope, however, that he will upon leaving the school act in a manner that will improve the conditions of the great majority of the people of this country.

Q. In what way?—A. By working toward elimination of unemployment, by working to the eliminations of the plantation system by working for greater impartiality in the courts, especially the lower courts, by fighting for the preservation of our Constitution and civil rights, by working to bring about a more equal distribution of our Nation's wealth, by working to remove the bonds of slavery borne by the economically oppressed social groups.

Q. You made the statement in your answer, by fighting for our constitutional rights and for civil liberty. Explain that statement for the committee.—A. By "fighting" I mean working for. Attempting to bring it about.

Q. Through what procedure would a student of your college go out and fight for his constitutional rights and civil liberties?—A. I don't know; that is up to the individual students. I can only give concrete instances of where two students fought to preserve constitutional rights and civil liberties. Bob Reed and Atley Delaney, at Atwood, Ark. Even though they were intimidated and terrorized by the unlawful acts of planters, they went ahead with the holding of meetings and thus fought for the right of freedom of speech and freedom of assemblage.

Q. Does the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics grant the right of freedom of speech and freedom of assemblage?—A. There is perhaps more freedom of speech and freedom of assemblage in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics than in the United States, according to my information.

Q. You referred a moment ago to the Poinsette County experience. You were placed in jail, were you not?—A. I was falsely placed in jail on a trumped-up charge.

Q. How long were you in jail?—A. I was in jail 4 nights due to the unlawful actions of the city marshal and Mayor Smith.

Q. Did you pay a fine?—A. I was in on a fake charge; I was kangarooed.

Q. What was the outcome?—A. The outcome of the kangaroo was a sentence involved, a \$50 fine and was immediately repealed to the March term of circuit court, and then I predict that it will be thrown out of court.

Q. Who went your bond?—A. Mr. Hall.

Q. Who is Mr. Hall?—A. He is a man of courage and a man who has respect for a man's constitutional rights. The planters are not successful in intimidating him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Without reading extensively from this transcript, I may say that Mr. Koch's testimony relating to his birth, education, background, and professional experience agrees entirely with that which he gave before this committee this morning, with perhaps some slight exceptions.

Mr. Koch, according to the transcript of the hearing before the State committee of Arkansas, you testified as follows: "There were three people primarily responsible for the founding of Commonwealth." Now, do you recall the names of the three people you mentioned on that occasion?

Mr. KOCH. Well, Dr. Zeuch is really the founder, the moving spirit; O'Hare—

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is Kate Richards O'Hare?

Mr. KOCH. The third member being Mr. Benton or Mr. Goodhue.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the transcript here, you name Harold V. Brown.

Mr. KOCH. He was not there from the beginning, I don't believe, but he did come there afterward as a member.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You described Kate Richards O'Hare as associate founder. Would you want that testimony to stand?

Mr. KOCH. Well, it was Dr. Zeuch's idea, and he made the preliminary plans. I think she came into the picture afterward. Maybe the title of associate director describes that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Associate founder.

Mr. KOCH. Associate founder.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the way you testified before the Arkansas committee. Now, the transcript states that you were asked the following question: "Do you respect the American flag?" and that you answered, "I refuse to answer without advice of counsel."

As I say, Mr. Chairman, this is, I think, a properly authenticated copy of the transcript as made at the time of hearing. It was obtained by Naval Intelligence from the State authorities in Arkansas.

Have you any desire to change your testimony in that respect, with regard to that?

Mr. KOCH. Well, that was not my testimony, and I explained the reason why.

Mr. STARNES. Yes, Dr. Matthews, he denied this morning that that was his testimony. The only thing we can do is to accept the document, and then it is a matter of accepting either the statement of Mr. Koch that he did not make that statement or accepting the documentary evidence. That is all we can do; we cannot resolve it in any other way; neither can Mr. Koch. But he can be asked whether he made those statements, so that he may enter an affirmation or a denial of them. You may ask anything you care to ask him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was doing that. He could again enter his denial on the basis of a more authenticated document which we now have.

Mr. STARNES. He understands. That is all right. That gives him full opportunity to do so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Mildred Price an instructor at Commonwealth College during your directorship?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, she was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Mildred Price the wife of Harold Coy?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, she was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether Mildred Price has been active for a number of years in any of the so-called Communist front organizations?

Mr. KOCH. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having given some categorical answers to questions concerning capitalism, which were propounded to you at the hearing before the Arkansas committee?

Mr. KOCH. You see, it was a long time ago when this so-called record was taken.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the transcript, you were asked the question, "Do you believe in capitalism as you understand it?" and your answer was, "I do not." Would that be in line with your views at the time?

Mr. KOCH. Certainly it would not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you mean that at the time you testified, you did believe in capitalism?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, I would say I did, and I do now. I think definite improvements should be made, I think they can be made, and I think they are being made.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you think you had a representative of the capitalists' viewpoint on the occasion of the dedication of the mural at Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know who may have been there, but I will say we had a spokesman of the so-called capitalists' viewpoint at the college.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you testify before the Arkansas legislative committee that you had a Communist faction at the college?

Mr. KOCH. I do not recall. There might have been Communists there, the same as there were Republicans, Socialists, and Democrats.

Mr. STARNES. You do not mean that you had Republicans down there?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, there were Republicans down there; at least, they said they were.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have a rule against their contributing anything in writing to the college bulletin?

Mr. KOCH. I do not know of any rule at all. That bulletin was put out by the journalism class usually.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the Commonwealth College Fortnightly, dated February 15, 1935—this is another issue, now—there was a united front formed at Commonwealth College. Do you recall anything about the circumstances of that united front, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. I do not now, no; maybe if you refresh my memory on it—

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the transcript of the testimony on that occasion, you said, in answer to a question concerning this united front, "I believe William Cunningham acted in behalf of the association, Henry Black in behalf of the Socialists, and Bill Andrews in behalf of the Communists." Do you recall that testimony?

Mr. KOCH. No; I don't recall it. That is possible.

Mr. STARNES. Did you know those parties, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Did you know them to represent the various shades of political opinion as represented there in your purported statement?

Mr. KOCH. Who was the third one?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Bill Andrews, as representing the Communist viewpoint.

Mr. KOCH. Who was the second one?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Henry Black, representing the Socialists.

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I am inclined to think that was their viewpoint, at least.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you did not give that testimony, that would have been the testimony you would have given?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I don't know, but you did have various groups there with various ideas—various people representing various ideas. That would not have been exhaustive at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again, we find this question asked of you by another member of the committee: "Do you have any higher respect for any other flag of any other country than you have for the United States flag?" You are alleged to have answered: "I personally am not a respecter of symbols, and I consider flags to be only symbols."

This morning, I believe, you denied having given that testimony. Does your denial stand on the basis of this question?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, it does. I cannot imagine saying a thing like that. I am sure I did not say it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again, you were asked this question: "Do you have a higher regard for any other governments than the regard you would have for the American Government?" The transcript indicates that you answered, "I believe that the Government of the U. S. S. R. is in

many ways superior to that of the American Government." You denied having given that testimony, this morning.

Mr. KOCH. That is correct; that is not in line with my ideas now, and I am sure it was not in line with that testimony then.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, your denial stands for this testimony?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again, the transcript of the testimony before the Arkansas committee indicates that you were asked the question: "Does the U. S. S. R. grant the right of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly?" You answered, according to this transcript: "There is perhaps more freedom of speech and freedom of assembly in the U. S. S. R. than in the United States, according to my information." Do you deny having given that testimony?

Mr. KOCH. I do. That is not in line with my thought.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Since testimony of that sort was so much out of line with what you call your own personal philosophy, did you not feel uncomfortable about having persons like Ella Reeve Bloor, Bill Reich, Carl Haessler, Andrew Omholt, and Virginia Donaldson on your election faculty staff?

Mr. KOCH. Of course, with the exception of Mother Bloor, you are telling me things about these people that I did not know about. Of course, a lot may have happened since then; but, as I pointed out earlier, for instance, at the University of Wisconsin, the university had Scott Nearing lecture, and I believe he was a big Communist. I don't see anything particularly out of the way there; they were not members of the staff at all.

Mr. STARNES. As I understand it, Virginia Donaldson was, but I do not recall that you have introduced her record, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She is the person who was teaching art classes at Commonwealth, according to the bulletin, and who began her article by citing the Marxist-Leninist philosophy as authority for the type of courses given at Commonwealth.

Mr. STARNES. By her?

Mr. MATTHEWS. As cited by her.

Mr. STARNES. I get the connection. I just had not got the connection up to that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At least, according to the information before us, she seems to have been a member of the staff at Commonwealth.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. KOCH. I would be curious to see that whole testimony; I have never seen it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not Bill Reich was on the staff of Commonwealth College for any extended period?

Mr. KOCH. He was on for a while; I forget just how long it was. Then, later, I think, he was invited down there to a summer lecture.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it would be proper to make this request or not. I should like to introduce at this point, as soon as we get it from the files, Bill Reich's public statement concerning his withdrawal from the American Workers Party and his espousal of the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. That would be quite all right. You may place in the record pertinent excerpts in order to complete the record. As the Chair stated this morning, unless you have pertinent excerpts from

the writing of these people themselves as their expressions, you do not have a complete record either for this committee or for the full committee to whom this record will be transmitted. Therefore, it is quite all right. You may add those excerpts.

STATEMENT TO THE WORKERS PARTY CONVENTION

As charter members of the Workers Party, as former members of the A. W. P. and C. P. L. A., and as active participants in mass work, we find it necessary to state fundamental differences with the positions being presented to this convention by both the Cannon-Shachtman group and the Muste-Abern group.

We entered this movement because we felt that the revolutionary aims of the working class could best be realized through it. It is now clear that the movement cannot serve to advance the interests of the working class but that it has on the contrary been so corrupted and has so degenerated as to constitute a serious disrupting force within the labor movement.

Today, when fascism and war menace the working people of the world, when the ruthless profit-seeking of capitalists depresses ever lower the standard of living of the working class, the great, urgent need is for the united action to defeat and destroy these dangers. There is no time to lose. Socialists, Communists, trade-unionists—all groups that have the interest of the workers at heart, must join hands in this common task. The accomplishments of the People's fronts in France and Spain encourage us in the conviction that similar united efforts can succeed in the United States. Everywhere the cry of the workers is for united action.

We have found however, from our experience, that Trotskyism seeks insidiously to prevent this united action. During the past year we have noted with increasing dismay the foul results of decay and disintegration induced by Trotskyism. We accuse it of being a counter-revolutionary force, providing objective aid to Hearst and other reactionaries, and spreading paralysis and confusion within the working class movement under the banner and slogan of world-revolution.

What are the facts? Practically every leading member of the Workers Party stands under charges from another of "duplicity," "bureaucracy," "stool-pigeon," "government agent," or worse. Our official records are strewn with epithets hurled by one leading comrade at the other. What more serious reflection of the effects of Trotskyism can be noted than the famous "private" letter of Cannon to Trotsky published by mistake in the International Information Bulletin, attacking Muste as insincere and also flaying Abern and Gould.

What is the result? From an apparently healthy beginning, The Workers Party has constantly disintegrated, member after member dropping out in sheer disgust—men and women who had accomplished effective deeds for the working class. In the past year, ninety percent of the time of the members of the Workers Party has been consumed in futile charges, counter-charges and caucuses to defeat and outwit opposing factions. The official documents issued before this convention are preoccupied almost entirely with the attack of one faction upon the other.

Criminally, this disintegration has been carried into the mass organizations influenced by the Workers Party, with the effect that the once militant, growing and effective National Unemployed League lies handicapped in whatever sections Trotskyism has asserted itself. What has been more damaging than the constant campaign by the Trotskyites in mass organizations against united action, than the campaigns of slander and vilification against leading mass workers, particularly by Ramuglia and Gordon in Pennsylvania? There is not one section of the mass movement that has not been injured by these recriminations. What was built up by the OPLA and AWP has been torn asunder by the Trotskyites.

That is the record—a record of destruction and decay!

Why do we see this wreckage around us today? Because Trotskyism is a negative force, capable only of producing division, sectarianism and strife. Its ultimate effect is to divide the working class and inhibit effective action. Its primary aim is to destroy the Communist International. Its chief object is to attack the successful socialist economy of the Soviet Union. Any steps that will achieve these ends are considered worthy of Trotskyite consideration. Today the Soviet Union, by its scientific social construction, stands as the greatest challenge to the capitalist world. It demonstrates concretely that Socialism can be an accomplished fact. Yet nine-tenths of the space in The New Militant and

other Trotskyist organs is devoted to what? To fighting the bosses and fascists? To building the mass movement? No! To the slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union.

Since this counter-revolutionary propaganda will not be accepted by the workers, it becomes ingrown and the Trotskyites turn to attacking each other within the fold. Hence the witches cauldron of boil and bubble that Trotskyism presents today. Trotskyites, realizing the utter bankruptcy of their movement in the United States, now plan to enter the Socialist Party to carry on the same destructive activity there that they carried on within the former American Workers Party, to solve their inner factional problems by confusion and slander within the Socialist Party and to poison the minds of Socialists against the Soviet Union.

From our experience, we wish to warn Socialist comrades of the danger of Trotskyism to the Socialist Party. Socialist party members must be forewarned of the splits, expulsions, recriminations, verbal black-jacking, physical lead pipe hurling and fole-pilfering which has characterized the Trotskyist movement during the past year. They must know of the vicious charges made by one Trotskyist leader against the other. They must be informed of the disintegration, amounting to panic and rout, that has taken place within Trotskyist ranks.

All this will be carried into the Socialist Party when the Trotskyites enter. Not only will they bring endless confusion, slander, and defeatism into the ranks of a Socialist Party growing in militancy and effectiveness, but they will form a bloc fighting in every way possible any step toward unity of the working class in the battle against war and fascism. We feel it our duty to the labor movement to warn Socialists of what is ahead in this respect, and do so seriously and earnestly out of our experience with the Workers Party and its effect upon mass organizations.

We are convinced that an effective struggle against war is impossible without consistent struggle in support of the peace policy of the Soviet Union and in defense of the socialism which has already been established in the Soviet Union. We are convinced that a struggle against fascism is impossible without a determined, earnest effort to build a mighty people's front led by a united working class. We are convinced that an effective struggle against capitalist decay and for socialist society cannot be conducted without a monolithic revolutionary world party founded on the principles of Marx, Lenin and those who now consistently carry on and apply their teachings. We are convinced that the way to final emancipation of the working class is through the dictatorship of the proletariat and the establishment of Soviet Power. That is why we cannot continue to remain associated with the counter-revolutionary forces of Trotskyism.

Therefore we resign to this convention as members of the Workers Party. We stand with the Soviet Union. We hail its socialist success and declare it to be the shining hope of the workers of the world. We stand likewise for the united front—of Socialists, Communists, trade-unions and other groups that will defeat fascism, halt war, and overthrow capitalism. We, as true Communists, call upon all comrades who believe likewise to forget their self-righteous sectarianism and oppositionism and to accept and work for the realistic program of the Communist Party of the U. S. A. and of the Communist International.

ARNOLD JOHNSON.
WINSLOW HALLETT.
BILL REICH.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would conclude what I have to ask the witness.

Mr. STARNES. Before I proceed with a few questions and then turn the witness over to the other committee members, do you want to introduce this reference to the witness that is contained in the Daily Worker of February 19, 1936?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the Daily Worker of February 19, 1936, page 4, there is an article with reference to a labor convention or conference in Norfolk, Va.

Mr. KOCH, did you attend that conference that was held at Norfolk, Va.? Do you recall having attended that conference?

Mr. KOCH. I did attend a conference down there; yes. I don't know what action was taken. I was not a member of the conference. I went down with somebody else. I don't think I spoke to any of the groups there.

Mr. STARNES. Does the article purport to show that Mr. Koch did give some expression of his views at the meeting?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It indicates that he gave an address.

Mr. KOCH. I might have spoken of the Commonwealth College; that is quite possible.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is this paragraph:

Lucien Koch, American Federation of Government Employees, in a powerful attack upon those forces now obstructing the organization of the great masses of workers, cited the fact that the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor is not even carrying out the decisions of the 1934 convention.

Do you recall making that address?

Mr. KOCH. No; I don't; and that is in keeping with the Daily Worker.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are sure that the Daily Worker falsifies?

Mr. KOCH. I know the Daily Worker has attacked me on occasions.

Mr. STARNES. Who else was present at this conference?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Francis Franklin was representing the American Youth Congress; Alexander Wright, Negro delegate from the International Workers Order; the American Newspaper Guild was represented. There were also delegates from the Communist Party, Socialist Party, National Consumers' League, American Youth Congress, and Workers' Alliance.

There was a minority resolution introduced by the Communist group, according to the Daily Worker, which the conference passed.

Mr. KOCH. Well, I went down there and stayed there for part of the time, and I think I was asked to say something on Commonwealth College.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall with whom you went down there, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. No; I don't. I was not a regular member of the conference, however. I remember the composition of the group was primarily made up of members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers.

Mr. STARNES. He says he remembers going down. You may include in the record the article there. It speaks for itself. He says he remembers going and attending a meeting and talking, but his recollection is that he thinks he talked about the work of the Commonwealth College.

(The article is as follows:)

LABOR PARTY IS ENDORSED IN VIRGINIA

WORKERS CONFERENCE ALSO FAVORS INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

NORFOLK, VA., February 18.—Industrial Unionism and the Labor Party won strong endorsement in the Virginia State Workers Educational Conference of 106 Negro and white delegates from 17 unions, 3 central labor bodies, and 30 other organizations.

Among the organizations represented were: Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Painters', Seamen's, Tobacco Workers, and Government Employees' Unions, American Newspaper Guild, and the Central Labor Unions of Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Richmond. There were also delegates from the Communist Party, Socialist Party, National Consumers League, American Youth Conference, Workers Alliance, Y. W. C. A., and Y. M. C. A.

There was a long discussion of industrial unionism. The majority resolution of the discussion group on "Organizing the Unorganized" stated only that there was room in the A. F. of L. for both industrial and craft unions. The minority resolution was written by the Norfolk section of the Communist Party, and read:

"Resolved, That the Committee for Industrial Unionism is fundamentally correct in the work that it is willing and desirous to do in organizing the mass industrial unions, and that these efforts will lead to increasing the membership of the A. F. of L. manyfold, and that these actions be not construed as dualism within the Federation but as a necessary change in the organizational policy of the A. F. of L."

W. I. Smith, secretary of the Norfolk Central Labor Union and chairman, Local 92, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, moved that the minority resolution be adopted. It was. Several delegates took the floor in support of industrial unionism.

Breedlove, president of the Portsmouth Central Labor Union, cited examples from his city where craft lines had not only hampered organization of workers but had made it impossible.

Lucien Koch, American Federation of Government Employees, in a powerful attack upon those forces now obstructing the organization of the great masses of workers, cited the fact that the executive committee of the A. F. of L. is not even carrying out the decisions of the 1934 convention.

Francis Franklin, American Youth Congress, voiced the demand of the working youth for industrial unions.

Alexander Wright, Negro delegate from the International Workers Order, called for "the only form into which it will be possible to organize the millions of Negro toilers."

A strong resolution endorsing the Farmer-Labor Party was adopted; it contains sharp denunciation of the Byrd-Glass machine now in control of Virginia politics. The resolution urges Farmer-Labor organization for this election campaign in each community.

Other resolutions endorsed the Lundeen-Frazier Social Security bill, the American Student Union, the Amlie American Youth Act, the Nye-Kvale bill against compulsory military training in schools, denounced arrests without charges.

A continuation committee was elected. It includes from Norfolk: E. L. Pickler, president of the Norfolk Central Labor Union; W. I. Smith, secretary; Norfolk C. L. U., Carolyn Tunstall; Norfolk Educational League, Junius McGlone, Local 92, A. C. W. A.; and Jim Porter, Norfolk Labor Journal. From Portsmouth: W. M. Boncer, Portsmouth C. L. U., Mr. Breedlove, president, Portsmouth C. L. U., and Andrew Raeside, chairman, Educational Committee, Portsmouth C. L. U. From Newport News: John Darling, American Newspaper Guild, and Mr. Gustafson, of the Boilermakers. From Richmond: H. M. Monahan, educational director, Richmond C. L. U.; Rev. L. C. Crump, Tobacco Workers organizer; Anne Manson; Sarah Hartman, W. P. A. teacher; and Mildred Randolph.—Daily Worker, Wednesday, February 19, 1936, page 4.

MR. KOCH. Yes; I think I was asked to say something about that.

MR. MATTHEWS. You have no doubt about the American Youth Congress being a Communist front organization?

MR. KOCH. I know very little about it. Is it such?

MR. MATTHEWS. Well, I thought you might have a description to give us.

MR. KOCH. Were they supposed to be there, too?

MR. MATTHEWS. According to this article they were.

MR. KOCH. The article claims many things I am not familiar with.

MR. MATTHEWS. Do you know anything about the International Workers Order? Would you call it a Communist Party front organization or an auxiliary of the Communist Party?

MR. KOCH. No; I am not familiar with it. I understand it is such—a left-wing group, anyway. But then, you see, titles are used so freely and loosely these days that I don't know what to believe.

MR. MATTHEWS. What about the Workers Alliance? Are you familiar with some of its work?

MR. KOCH. Well, very roughly, I should say that was a Socialist group.

MR. MATTHEWS. You would not describe it as a Communist Party front organization?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I thought that was supposed to be a Socialist group.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Attorney General in his decision and order of deportation against Harry Bridges described the Workers Alliance as a Communist Party front organization.

Mr. STARNES. And it was Mr. Biddle who made that characterization.

Mr. KOCH. Well, it certainly started out as such an outfit.

Mr. STARNES. Was the Workers Alliance very active up in Pennsylvania when you were there as representative of the W. P. A.?

Mr. KOCH. I never heard of them.

Mr. STARNES. Did you ever have any association with David Lasser?

Mr. KOCH. No. I know about him.

Mr. STARNES. Did you have any association of any type or character with Herbert Benjamin?

Mr. KOCH. No. I have also heard of him. He was with the unemployment council.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Benjamin was executive secretary of the Workers Alliance.

Mr. KOCH. I want to correct one possible misunderstanding. When I was setting up the workers' education program in Pennsylvania, I was not working for the W. P. A.; I was working for the affiliated summer schools, and I think they got some money from the Carnegie Foundation, and I was on some of this work, but I understand it was in cooperation with the workers' education office of the W. P. A. I don't know if that was the exact title. I don't want to leave the impression that I was on the Government pay roll.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How much did the Carnegie Foundation give to Commonwealth?

Mr. KOCH. I don't know how much that was; I think \$500 to \$1,000.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were an employee of the Federal Government here in Washington at the time you attended this conference; is that correct?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I was with the Federal Government at the time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a member of the American Federation of Government Employees?

Mr. KOCH. Yes. My understanding was that that was a conference on workers' education, in Norfolk, sponsored by the trade unions. That was the impression I got on attending it, but this stuff is surprising to me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member and local delegate of the American Federation of Government Employees?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the central labor body or any other labor body ever refuse to seat you as a delegate while you were a member of the union here?

Mr. KOCH. The District Council of the American Federation of Government Employees did refuse to seat me—those in attendance here—on the basis of some stories that came out presuming to connect with the so-called testimony of the legislative witch hunt that took place in Arkansas, and on the basis of that they denied me a seat.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did they refuse three times to give you a seat?

Mr. KOCH. No; they refused once. Of course, you have to understand the internal situation there, too. You had two or three people that were in control of the council, and they were afraid if young blood got in that possibly their control would be lessened.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever a member of the American Federation of Teachers?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I was a charter member of the local that was formed at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the American Federation of Labor in a meeting at Paris, Ark., refuse to seat you as a delegate from the American Federation of Teachers?

Mr. KOCH. No; I was never refused a seat.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did attend their convention, did you not?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I attended a couple of conventions of the State Federation of Labor, but I don't remember anyone being refused a seat.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did they refuse to let you have the floor, or anything of that sort?

Mr. KOCH. Was I a delegate? I don't think I was a delegate.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Commonwealth College Fortnightly states that in the early summer of 1935 the Arkansas Federation of Labor, meeting in Paris, refused to seat you and Horace Bryan as delegates from local 194 of the American Federation of Teachers. Did they or did they not?

Mr. KOCH. I don't recollect that they did, but possibly they did; but that was my recollection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The September 15, 1935, issue of the Commonwealth Fortnightly has an article headed "State convention turns reactionary. Fraternal delegates refused seats by Arkansas federation." The two delegates whose seats were refused were Lucien Koch and Horace Bryan. Did you as a member of the American Federation of Teachers acquaint yourself with the political wranglings inside the American Federation of Teachers?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not, directly. The others may be concerned about that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know anything about the fight over local 5 in New York City?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I remember some reference to it in the paper.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the American Federation of Teachers as a whole through a vote of all members finally expelling local 5 from the American Federation of Teachers on the ground of its complete control by the Communist Party?

Mr. KOCH. No, I was not familiar with that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How did you vote on the issue when it came before you?

Mr. KOCH. I did not vote on it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All members of the American Federation of Teachers were circularized and voted by mail.

Mr. KOCH. I was not circularized, and I did not vote. When did this take place?

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you a member of the American Federation of Teachers?

Mr. KOCH. As I say, I joined, and I was a charter member of the local at the University of Wisconsin; and when I left Commonwealth,

my membership lapsed, I assume. I never attended any of the national conventions of the American Federation of Teachers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you sure that your membership lapsed?

Mr. KOCH. I did not pay any dues, anyway.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At any rate, you did not vote on the issue of local 5?

Mr. KOCH. No; I don't remember having been sent any literature on it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Commonwealth College Fortnightly attacks William Green and the A. F. of L. for their attitude toward local 5. This was the summer of 1935. It states that Commonwealth Local 194, to which you belonged, had a representative at the national convention in Cleveland. Do you know who that delegate was?

Mr. KOCH. I am not sure. I think it was Williams or Horace Bryan.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the bulletin, David Engelstein was the representative of your local to the national convention.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know Engelstein, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Was he a member of the faculty of Commonwealth?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Go ahead, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The article criticizes William Green for his command to expel local 5 in New York City. The American Federation of Teachers did not comply with Green's demand at the time, but they later, by a national referendum vote of the American Federation of Teachers, did expel local 5 for its Communist affiliations, and the local formed a new union after it was kicked out.

I thought you taught trade union history and trade union problems.

Mr. KOCH. Yes, up to a certain point.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you not acquainted with these incidents in the history of your own union?

Mr. KOCH. When did this expulsion take place in local 5?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oh, I do not recall the exact date of expulsion.

Mr. KOCH. I am sure it was after. I never had anything to do with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The issue of local 5 was hot away back in 1936; it was, at least, according to the Commonwealth College's own bulletin.

Mr. KOCH. When did the expulsion take place? I knew something of the fight, but I didn't know they had been expelled.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you take a position on the fight?

Mr. KOCH. No; I was not particularly interested in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did not the delegate report back to your local at Commonwealth?

Mr. KOCH. Maybe he did, but I don't recall it. If he did, I don't remember being around.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a union organizer, is that the standard of interest that you advocate for members?

Mr. KOCH. Maybe I was not at the campus if he did report back. It was a rather small faculty. It did not necessarily hold formal meetings. As I say, this apparently happened during the time when I had decided to sever my connections, and I wasn't paying any particular attention to what was going on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It appears that you were a delegate from local 194, if not at the same time, the same month; at least, you had some connection with the union at that time.

Mr. KOCH. Yes. I remember attending the State convention of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you do not remember having taken any position with reference to local 5 of the American Federation of Teachers in New York?

Mr. KOCH. No, I am almost certain I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Koch, you began your association with Commonwealth College as a student at the age of about 15 or 16?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Where were you living at the time you became a student?

Mr. KOCH. At Commonwealth College?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. KOCH. I was living at Llano Cooperative Colony. I went there for the sole purpose of attending the college. I was not a member of the cooperative colony as such.

Mr. STARNES. Where did you come from? Oregon?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, Oregon City, Oreg., from a farm.

Mr. STARNES. Did you come with your parents, or did you come alone?

Mr. KOCH. No, I went down with my father and my oldest sister.

Mr. STARNES. From Oregon down to Louisiana?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. How did you learn of the college and of its work? Through what medium?

Mr. KOCH. Well, my father learned of it. He was interested in the cooperative movement and received some periodicals, as I understand it, from the cooperative movement. Apparently those periodicals included a write-up of Llano Cooperative Colony. So, he took my sister and I down, and he went down for the purpose of looking the place over, himself, with the idea of maybe bringing the whole family. But after he was down there 2 or 3 weeks, he was disillusioned. He decided that the cooperative colony was not all the newspapers led him to believe.

Mr. STARNES. Yes. You remained there?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, we remained at the college.

Mr. MASON. You say "we"?

Mr. KOCH. My sister and I.

Mr. STARNES. Did she go along and complete the course at the college, too?

Mr. KOCH. She was not there as long as I was.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall when you completed your work as a student at the college?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I assume that I took some course right up to 1929, probably. I probably took a course or two on the side.

Mr. STARNES. In your later years in college, like many other youngsters, you were both instructing and taking instruction in college?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. From there you went on to the University of Wisconsin.

sin, to get your master's degree?

Mr. KOCH. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. After receiving the master's degree from the University of Wisconsin, you came back as director of the school?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. STARNES. I do not think it is in the record, but whom did you succeed as director?

Mr. KOCH. Dr. William Edward Zeuch.

Mr. STARNES. You were his immediate successor?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. He was the founder of the school?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. He remained head of it until you succeeded him in 1931?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know where the doctor went when he left Commonwealth, and with whom?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; they had awarded him a Guggenheim fellowship, and he went to Europe to study workers' education in Europe.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall to what country he went to study?

Mr. KOCH. England.

Mr. STARNES. Where did he go from there? Do you know?

Mr. KOCH. Well, I think he returned to this country. He may have gone through some of the other countries, but I don't recall whether he did.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, is he not located at the present time in Baldwin County, Ala., near the Gulf of Mexico?

Mr. KOCH. Not that I know of. The last I heard of him—and it was third-handed report—I understood he was in a hospital in New Orleans.

Mr. STARNES. Have you not read recently that he is head of a school in Baldwin County, Ala.?

Mr. KOCH. No, I have not; that is news to me.

Mr. STARNES. Who was mainly responsible for the policies of the college? The doctor? What you call a director, I presume, corresponds with what we would ordinarily call the president of a college or university?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I think you could make the comparison, except that Commonwealth was on a much smaller scale and much more informal.

Mr. STARNES. He, like the president of a school, shaped the policies of this school?

Mr. KOCH. Not necessarily. He had quite a lot to say about them, but the faculty had meetings occasionally.

Mr. STARNES. What responsibility or authority did he have in connection with the operations of the school?

Mr. KOCH. The director?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. KOCH. Well, he was primarily charged with financing the college, insofar as it had to raise funds, and he was titular head and the public representative of the college, and also always taught. The two usually worked together.

Mr. STARNES. Your college was so small that the director had to be one of your instructors to carry on the course there?

Mr. KOCH. Oh, yes.

Mr. STARNES. How did you select your teachers, Mr. Koch? On what basis?

Mr. KOCH. Well, of course, no salary was paid, you see, so what we did was to go around and consult, say, with the members of our advisory committee—national advisory committee—and ask them for recommendations, and selected them the best we could.

Mr. STARNES. Who had the final responsibility of accepting or rejecting whoever was recommended to you by the national advisory committee?

Mr. KOCH. There wasn't any conflict that I know of, so we didn't have to exercise final responsibility.

Mr. STARNES. I am assuming, of course, that that would have rested finally with the president or director of the school.

Mr. KOCH. I assume he could have exercised that authority; but, as I say, it was never exercised.

Mr. STARNES. Who shaped the courses of study and the curriculum of the school?

Mr. KOCH. Well, the faculty discussed the curriculum of the school, and it was left up to each teacher pretty much to develop his own course.

Mr. STARNES. But primarily, again, that was the final responsibility of the director of the school as to what should be taught at his school?

Mr. KOCH. Well, it did not work that way.

Mr. STARNES. Not as to how they taught it, but at least as to what courses should be taught?

Mr. KOCH. That would be the decision of the faculty.

Mr. MASON. That is true in all universities and colleges of the present day. There is a faculty committee that sits in and advises and consults with the president and determines what should be taught, but he has the final say.

Mr. STARNES. I was driving at the organization and administration of the school, to see if it was radically different from that of the commonly accepted practice among schools and colleges throughout the country.

Do you recall whom you had on your faculty committee to help you select courses of study?

Mr. KOCH. The faculty was so small we just had faculty meetings periodically. I think I could have exercised final authority. I don't remember having exercised it.

Mr. STARNES. That pertains to the members of the faculty who taught the prescribed and regular courses at the school?

Mr. KOCH. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. On the special courses and lectures, who was primarily responsible for the selection of the lectures and the special professors?

Mr. KOCH. Again, it is a question of the faculty and a question of whom you can get, because when you don't pay people you don't have as wide a selection as ordinarily, and you cannot have as much discretion as you would like to have.

Mr. STARNES. Are you a family man?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. How long have you been married?

Mr. KOCH. I think I was married on February 13, 1935.

MR. STARNES. Those are all the questions I wish to ask. We have with us Mr. Mason, a member of the special subcommittee; and then we have present also two members of the full committee. If they wish to ask any questions, they may do so.

MR. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I want to ask any questions particularly, but I do want to summarize the facts that have impressed me in this review of the past actions of Mr. Koch.

According to the testimony, Mr. Koch was the director of the Commonwealth College from 1931 to 1935, a 4-year period, during which time, of course, as the director or head of the school, whether or not he exercised his authority, he was responsible for what went on in that school and the type of the course of study and, I suppose, the type of instructors and lecturers who appeared on the campus. There is no shirking that responsibility, no matter what you do, because when you assume a position that carries responsibility you must assume the responsibility, and there is that one fact that is fixed in my mind.

The second fact that is fixed in my mind as a result of this testimony is that there was an investigation—call it what you please—by the Legislature of Arkansas of this school during the time that Mr. Koch was responsible for the school. According to Mr. Koch's testimony to us, he denies having made several of the statements that are rather damaging that are carried in the transcript of that investigation. The investigation undoubtedly was carried on by at least two or three members of the legislature acting as a committee, just as we are.

Then, we are up against the proposition of accepting Mr. Koch's denial or accepting the authentic copy of this transcript, which was witnessed by at least three and perhaps more members of the legislature, and we have to make that choice in our own judgment of Mr. Koch.

They are the two things that remain in my mind, and they are the two things I have been impressed with. That is all.

MR. STARNES. We are delighted to have with us two members of the full committee, Mr. Eberharter, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Mundt, of South Dakota. Do you gentlemen wish to ask any questions about the facts or the testimony that interested you?

MR. EBERHARTER, do you have anything you wish to ask?

MR. EBERHARTER. What degree do you have?

MR. KOCH. Master of arts, University of Wisconsin.

MR. EBERHARTER. What was the subject of the thesis by which you obtained that degree.

MR. KOCH. My master's thesis was on the subject of labor in Australia.

MR. EBERHARTER. Had you ever been to Australia?

MR. KOCH. No. It was purely a research job, done on this side.

MR. EBERHARTER. Labor in Australia? Was that on the communistic side or more on the trade-union side? Which?

MR. KOCH. The trade-union side. That is the only side of the labor question I am interested in.

MR. EBERHARTER. You had been interested in that subject during your college course?

MR. KOCH. Yes; at least, one of my courses was in labor problems.

MR. EBERHARTER. How long a time did you spend in Pennsylvania on this particular work?

Mr. KOCH. Two or three months was all.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Was 2 or 3 months' period during the summer?

Mr. KOCH. No; I believe it was in the late winter.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In what part of the State was it?

Mr. KOCH. Mount Carmel, Pottsville.

Mr. EBERHARTER. When you testified before the subcommittee of the Legislature of Arkansas, in what city did you give your testimony?

Mr. KOCH. Mena, Ark.

Mr. EBERHARTER. How long were you on the stand?

Mr. KOCH. Several hours.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Were you under oath?

Mr. KOCH. I don't know whether I was or not. Does the so-called transcript state? I don't recall whether or not I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To answer your question, the transcript says, "Lucien Koch, first having been duly sworn upon his oath, testifies as follows, to wit."

Mr. KOCH. It was a very hostile investigation, for reasons that I went into. As a matter of fact, I am reluctant to refer to it as an investigation. I think a more appropriate title would be "witch hunt."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did you see the testimony immediately after it was printed?

Mr. KOCH. No; I have never seen it to this day. We were promised a copy but never received a copy. We were not allowed to have counsel present. We were not allowed to have witnesses present. We were quite fearful of what might happen, so we asked for a stenographer to be present, but were unable to do that, and the stenographer present was very much unqualified. She could not keep up; she could not spell words. That is why I haven't any confidence in the record.

Mr. MASON. That was all brought out this morning.

Mr. KOCH. I hope the committee takes all that into consideration, because I think that has an important bearing on this matter.

Mr. STARNES. That is the reason why I stated this morning we would give you the fullest opportunity to be heard here without any fear of reprisal or threat of duress, and with the utmost freedom of opportunity to speak your mind with respect to any question that you have been asked.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with Mr. Mason. I am sorry I was not here this morning.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Mundt?

Mr. MUNDT. It may be that some of these questions were asked in my absence. If so, please tell me as I go along.

In your capacity as director of Commonwealth College, did you confer with members of the advisory committee concerning the selection of your faculty?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, insofar as I was able, I saw them during my trips around the country and discussed questions of teachers with them and questions of student problems and finance.

Mr. MUNDT. Can you give the committee the names of some of the members with whom you conferred?

Mr. KOCH. I don't think so, as this dates away back, and I don't remember them. I recall that Roger Baldwin was one; but as of this time I can't recall. I recall always stopping in to see Justice and Mrs. Brandeis when I was in Washington.

Mr. MUNDT. Were they on the council?

Mr. KOCH. No; they were not on the council. They contributed financially. They advised me on the college.

Mr. MUNDT. Was your undergraduate collegiate work at this college—Arkansas Commonwealth College?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; my work there was accepted as being equivalent to a bachelor of arts degree.

Mr. MUNDT. By the University of Wisconsin?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Do universities generally accept work done at your college as being the equivalent to that required for a bachelor of arts degree?

Mr. MASON. He did not get a bachelor of arts degree. He had the equivalent of it but did not have the degree when he went to Wisconsin.

Mr. KOCH. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. Your testimony was very clear on that this morning.

Mr. KOCH. I could not answer your question just now because I did not know of any student who tried to get into any other university.

Mr. MUNDT. Who edited this Commonwealth fortnightly while you were director of the college?

Mr. KOCH. That job was passed around quite frequently. I know that Irving Wiseman was editor for quite some time. He was also at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. MUNDT. That was under your general direction, though, was it not?

Mr. KOCH. As the Congressman says, maybe I can't escape responsibility, but actually I had nothing to do with it. We were all very busy, and we tried to assign out these things. I understand that what the Congressman says is probably true.

Mr. MUNDT. Was that a student publication or an administration publication?

Mr. KOCH. No; it was a college publication, fortnightly, that went out to the friends of the school.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Koch, where are you registered? Here in town?

Mr. KOCH. No; in Quincy, Mass.

Mr. MUNDT. What is your classification?

Mr. KOCH. 3-A.

Mr. MUNDT. That is on the basis of family?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Not on occupation?

Mr. KOCH. No. I think 3-A is pure dependency.

Mr. MUNDT. In your opinion, Mr. Koch, is membership in the Communist Party a sufficient bar for employment today in the United States Government?

Mr. KOCH. I certainly think so; and it is a bar to holding any official position in the organization I represent. We have a provision in the national constitution in the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America barring Communists from holding any office in the organization whatsoever. I think we are one of the few national unions that have that provision.

Mr. MUNDT. You have no connection with the Maritime Union?

Mr. KOCH. No; no official connection. I know of some people.

Mr. MUNDT. Those are all the questions I have.

Mr. STARNES. Is there any further statement you would like to make, Mr. Koch?

Mr. KOCH. Yes, Congressman, if I may. First, I want to apologize officially for being late this morning. I explained how that happened.

Mr. STARNES. That is quite all right. We can understand that and the apologies are accepted.

Mr. KOCH. The train was late, and there was nothing I could do about that.

As I understand it, I am not being accused of being a Communist or being a Socialist by the committee—at least, on the basis of the testimony brought out.

Mr. STARNES. Oh, no; the committee has made no accusations. We are giving you an opportunity to make a statement with reference to the allegations and the charges that have reached the committee and have come to the committee's knowledge, to the effect that you have been associated with or were working together with members of the Communist Party and Communist front organizations and subversive groups during the course of your career.

Mr. KOCH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear to the committee here that I am not and have never been and never intend to be a Communist or a member of the Communist Party. I am not, never have been, and never intend to be a Socialist or a member of the Socialist Party.

So far as the questioning was concerned, apparently all the points that have been raised were raised in connection with the period in which I was associated with Commonwealth College, with particular reference to the so-called legislative inquiry of the school that took place. I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat the background which led up to the investigation of the school, but I do urge the committee to bear that situation in mind, because I think it has an important bearing.

So far as Commonwealth College is concerned, during my administration it was thoroughly a nonpartisan and nonsectarian school—that and no more. It was not controlled by any minority political groups or by any other groups. In other words, as far as that is concerned, we tried to conduct it as our average university today is conducted.

Mr. STARNES. I was impressed with the idea that your students seemed to be drawn from a wide area.

Mr. KOCH. All over the country.

Mr. STARNES. They seemed to be a cross section geographically, apparently, of the country.

Mr. KOCH. Pretty much so; yes.

Mr. STARNES. What was the largest enrollment you ever had?

Mr. KOCH. I think 50 or 60 possibly in any one term.

Mr. STARNES. Probably at any one particular time you had as many as 15 or 25 States represented in your student body?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; that would not be unusual at all.

Mr. STARNES. All right. You may proceed.

Mr. KOCH. I do not want to be held responsible for what may have developed after my administration at Commonwealth.

Mr. STARNES. We would not even attempt that at all. The only reason questions were asked about it, as you can well understand, was to see whether or not there was any continuity of policy throughout the years of the college.

Mr. KOCH. Yes. I do want to point out to the committee again that prior to my leaving Commonwealth, I naturally knew I was going to leave, and I didn't take a very active part in administering the affairs of the school. I say that even though you feel that what took place is my responsibility, and maybe legally that is correct; I do not know about that. But I was not very active in the picture, as I remember the thing, during that period.

Now, so far as this so-called record of the legislative witch hunt is concerned, a reproduction—a purported reproduction—of that article appeared in the Liberty magazine. I think that article came out in late 1936 or 1937—or early 1937—and at that time I was employed by the Federal Government. The article represented part of the general attack on the administration on the part of the press that was not friendly to the administration, and that included most of the press. But I did enter suit on the basis of that article. I sued Liberty magazine and Bernard Mcfadden, publisher, and I collected. In other words, I was successful in that suit, and I collected \$500 and, in addition, got what was in effect a retraction.

Now, that, I want the committee to know, was based upon the sort of stuff your investigator was reading off today. I think that should have a big bearing with the committee. I have a leaflet that the union put out following that, with a photostatic copy of the check, and also a copy of the literature.

Mr. STARNES. Would you like to place that in the record?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; I would. I am wondering if perhaps I should not read the leaflet.

Mr. STARNES. It does not make any difference. If you place it in the record, it will be more impressive.

Mr. KOCH. I just hope the committee will read it.

Mr. STARNES. Let that be received as an exhibit and included as part of the testimony.

(The article in Liberty magazine, entitled "Rah, Rah, Russia!" and the leaflet referred to by the witness were received and marked "Koch Exhibits No. 3 and No. 4," respectively.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should like to ask the witness if he can state briefly what the basis of his suit against Liberty magazine was. Numerous contentions are made in the Liberty article, and it is quite possible that suit was brought there on some points and not on others.

Mr. KOCH. I am not a legal man. I just knew the article was damaging and was unfair. It was a lie. I told the lawyers to go to work on them.

Mr. STARNES. I suppose, Dr. Matthews, in order to shorten this, that the committee should secure a copy of the record.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There are a great many matters of sex that are brought into the article, and it may be that suit was based on the matter of sex and not on all of the article; I do not know.

Mr. MASON. We would have to get a copy of the suit to know what he was guilty of.

Mr. STARNES. This is the headline of the article: "Rah Rah Russia." In order to keep the record clear, I think we should have some sort of record from the court in which suit was brought, because it may have gone to trial on an issue that is entirely foreign to the charge

that he was a Communist. I do not see how any suit could be based on communism and a verdict rendered so long as the Communist Party is recognized legally as a political party in this country. That could not be libelous any more than you could sue a man for calling you a Democrat or a Republican. So we would be happy to get a copy of the court records. After we get them we will see what the issues were that went to the jury and on what basis the case was decided.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where was suit filed?

Mr. STARNES. Yes; where was suit filed? New York City?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Do you remember in what court?

Mr. KOCH. One law firm was in Massachusetts; the other was in New York City. So, I assume it was filed in New York City.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, I should like to ask the witness if settlement was made out of court.

Mr. KOCH. Yes; it was made out of court. I didn't have the funds to see it through. If I had, I would have seen it through and got that much more money.

Mr. STARNES. Well, there has been no indication that settlement was made out of court.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is the name of the law firm that filed suit for you?

Mr. KOCH. It is on the check.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Hays, St. John, Abramson, and Schulman.

Mr. STARNES. Evidently there was no judgment, but we can check the court records and find out. There was the settlement made outside of court, and we will find out what sort of entry was made with reference to it on the court docket.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was this a New York firm?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; that is a New York firm.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that Lee Pressman's firm?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. We will be happy to get hold of the court file, Mr. Koch, and check that. I think that is necessary to clarify the situation. We will make it an exhibit to your testimony here.

Mr. KOCH. All right, sir. Thank you.

I would just like to state that since April 1937, I have been associated with the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America in various capacities: as national representative, as regional director for New England, as director of organization for the Bethlehem Shipyards Division of the union, and as port director of the port of Baltimore. I think my record during those years speaks for itself. I think the record of our organization speaks for itself so far as the war effort is concerned. We want to reiterate that our national constitution carries a provision which prohibits Communists or subversive elements from holding office in the organization. We have a good, clean, upstanding union, and a union that has had a great deal to do with getting out ships needed for this war. I think the record of my national president and my national secretary and treasurer is pretty well known; I think they have an outstanding record. I do not think that people of that character would have members of their staffs who are not competent or fit to do the work as Americans like to see it done.

I want to point out that my entire life, practically, has been devoted to trying to work with and help, insofar as I could in my own humble way, the average American, doing the best I could to increase his wages, improve his conditions, and to see that he gets standing and has the influence in the community and the Nation that he deserves to have. Now, I realize that some of us in that position have been attacked before, and I assume some of us will be attacked again. We recognize that we face that possibility when we are in this work. But as far as my feelings are concerned, I realize you have to do that in order to get anywhere and in order to accomplish anything. I think Jesus Christ established a pretty good record along those lines.

Mr. STARNES. You were never engaged in any type of work, however, throughout your life except in school work or as an official of a trade-union?

Mr. KOCH. That is not true, sir.

Mr. STARNES. I thought I gathered from your testimony this morning that you entered this college when you were approximately 16 years old.

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You stated that you stayed there until 1929 as either a student of a part-time instructor and student.

Mr. KOCH. Only for the student—

Mr. STARNES. Just a minute; and during the school years?

Mr. KOCH. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Then you went to the University of Wisconsin for 3 school years, and then you returned as director of Commonwealth and stayed there until 1935. From 1935 until 1938, or 1937, you were employed by the Federal Government, and then from that position you went to Massachusetts as an employee and organizer of this union. The only work you ever did in the meantime on any other job of any nature was during the summer months while you were going to school?

Mr. KOCH. Yes; and then, of course, the work I did before I went to school. You know, farm boys very often go to work rather early.

Mr. STARNES. Yes; I can testify to that.

Mr. KOCH. For instance, I worked my way through high school by working in a printing establishment, and during the summers I worked in the timbers up in Oregon—very heavy work, though enjoyable, I thought; and then I worked at the building trades for about 6 summers and became a house carpenter. I also worked in a greenhouse establishment for one summer, as a means of earning money to keep going.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The witness referred to his union. Is John Green the national president of your union?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is Philip Van Gelder the national secretary?

Mr. KOCH. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know, do you not, Mr. Koch, that Green and Van Gelder were two outstanding leaders of the Socialist Party in Philadelphia for many years?

Mr. KOCH. No; I did not know that, and I don't believe that is true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I will state under oath that that is a matter of public record.

Mr. STARNES. Very well. That is all. That will close the hearing for this afternoon.

(At 4:10 p. m. an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, March 30, 1943, at 10 a. m.)

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Commoner, Mena, Ark., June 1939, pp. 1, 4]

SCHOOL ELECTS OFFICERS

GOVERNING BODY REPRESENTS SOUTHERN LABOR MOVEMENT

Of the eleven nonresident members of the Commonwealth College Association, six were elected recently to serve until the annual meeting next fall. In accordance with the Reorganization Plan of 1937, the entire board has been chosen from the leaders of the labor and progressive movements in the South and West.

In addition, three new members were elected to Commonwealth's National Advisory Committee, composed of national figures who endorse the College's program and who assist it in an advisory capacity.

NONRESIDENT MEMBERS

The eleven nonresident members, who belong to the higher governing body of the school, the Association, are:

Dr. George Bishop, Missouri Medical College, Washington University;
 Horace Bryan, Texas; provisional president, Dist. 12 U. C. A. P. A. W. A.;
 Gerald Harris, Alabama; vice-president, Alabama Farmers' Union;
 W. V. Howard, Oklahoma; geologist;
 William I. Igo, Oklahoma; International Typographical Union;
 Guy Kirtley, Texas; American Federation of Teachers;
 Walker Martin, Alabama; financial secretary, Local 7264 U. M. W. A.;
 Gordon McIntyre, Louisiana; sec.-treas., Louisiana Farmers' Union;
 Edward N. Norman, Florida; Citrus Workers Organizer;
 William Sentner, Missouri; intl. vice-pres., U. E. R. M. W. A.;
 C. Alpheus Stanfield, Arkansas; labor attorney.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ANNOUNCED

The three members of the Advisory Committee are Gordon Ward, agricultural extension expert of Virginia Polytechnic Institute; Bertha C. Reynolds, George Warren Brown Department of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; and John P. Davis, executive secretary of the National Negro Congress.

The entire list of members of this committee follows:

Cedric Belfrage, Walter Bergman, John Bosch, Harold Coy, Jerome Davis, Clinton S. Golden, Lester Granger, Carl Haessler, J. B. S. Hardman, Lem Harris, Donald Henderson, Angelo Herndon, Granville Hicks, Charles Johnson, Lucien Koch, Elizabeth Lawson, E. C. Lindeman, Grace Lumpkin, J. A. MacCallum, Alexander Meikeljohn, Tom Mooney, B. F. Poulnot, A. Philip Randolph, Bertha C. Reynolds, Victor G. Reuther, Reid Robinson, Willard Uphaus, Gordon Ward.

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Joe Starnes (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Hon. Joe Starnes, Hon. Noah M. Mason, Hon. Herman P. Eberharter, Hon. Karl E. Mundt.

Also present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator of the committee, and Dr. J. B. Matthews, director of research for the committee.

Mr. STARNES. The subcommittee will resume its hearings.

The subcommittee this morning will proceed with its hearings by taking the testimony of Mr. Frederick L. Schuman, who, I understand, is present.

Mr. Schuman, some charges were made recently, or a statement was made on the floor of the House, with reference to the fact that you, as a Federal employee, had been a member of certain organizations which are commonly denominated "front" organizations for the Communist Party, or associated with those in a public manner, and that you had been associated with or a member of certain "front" organizations which had been denominated as subversive by a Special Committee of the House Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities, as well as by the present Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Biddle.

Subsequent to those allegations and charges, if they may be deemed as such, the House Appropriations Committee took cognizance of these matters and asked that the Rules Committee grant a rule permitting the establishment of a special committee from the House Appropriations Committee to pass on all such allegations and charges, and it is for the purpose of giving you an opportunity to be heard and to complete the record so it can be in turn transferred or transmitted to the House Appropriations Subcommittee that you were called this morning and given an opportunity to make any statement in explanation of those statements that you care to make. It was felt that you should be given that opportunity, and your testimony will be under oath. Whatever examination will be conducted other than the preliminary examination which I as chairman will conduct will be carried on by Dr. Matthews, who is the chief research member of the Special Committee Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities.

Dr. Matthews is already under oath as a result of the proceedings

yesterday for any statement that he might make in the course of the examination, and we will now swear you.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

TESTIMONY OF FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, PRINCIPAL POLITICAL ANALYST, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have anyone accompanying you that you want to represent you in any way?

Mr. CHARLES DENNY. I am the General Counsel of the Federal Communications Commission. I come at the request of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, simply as an observer for the Commission, if that is agreeable to the committee, not as counsel for Mr. Schuman. I do not plan to participate. I just simply would like to attend.

Mr. STARNES. The hearings are executive, but we will be delighted to extend to you that courtesy, and you are at liberty to attend any hearings in which any of the employees of the Federal Communications Commission are involved.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you, Mr. Starnes.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Schuman, the questions that I shall ask are questions that we propound to everybody else, and I hope you will not feel embarrassed if any of them seem to have any improper implications, because they do not. They are purely to elicit information in a preliminary manner.

Will you give us your full name and address, please?

Dr. SCHUMAN. May I ask you, Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, whether I will be permitted to correct a copy of the transcript and retain a copy of the same?

Mr. STARNES. You will be given full opportunity to check any of the proceedings of this committee as it relates to you—full liberty in reading and checking those hearings. They are executive, as I stated, and you know what an executive hearing is. It is chiefly for the purposes, as I said, of completing the record to be transmitted to the Appropriations Committee, which will make whatever recommendations that are going to be made concerning the matter.

Dr. SCHUMAN. And may I retain a copy myself of the corrected transcript?

Mr. STARNES. We have never followed that practice. I mean, we have never indulged in that practice, as I understand it. These executive proceedings, as I recall, have not been printed. It is understood that you may examine them fully and carefully, but so far as making copies of them available, these are executive hearings. They are made available to you for examination any time you want—any time. I do not think you could ask for more consideration than that.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My full name is Frederick Louis Schuman.

Mr. STARNES. What is your address, please, sir?

Dr. SCHUMAN. My residence now is 2410 Eleventh Street North, Arlington, Va.

Mr. STARNES. Are you a native-born citizen?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am.

Mr. STARNES. When and where were you born?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Chicago, Ill., February 22, 1904.

Mr. STARNES. Will you please give us your educational background?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I attended the John C. Coonley Elementary School in Chicago; I graduated from the Lakeview High School in Chicago; I attended the University of Chicago as an undergraduate from 1920 to 1924, when I received a bachelor's degree. I continued on with graduate work at the University of Chicago from 1924 to 1927, when I received a doctorate of philosophy in political science.

Mr. STARNES. After finishing school or college, in what work did you engage, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I engaged in teaching political science at the University of Chicago, beginning in 1926 and remaining there first as an instructor and later as an assistant professor until 1936, when I transferred to Williams College, in Williamstown, Mass., where I have been teaching until last October, when I came to work for the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. STARNES. Was your work at the University of Chicago, and later at Williams, exclusively in the field of political science, your teaching work?

Dr. SCHUMAN. My teaching work, yes, was exclusively in the field of political science. I have done a good deal of writing and lecturing in addition to teaching, all in the field of diplomatic history, international relations, contemporary world politics.

Mr. STARNES. What was your first connection with the Federal Government as an employee, or in any official capacity?

Dr. SCHUMAN. My first connection with the Federal Government as an employee was my appointment to my present post, where I began work on the 21st of last October.

Mr. STARNES. What is the salary you receive as an employee of the Federal Communications Commission?

Dr. SCHUMAN. \$5,600.

Mr. STARNES. What is the classification?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman; I have not memorized the classification grade. I don't know, offhand. I think it is E-2, but I am not certain.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall what field they placed you in, what line of work?

Dr. SCHUMAN. My title is principal political analyst.

Mr. STARNES. What are the duties in that connection?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am engaged in the analysis of enemy radio propaganda, principally Nazi radio propaganda, as a member of the German Section of the Analysis Division of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service.

Mr. STARNES. How does that work proceed? That has been very interesting to me, because we have gone into the matter somewhat, shall I say in a surface manner, in our hearings on the appropriations bill each time, and we have been intrigued by the possibilities of that work. Just how is that work carried on, Doctor? How do you get the information, and what disposition do you make of it after you obtain it?

Dr. SCHUMAN. You are referring, Mr. Chairman, to the work of the Analysis Division, or the entire agency?

Mr. STARNES. Of the Analysis Division.

Dr. SCHUMAN. The Analysis Division works with mimeographed transcripts of radio broadcasts picked up, some of them in Maryland, some of them on the west coast, some of them in the Caribbean. It also works with a large volume of cable material which comes to us from London. Our work consists in the preparation each week of a mimeographed publication called the Weekly Review of Official Foreign Broadcasts, which is rather widely distributed to other war agencies and other departments of the Government concerned with the war effort.

We also prepare in the German Section of the Analysis Division another weekly, the Central European Radio Analysis, intended for those with a special interest in central Europe and in Nazi propaganda. The client list for that is somewhat smaller than the client list for the other weekly, but also includes a good many people in the State, War, Navy, Lend-Lease, Office of Strategic Services, Board of Economic Warfare, and other agencies.

We also receive a good many special requests from other agencies, some of which call for a good deal of investigation into our materials. We likewise prepare special reports of various kinds, some of them on current events of wide interest, such as the January 30 celebrations in Germany of the coming to power of Hitler. Occasionally we prepare longer-range special reports, as for instance a recent one, Nazi propaganda treatment of the American soldier!

That, I think, indicates in a broad way, at least, the weekly scope of our division.

Mr. STARNES. What disposition do you make of these reports and these analyses that you make?

Dr. SCHUMAN. The weekly reports are distributed to our regular client list. I think roughly there are one hundred and sixty-some clients for the Central European Radio Analysis, and something over 200 clients for the Weekly Review of Official Foreign Broadcasts.

Mr. STARNES. Is it intended that those analyses should reach a selected clientele in this country who, by their racial or national roots, are rooted in these particular areas, or is it for the public generally?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No; it is not for the public, Mr. Chairman. All of these reports are confidential. They go only to other public officials engaged in the war effort, and interested in the results of our analysis of radio propaganda. They are not distributed to the public.

Mr. STARNES. I see.

Are any of these analyses made available to the Office of War Information?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. To the Naval and Military Intelligence?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; all of them. That is to say, we have clients on all of our lists in all of those agencies.

Mr. STARNES. Let the record show that Mr. Eberharter, a member of the full Committee Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities, is now present.

What is the degree of cooperation that you have with the O. W. I., Dr. Schuman, and how do you work together?

Dr. SCHUMAN. We distribute all of our weekly reports to various people in the Office of War Information, some of them in the Overseas Branch in New York, some of them here. We receive a good many special requests from people in the Office of War Information. We extend or send occasionally suggestions for overseas propaganda to the Office of War Information. I meet every Tuesday with one of my colleagues with two members of the Office of War Information in a regular weekly luncheon, and I should say, all things considered, that we perhaps work more closely with that organization than with any other single agency.

Mr. STARNES. Do they make available to you any sources of information that they have of conditions abroad, in helping you to prepare your analyses?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; they do. We receive regularly each day now a copy of the Office of War Information cable from London, which consists partly of analyses of the European press, partly of summaries and excerpts from domestic radio broadcasts, partly of propaganda analysis performed in London by the local branch of their Office of War Information. That is the principal source of information that we receive from them, but we receive in a more irregular way various other publications of the Office of War Information, and there is a good deal of interchange of data between the two agencies constantly.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, have you ever been arrested or convicted of any crime?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have never been arrested nor convicted of any crime.

Mr. STARNES. That completes the preliminary examination. Dr. Matthews has some detailed questions to propound to you with reference to these allegations which have been made as to your connection or association with subversive organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On whose recommendation were you employed by the Federal Communications Commission, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. On whose recommendation?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Are you asking who asked me to assume my present post there?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; make that the first question.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I was originally invited to assume my present post by the Chief of the Analysis Division, Dr. Goodwin Watson. The preliminary correspondence included, however, Mr. Harold Graves, Jr., who is Administrative Chief of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, and Dr. Robert D. Leigh, who is head of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In discussing the matter of your employment with Dr. Goodwin Watson, or in writing to him about it, did you express some hesitancy in accepting the position lest you be put under fire for some of your past activities and connections?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you care to elaborate on how you expressed that hesitancy?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Would you care to have me read an excerpt from the letter in which that matter is dealt with?

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you please.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, Doctor, is Dr. Watson the head of the Division?

Dr. SCHUMAN. He is head of the Analysis Division; yes, sir.

In a letter of the 6th of May 1942 to Dr. Goodwin Watson, I said, among other things, these:

Finally, I feel I should ask you to weigh carefully before making a decision possible risks to which you may expose yourself and your associates in tendering me an appointment. I have taken full cognizance of what has happened to Maurice Parmelee, Malcolm Cowley, and Hartley Grattan and other liberals who have sought to contribute to the war effort in Washington. I am no less open to attack than these men, for, like them, I have a consistent public record of anti-Fascism, anti-Nazi-ism, and advocacy of close collaboration with the Soviet Union against Fascist aggression.

No good purpose would be served by my accepting an appointment and then being discharged within a few weeks or months as subversive. If, therefore, there is any likelihood of that happening, it would be best for me not to consider an appointment. I fully appreciate that no assurances are possible in these matters, but in order that you may make some estimate in your mind of the likelihood, let me say herewith that I am listed, of course, in Elizabeth Dilling's *The Red Network*, and honored therein in a paragraph of false and preposterous allegations that I was denounced as a "red" by the Hearst press in 1934 and '35; that I have been more recently condemned as a "Stalinist" by various Trotskyite individuals and publications.

The specific allegations were looked into in 1935 by the Committee of the Illinois State Senate investigating subversive activities at the University of Chicago. They were pronounced false and unwarranted by the committee in its final report.

I have never been a member of any Communist or Communist front organizations, nor have I ever supported or sympathized with Communist activities in the United States. I am nevertheless on record as opposed to the continuation of the Dies committee and on one occasion, on March 31, 1935, I spoke at a meeting at the Chicago Coliseum under the auspices of the Friends of the Soviet Union. On the same platform were the late Congressman Ernest Lundeen and Mr. J. B. Matthews, now chief investigator for the Dies committee.

I know that you are fully aware of the possibilities here, and I appreciate all the more your asking me to consider an appointment, but you may not be aware of all the facts I have set forth and I should not want you to proceed further with this matter without giving them full consideration.

I should like to add, if I may, gentlemen, that I suggested at this time—last April and May—with the concurrence of the officials at the Analysis Division, that it seemed desirable to have me investigated by the Civil Service Commission or the F. B. I. before I assumed the post, and requests were made to both of those agencies to carry through an investigation, but for reasons unknown to me the investigation was not completed until after I had assumed my duties last October.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mentioned the name of Maurice Parmelee in your communication to Dr. Watson. Are you personally acquainted with Maurice Parmelee?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I think the answer to that would be "No." I have met him only once, and that very casually.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the writings of Maurice Parmelee?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am acquainted with his writings in the field of political science.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you read his book entitled "Bolshevism, Fascism, and the Liberal State"?

Dr. SCHUMAN. " * * * and the Liberal Democratic State." Yes, I am familiar with that book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say as an expert in the field of political science that that book presents the liberal viewpoint?

Dr. SCHUMAN. As I recall the book—I have not looked at it for a good many years now—its main emphasis was on a comparison between Bolshevism and Fascism, with only a rather limited treatment of the liberal democratic state in the later chapters of it. So, in terms of the distribution of pages in the book, as I recall them, I would say the liberal democratic state did not receive as much space as bolshevism and fascism.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you discover any personal viewpoint on the author's part in presenting his material in this book, whether dealing with bolshevism or fascism or the liberal democratic state?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Well, as I remember the book, it seemed to me that the viewpoint from which it was written was the viewpoint of a convinced democrat—with a small "d"—a proponent of the liberal democratic state who was, however, as between communism and fascism, much more sympathetic with communism than with fascism. But it would not be my impression that the point of view, the orientation of the book, was a Communist orientation. It was a liberal democratic orientation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you wish to state with any positiveness that his orientation was not decidedly or pronouncedly that of a Communist, in the writing of this book?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Well, Dr. Matthews, I think that is a question you ought to ask Dr. Parmelee, and not me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am asking you as a man who has characterized Dr. Parmelee in your communication to Dr. Watson as a liberal.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; I would regard him as a liberal, definitely.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am also asking you in your recognized capacity as an expert in the field of political science.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I would classify the ideology of Maurice Parmelee as that of a left-wing liberal.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you read his book entitled "Farewell to Poverty"?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am sorry to say I have not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe that is the more recent of the two books. Then you would not be prepared to state whether or not you consider that to have the orientation of a Communist?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am afraid I would make no statement about it without reading it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You also mentioned the name of Malcolm Cowley in your communication to Dr. Watson, and I believe you also characterized Malcolm Cowley as a liberal. First, I would like to ask you if you are personally acquainted with Malcolm Cowley.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long have you known Malcolm Cowley.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Oh, I should think 10 years. I have never seen very much of him, but have corresponded with him and seen him now and then over the past 10 years.

Mr. STARNES. Let the record show that Mr. Mundt, a member of the full committee, is present.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are aware of the fact, I believe, from some of your previous testimony which I have read, that Malcolm Cowley

admits that he had a part in preparing a pamphlet entitled "Culture and the Crisis," which pamphlet endorsed the Communist Party and its candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States in 1932. Is that correct?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am not aware that Mr. Cowley ever said to me, or anyone, that he had any part in preparing that pamphlet. He did not, to my knowledge, ever deny that his name was properly used on the pamphlet, as I did repeatedly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are aware, then, of the fact that Cowley did sign the statement supporting the Communist Party candidates in the elections of 1932?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am afraid, Dr. Matthews, I cannot say I am aware of that fact. All I am aware of is that Malcolm Cowley has never to my knowledge denied that his name was properly used on that pamphlet.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with Malcolm Cowley's relatively recent volume of poems, published in February 1942?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am sorry I am very much behind in my reading of poetry. I am not acquainted with that volume.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not read reviews of the volume?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have seen one or two reviews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you see the review of the book that appeared in Time magazine shortly after its publication last year?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I don't recall it. I may have seen it, but I don't recall it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It may refresh your recollection if I say that the review in Time magazine called attention to a poem in which the poet, Mr. Cowley, described with some enthusiasm the march of a mob of armed insurrectionists on the Capital of the United States and their seizure of the Capital. Do you recall having read that?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I don't recall having read that in any review in Time magazine, but I recall a reference to that on the floor of the House on the 1st of February. I assume that there must have been some such passage in the book, or reference would not have been made to it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with numerous other political connections of Malcolm Cowley over a period of 10 years, in which time you have known him personally?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No; I would not say that I was. I have not seen him as frequently as once a year during that period of time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you do believe that it is proper to describe him as a liberal?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I would describe him, again, as a left-wing liberal, more leftish, however, than Maurice Parmelee, in this sense, that Mr. Cowley at one time, at least, seems to me—this is purely a personal opinion—to come pretty close to sharing the outlook of the Communist Party of the United States, an outlook which I have never shared and which, so far as I know, Mr. Parmelee has never shared.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you have classified Malcolm Cowley as a liberal at the time of which you speak, when he, according to your viewpoint, came close to sharing the position of the Communist Party?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Well, that, Dr. Matthews, raises a question of semantics. I should want to know what alternative terms one was choosing among before saying "yes" or "no." If one were choosing as between

liberal and radical, I suppose I should say that at that time I should have been disposed to classify Mr. Cowley as radical rather than as a liberal. If the choice were between the terms liberal and Communist, and if one meant by Communist a member of the Communist Party, fully sharing its views on all subjects, then I should not want to characterize Mr. Cowley as a Communist from what I know of him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a student of political science, is it your understanding that there are numerous persons properly classified as Communists who do not hold party membership cards, or have formal affiliation with the Communist Party?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Properly classified by whom?

Mr. MATTHEWS. By students of political science, such as yourself.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I should say in general that students of political science, in their efforts to use precise terminology, would classify as Communists, with a capital "C," only those people who publicly embrace the Communist philosophy and engage in political activity in furtherance of that philosophy. Other persons, I think, would better be classified as Communist sympathizers, or fellow travelers, if you like. But I think the precision of language is not very much promoted by using the term "Communist" as a generic term to include all persons who may at one time or another have found themselves in agreement with this, that, or the other position on questions of public policy that Communists may have adopted.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the interests of the precision of language, would you restrict the application of the term "Communist" to those who publicly profess their belief in communism, as you stated in your previous answer?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No; I would want to include in the term any individuals who may be discovered to have been secret members of the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, in the interests of precision, you would want to modify your answer slightly, would you?

Dr. SCHUMAN. In that sense; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you publish a book entitled "American Policy Toward Russia Since 1917," Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the publisher of the book?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That volume was published in London by Markham Lawrence, and in this country by International Publishers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where was it first published, in London or New York?

Dr. SCHUMAN. As I remember, the New York publication preceded by 6 months or so the London publication.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make arrangements for the publication of the book in London as well as those for the publication of the book in New York?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I had some correspondence with Markham Lawrence, but my recollection is that the arrangements were made by International Publishers, in New York.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware, Dr. Schuman, of the fact that International Publishers is the leading publishing house of the Communist Party in the United States?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am aware of that fact now. I was not wholly aware of that fact in 1928, when the book was published.

If you will permit me to, Dr. Matthews, I would like to make a brief statement about that book and the circumstances of its publication.

The book in question was my doctorate dissertation at the University of Chicago. It was based on 3 months' work here in the Department of State in certain archive material. The topic of the book was suggested to me by two of the professors under whom I was then working, Prof. Quincy Wright and the late Prof. Samuel Northrop Harper.

The resultant manuscript, like most doctoral dissertations, was a highly documented, detailed, factual study of this particular episode of recent diplomatic history. Those under whom I worked at the university thought it might be possible to publish the thesis in book form. With that in mind I sent the manuscript to a number of standard commercial publishers, including, as I remember, MacMillan, Alfred Knopf, Henry Holt, and some others. It was at that time wholly unknown in the writing and publishing field, and all of these publishers rejected the manuscript on the ground it would be very expensive to publish by virtue of its elaborate documentation, that there would probably not be a sufficiently wide market to justify it commercially.

When I had given up hope of any publication of it, it was suggested to me by a Chicago attorney that International Publishers might be interested in taking it. I had not communicated prior to that time with International Publishers, nor was I familiar with what they did except that I knew that they had published a good many works about Russia, and in the field of Russian history, the Russian Revolution, and so on. So I submitted the manuscript to them, and they decided to publish it.

I think I ought to add that subsequently International Publishers endeavored to secure from Gosizdat, the Soviet State publishing house in Moscow, a Russian translation of that book, on the assumption that the Russian publishing house would be equally interested in this particular story. Some work was begun on a Russian translation, but it was finally decided by Gosizdat not to publish this book in Russian translation, because it was not written from the Communist point of view, and that ended that particular episode.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the Chicago attorney who suggested to you that you approach International Publishers concerning the publication of the volume?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Mr. Arthur Fisher, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. With whom did you correspond or deal in International Publishers relative to the publication of the book?

Dr. SCHUMAN. With Mr. Alexander Trachtenberg.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Didn't you know, as a student of political science, that Alexander Trachtenberg was one of the leaders of the Communist Party in the United States?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not know that at that time. I am not certain that he was a leader at that time.

Mr. STARNES. What was that year, Doctor?

Dr. SCHUMAN. The book was published in 1928. My correspondence with him, as I recall it extended over the early months of 1928. I

believe I am correct in saying that at that time Mr. Trachtenberg had not been a candidate for any office under the auspices of the Communist Party, nor held any party position. I may be mistaken in that. I know that subsequently he did become a candidate and identified himself with the party.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, do you recall what the record discloses with reference to Mr. Trachtenberg's own testimony before this committee as to his identification with the Communist Party in its earliest stages here in this country?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; I looked that up from Mr. Trachtenberg's own testimony, and he testified that he had been publicly and prominently associated with the Communist Party as a member and as a writer for some years prior to 1928. However, it does not follow that Dr. Schuman was aware of that.

Mr. STARNES. I can understand that fact. I just wanted to refresh my recollection of Mr. Trachtenberg's testimony, because I recall very distinctly his having testified before the committee and identifying himself with the party over a long period of time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Mr. Trachtenberg furnish assistance of any kind in preparing the manuscript or in revising the text?

Dr. SCHUMAN. He made certain suggestions, some of which I followed. As I remember, most of the suggestions were in the direction of shortening the manuscript, which was very much longer as a doctoral dissertation than it is in book form. I think there were three or four points, also, in which he made suggestions for further documentation from Russian sources with which I was not familiar. There were no suggestions made by him that I remember that altered the substance of the book or the point of view from which the book was written, or anything of that sort.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Mr. Trachtenberg the only person at International Publishers with whom you corresponded or discussed the matters of the text?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes. There was a young lady whose name now escapes me with whom I had some correspondence with regard to the maps which appear in the book, but Mr. Trachtenberg is the only person with whom I had any correspondence or discussion about the book itself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the preface to your book you have acknowledged some indebtedness to International Publishers for making the book much more accurate. Could you elaborate briefly on what that involved?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That had to do with the suggestions about further documentation to which I referred a moment ago. There may have been several matters of dates and spellings of names that entered into those suggestions. Since I got all of those from Mr. Trachtenberg I proposed to express my appreciation to him personally in the preface, and he requested me to make the acknowledgment to the publishing house rather than to him personally, and I saw at that time no harm in that, so I did it. I thought later it was perhaps an unwise decision, but be that as it may.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is true, is it not, that chapter 12 of your book deals with the subject of the Propaganda of World Revolution?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your study of Communist propaganda, aiming at world revolution; that is, the overthrow of the governments of other countries and the establishment of Communist regimes in other countries, did you go into the question of their strategy or tactics?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; to a limited degree. My major interest in this field of study, and indeed throughout my teaching and writing career, has been an interest in international relations as such. I have never dealt in detail or specifically with the domestic tactics and strategy of particular Communist Parties except insofar as that might have a significant bearing on international crisis situations or on diplomatic developments.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you in the course of such study go into the question of what the Communists themselves have called "transmission belts"?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; except. Dr. Matthews, it is my recollection—you, I am sure, know much more about this than I do—that that term was not used by the Communists themselves during the period which this particular volume covers. I may be in error there, but that is my off-hand impression.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; I am sure you won't object to a correction there. The phrase originated with Lenin, and was the subject of written discussion for a period of years down until 1931, when Clarence Hathaway wrote a very extensive article in the Communist on the subject of transmission belts, in which article Hathaway quotes at considerable length Lenin and Stalin and others of the outstanding theoreticians and leaders of the Communist movement.

I offer that as a part of my testimony, Mr. Chairman.

Now, these organizations which the Communists themselves have at times called transmission belts, and at other times mass organizations, and at other times members of the Communist solar system, have been described by non-Communists as "front" organizations. Are you at all acquainted with that designation of these groups?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What would be your description of a front organization as an expert in the field of political science?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have not myself used that term, because it is my impression that it has been used so loosely, so carelessly, as not to have very much descriptive value. If I were to use that term in my own speaking and writing, I should want to limit the use of it to organizations which are controlled by members of the Communist Party, and which pretend not to be so controlled. There have been, of course, a number of organizations of which that, I think, would be probably a correct description.

Mr. STARNES. Name some of those for us, in your judgment.

Dr. SCHUMAN. The organizations secretly controlled by the American Communist Party? I should say that the American League for Peace and Democracy, as of 1939 and '40, and for part of '41, was probably such an organization; I don't know. I am basing that statement on no knowledge of who the controlling individuals were behind the scenes, but on the facts that appeared that that organization followed very closely the official line of the Communist Party.

I am not certain that I know of any other organizations by name which I would be prepared to include in such a statement.

Mr. STARNES. What about the American Student Union?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am not prepared to say of my own knowledge that the American Student Union was such an organization.

Mr. STARNES. American Youth Congress?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am not prepared to say of my own knowledge that it was.

Mr. STARNES. The Workers' Alliance?

Dr. SCHUMAN. It may have been, but the authority on all these matters sits opposite me at the table, and I pretend not to be an authority on those particular organizations.

Mr. STARNES. The committee has been delightfully entertained by the verbal precision and hair-splitting of the two very distinguished gentlemen around the table, one a witness and the other an examiner. It has been a delightful and delectable intellectual dish, but, getting down into the field of the practical, isn't it generally considered by all American people who have any information at all about any of those movements now that the American Student Union, the American Youth Congress, the Friends of the Soviet Union, the Workers' Alliance, and the American League for Peace and Democracy either were members of the solar system, transmission belts, or fronts, or whatever you want to denominate them? They were really agents or adjuncts of the Communist Party, and were helping to carry on the Communist Party line in the United States.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is certainly not my purpose here to be entertaining or to indulge in hair-splitting. All I can say in reply to your question is that I am not prepared from my own personal knowledge to pass judgment on that question. I am aware of the fact that a considerable number of people share the judgment which you have so ably expressed. I am not prepared from my own personal knowledge to say that I know that these organizations were secretly controlled by the Communist Party. I suspect that some of them were.

Mr. STARNES. You are not prepared, Doctor, to dispute the sworn testimony of Mr. Browder, Mr. Gitlow, Mr. Lash, and many other people in this country who were associated with those movements, and who have stated that they were a part of the system?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Those are the gentlemen who should know, assuming that they were testifying honestly with regard to the question under consideration.

Mr. STARNES. They were testifying like yourself, under oath before the committee, at the time they made the statements.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Then I would say a prima facie case had been made out for accepting their testimony.

Mr. STARNES. And, of course, I presume you are aware of the fact that the Attorney General has ruled or held these various groups as being Communist front organizations or subversive organizations.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes, yes.

Mr. STARNES. Are you prepared to accept Mr. Biddle's rulings on that fact as prima facie or final?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Prima facie at least; perhaps as final.

Mr. STARNES. Especially when you are probably aware of what his philosophy and personal feelings are with reference to liberalism, if you want to use that term, and I don't care to put either a capital or a

small letter in front of it. I think it is the most sadly abused word in the English language in the political field.

(Discussion at this point was off the record.)

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Schuman, the committee is prepared to accept your statement that Mr. Matthews is familiar with these movements that we have under investigation, because at one time he was either associated with some of them himself or had a very intimate knowledge of their work. The committee considers him to be an authority in that field, and as such he has been of inestimable value to us as a committee representing the Congress, and to the people of the United States, in bringing to light the activities of many people who denominate or term themselves as liberal. We feel that a fair reading of their records and their actions and their lives and their influences would show them to be followers of a state socialism of the Communist brand.

We are perfectly willing to admit that Dr. Matthews is an expert in that field, and he has been associated with many of the people that we have under investigation who have testified before us, and they know he does have knowledge of the facts, and many of those who have sat across the table just as you are doing this morning have worked with him during those movements. Whether you have or not I don't know. That will develop in the course of the proceedings.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, have you read the Attorney General's decision in the case of Harry Bridges?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I read it when it appeared in the press at the time. I have not read it recently.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the decision ordering the deportation of Harry Bridges, on page 11 of the printed decision, issued by the United States Department of Justice, under date of May 28, 1942, the Attorney General had the following to say:

Testimony on front organizations showed that they were represented to the public for some legitimate reform objective, but actually used by the Communist Party to carry on its activities pending the time when the Communists believe they can seize power through revolution.

As a student and an expert in the field of political science, would you agree that that is a fair characterization of the front organizations of the Communist Party?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I think I would, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In connection with that description of Communist front organizations by the Attorney General, he went on to designate as such front organizations the Workers' Alliance, the International Labor Defense, the All-American Anti-Imperialist League, the American Negro Labor Congress, and the American League Against War and Fascism. That doesn't call for any particular comment from you, Dr. Schuman, unless you wish to disagree with the Attorney General's statement with reference to some one of those organizations.

Dr. SCHUMAN. The only one of the organizations listed with which I have ever had any connection was the last one named, the American League Against War and Fascism, and while I should be reluctant to differ with the Attorney General's judgment there, my own impression was—it may have been erroneous—that in the early years of that organization it was not accurately described as a Communist front organization, but I feel equally certain in saying that later on it certainly assumed those characteristics, particularly after

it changed its name in the summer of 1939 to the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If I may make a correction, Dr. Schuman, the name was changed in November 1937, rather than in the summer of 1939.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I had forgotten the date.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware of the fact that from the inception of the American League Against War and Fascism, and for a number of years thereafter, Earl Browder was publicly listed as the vice president or vice chairman of the organization?

Dr. SCHUMAN. From its inception?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Dr. SCHUMAN. No, I was not aware of that fact.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The league was established on the first day of October 1933, and at that time Earl Browder became vice chairman of the organization.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I was out of the country at that time, and not familiar with the circumstances of its inception.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the dates when you were affiliated in any way whatsoever with the American League Against War and Fascism?

Dr. SCHUMAN. When I returned from Germany, in December of 1933, I returned with the conviction, which I expressed in my writings and in numerous lectures, that the greatest impending danger to democracy, to liberal capitalism, to peace and to the security of the United States, was represented by German National Socialism, and I took the view at that time that every effort ought to be made by all those aware of this danger to point out the danger and to bring about a maximum degree of cooperation against the danger by all sorts of groups, all sorts of organizations, that might be disposed to take common action against the danger.

My interest in the American League Against War and Fascism was motivated exclusively by those considerations. It was motivated further by the fact that at that time, as I understood the program of the American League Against War and Fascism, it was a program of international collective security against Fascist aggression. I happen to agree with that program. I happen to take the position that the cooperation of all individuals and groups, of all affiliations, regardless of their motives, was justified and necessary in order to call attention to this danger and in order to stimulate action in time to prevent World War II. I was not, to the best of my recollection, ever a member of the American League Against War and Fascism, but I did on several occasions in 1934 and '35 address public meetings most of them I believe on the campus of the University of Chicago, under the auspices of the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is your answer to my question that the dates were 1934 and '35 that you had affiliation with the organization?

And, I believe you stated that your interest in and affiliation with the organization was attributable to the fact that the organization advocated the doctrine of collective security, and you agreed with that.

Dr. SCHUMAN. That is correct. I am not sure I agree with the term "affiliation" as an accurate description of speaking for or speaking under the auspices of an organization, but let that pass.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May we let the record show that when the examiner is using the word "affiliation" he means it to cover speaking for an organization, so that there will be no misapprehension on what is intended.

Mr. STARNES. Or publicly associated with. In other words, he was publicly associated with the organization. There is no disagreement with that term, Doctor? You were publicly associated with it if you spoke under its sponsorship. I assume you would not deny that fact, that you were publicly associated with it?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, as a student of political science I think you must be aware of the fact that the Russians did not begin to put forward the doctrine of collective security as early as 1934, and that the American League Against War and Fascism did not have anywhere in its program any intimation of the doctrine of collective security that early.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Will you permit me to correct you, Dr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Surely.

Dr. SCHUMAN. The Soviet Union became a member of the League of Nations on the 16th of September 1934. It then assumed all the obligations of membership under the League covenant, including the obligations of collective security. Moreover, former French Premier Eduard Herriot visited the Soviet Union as early as 1933 and negotiations were going on constantly between Paris and Moscow all during the late months of 1933 and throughout 1934, looking toward the membership of the Soviet Union in the League of Nations.

The purpose of these negotiations was to make the Soviet Union a participant in the League system of collective security. Now I don't know—you do—at what time, at what point, the American League Against War and Fascism began talking explicitly about collective security through the League of Nations, but in terms of Soviet foreign policy there was a commitment to participation in collective security even before the assumption of Soviet membership in the League of Nations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to enter into a dispute with Dr. Schuman on this particular point. I do wish the record to show for my part that it was not until after the Seventh World Congress in August of 1935 that the doctrine of collective security was advocated in the United States under that phrase by the Communist Party, or by the Communist movement internationally, including the Soviet Union, and it was after the Seventh World Congress in 1935 that the new type of front organization which did begin to espouse collective security was set up, not only in the United States but in many other countries. I am not disputing the date on which the Soviet Union joined the League of Nations.

Dr. SCHUMAN. May I just add to that, Dr. Matthews, that in all of my speaking and writing activities during 1934 and 1935, including those that had any affiliation with or association with such organizations as the American League Against War and Fascism, I was interested in arguing for one thing and one alone, namely a maximum of cooperation between the United States, Britain, France, China, and the Soviet Union, against what seemed to me the constantly growing danger of Fascist aggression from Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you at any time during 1934 or 1935 read the official and published program of the American League Against War and Fascism?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Probably. I should hate to try to quote it from memory.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was a 10-point program. The first point in the 10-point program set forth the program that those who were interested in the preservation of peace should organize to conduct the sabotage of all war preparations in time of peace and all war activities in time of war through strikes, mass demonstrations, and the like. That is the statement of the first point of the American league's program, which was in existence and advocated by the American league in both 1934 and 1935. Do you recall having seen that?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I recall having seen that. I don't recall the date of it. I was always completely opposed to that position. I was always completely opposed to pacifism in all its forms, to the war resisters movement, to the Oxford oath, and in my various public addresses before groups of this kind I argued against those positions and against the one you quoted.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you mean that at meetings of the American League Against War and Fascism you did take issue with the organization's program?

Dr. SCHUMAN. If that point you quote was raised at any of these meetings, I don't recall that it was, but if it was raised at any of the meetings under the auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism, of course I should have taken issue with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you don't recall that you did so take issue?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I don't recall that the question was raised in the various discussions in which I participated. At least I am talking now of the meetings under the auspices of the American league.

The question was raised at various student groups at the University of Chicago, at the National Student League meetings, at various informal discussion groups of one kind or another, and I always adopted a consistent position of opposition to that program.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it a correct statement of the fact, then, that in your speeches under the auspices of the league, unless the question was raised you did not of your own volition take any issue with that statement?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I took issue with it by implication insofar as I was arguing at all of those meetings for an international program of collective security against Fascist aggression, and any such program would obviously be incompatible with advocacy of resistance to war preparations and resistance to war activities.

Mr. MUNDT. But you made no specific criticism of that plank in the program?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Not that I recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the approximate number of occasions upon which you spoke under the auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I think, Dr. Matthews, there could not have been more than two or three such occasions, but I don't recall the precise number.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were all of those meetings held in Chicago or in the vicinity of the city?

Dr. SCHUMAN. To the best of my recollection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, I wish to show you a photostatic copy of an article which appeared in the Daily Worker of September 14, 1932, on the first page. The article is entitled "Writers in Support of Communists." Have you, in your work of teaching political science, read the Daily Worker with any degree of regularity?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Not with anything like regularity; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you see that particular issue of the Daily Worker?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Back in 1932?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know that the Daily Worker published such an article?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has it ever been brought to your attention prior to this time that the Daily Worker published such an article?

Dr. SCHUMAN. It has not. May I read it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; certainly.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Dr. Matthews and gentlemen, this looks to me like a summary of the pamphlet entitled "Culture and the Crisis," which was referred to on the floor of the House on February 1. The list of names appended to this looks to me like the list of names appended to that pamphlet. I have said before, and I say now, that my name was misused on that pamphlet, that I did not at that time nor at any time ever endorse any Communist candidates for any office—national, State, or local—and insofar as my name has ever appeared in any document purporting to endorse such candidates my name was used without my permission.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, I may state for your information that this article appeared in the Daily Worker before the preparation or publication of the pamphlet entitled "Culture and the Crisis," to which you refer. Therefore this article could not have been a summary of the pamphlet to which you refer. Furthermore, while there are many names in this article which parallel the list of names appended to the pamphlet Culture and the Crisis, there are also some differences in the lists. There are some five or six names which appear on the one which do not appear on the other. Obviously this is a different and earlier document; the intrinsic evidence of the pamphlet proves that, because the pamphlet refers back to the publication of this article.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I see. Then I was in error in thinking it was a summary of that pamphlet.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer this article as an exhibit.

Mr. STARNES. It will be incorporated in the record as an exhibit, exhibit No. 1.

(The photostatic copy of an article appearing in the Daily Worker, under date of September 14, 1932, p. 1, was marked "Exhibit No. 1.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. The article reads in part as follows:

A group of educators, writers, architects, and artists issued a call today for the formation of committees throughout the country in support in the national elections of the Communist Party and its candidates, William Z. Foster and James W. Ford. The call signed by the group including Lincoln Steffens; Winifred L.

Chappell, executive secretary, Methodist Federation for Social Service; Prof. Newton Arvin, Smith College; Sidney Howard, author of *They Knew What They Wanted*, Pulitzer prize winner; Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, University of Chicago; Bruce Crawford, editor, *Crawford's Weekly*, Norton, Va.; Sherwood Anderson, John Dos Passos, Theodore Dreiser, novelists; Adolf Dehn, Alfred Fruhe, artists; and Maxwell Hyde, architect, stated "that the only effective way to protest against the chaos, the appalling wastefulness, and the indescribable misery inherent in the present economic system is to vote for the Communist candidates."

Is it your testimony, Dr. Schuman, that you did not sign or otherwise give authorization for the use of your name in connection with the statement which I have read?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not sign or give authorization for the use of my name in connection with that statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Lincoln Steffens?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Winifred Chappell?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, Winifred L. Chappell was an officer of Commonwealth College subsequent to the time the position of director of the college was held by Lucien Koch.

Did you know Theodore Dreiser?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not. You are speaking now of personal knowledge?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Dr. SCHUMAN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know John Dos Passos?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you, in your capacity as a student of political science, know of the political affiliations of Winifred L. Chappell, Lincoln Steffens, Theodore Dreiser, and John Dos Passos?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Only in a general way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say that they, or some of them, could be fairly classed as Communists, and if so, which ones?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I would not be prepared, Dr. Matthews, from my own personal knowledge, to say whether those people could or could not be classified as Communists. In the event that their names were properly used with their authorization, appended to such a statement endorsing Communist candidates, then I should, of course, be disposed to classify them as Communist sympathizers, not as party members, but I don't know whether their names were properly used or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you any explanation whatsoever as to why your name would be used in an article of this kind when it certainly must have been a very serious matter publicly to identify a man with the Communist Party in any way?

Dr. SCHUMAN. The only explanation I could have for that lies in a book which was referred to early in our testimony. The conclusions of that book favored American diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union 5 years before such recognition was actually extended, and since at that time the American Communist Party and various Communist sympathizers were in favor of American diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union, I presume that some of those people wished to identify me with what they stood for in other respects.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were there not thousands of American citizens who were leaders in various fields who had advocated the recognition of the Soviet Union at this time in 1932?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No doubt.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It appears that their names were not used in this connection endorsing the Communist candidacies of Foster and Ford simply because they advocated recognition of the Soviet Union.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have no knowledge of that. That would require us to know whether the names there listed were properly used, whether authorization was given. It is perfectly conceivable to me that some of those names on that list were misused as my name was misused.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, you never made any repudiation of that until this matter was brought to the attention of the public in the last 12 months?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Are you referring to the article in the Daily Worker?

Mr. STARNES. Yes; the Daily Worker and also Culture and the Crisis.

Dr. SCHUMAN. With regard to the article in the Daily Worker, I did not see that article until this morning. I could not repudiate an article which I had never seen.

The pamphlet Culture and the Crisis first came to my attention in the early months of 1934, when I was lecturing in the North Shore suburbs of Chicago, lecturing chiefly about Germany and the Nazi menace to world peace and American security, and copies of that pamphlet were then being distributed to various women's clubs and other organizations in that area by Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, who is at present under indictment for conspiracy to commit sedition.

Wherever I discovered any organization or group that had been approached by Mrs. Dilling and had been given copies of this pamphlet, I repudiated the pamphlet, and I think I ought to add for the record that I contemplated a libel suit at that time against Mrs. Dilling, who, so far as I could discover, was the only individual distributing the pamphlet, but the authorities of the University of Chicago were opposed to libel action, and out of deference to their wishes I refrained from litigation.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall who published the Culture and the Crisis?

Dr. SCHUMAN. The pamphlet purports to be published by a group calling itself the League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford.

Mr. STARNES. Does it show who published it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Workers' Library Publishers, New York.

Mr. STARNES. Did you ever call that publishing house into account and threaten to sue them?

Dr. SCHUMAN. When I discovered the existence of the pamphlet the people who had prepared the pamphlet, and, so far as I know, the Workers Library, was no longer in existence. I am uncertain as to the latter point, as to whether such a publishing house was still functioning at the time I learned of the pamphlet, but the group that had issued the pamphlet had dissolved, and I was informed that its records were scattered. There seemed no way of holding anyone to accountability except the people who were distributing the pamphlet.

Mr. STARNES. And that was the reason you threatened suit against Elizabeth Dilling, because she was distributing the pamphlet?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. You did not take action against the Daily Worker nor this publishing house, nor threaten them with a suit, nor discuss the

question of bringing suit against those publishing companies with the authorities of the University of Chicago?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I would have done that with regard to the Daily Worker had I known of the article which I have seen this morning. With regard to the pamphlet, I could not discover against whom suit was to be brought.

Mr. STARNES. What about the group there?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford.

Mr. STARNES. Did you attempt to bring any action against them or make any inquiry as to whether or not they were in existence?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did, Mr. Chairman, make inquiry. The group was not only an unincorporated group but a fly-by-night irresponsible group which had broken up and disappeared, and there seemed to be no way of bringing suit against the members of that group unless I should bring suit against them as individuals for using my name without my authorization, and that seemed not to be a very feasible procedure.

Mr. STARNES. Did you issue a public statement and give it to the press denying that those were your views, and denouncing these people for misrepresenting your attitude to the people of the country?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did issue such public statements, and they were available to the press.

Mr. STARNES. When were those statements issued, Doctor?

Dr. SCHUMAN. In the spring of 1934, in connection with various lectures in the North Shore suburbs of Chicago. I am not aware that any of those statements was published. I did not call up newspapers and say, "Please publish an article saying I am not a Communist," and I did not sign this pamphlet. When, however, the Illinois State Senate committee investigating subversive activities in Illinois colleges and universities held hearings in the spring of 1935 I there on the stand repudiated this pamphlet, and said to those gentlemen what I have just said to you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, on what do you rest your belief that the Workers Library Publishers is no longer in existence?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I rest my belief on the correspondence which I had at the time in my effort to ascertain who had issued the publication and against whom action should be taken, and the correspondence led me nowhere.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did your correspondents tell you that the Workers Library Publishers was no longer in existence?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I believe so; I am not certain.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, that is easily verified. The Workers Library Publishers is in existence today, and from 1932 down to the present time has issued hundreds of thousands of pamphlets for the Communist Party. It is one of the official publishing agencies of the Communist Party, according to the testimony of Alexander Trachtenberg and William E. Browder and Earl Browder before this committee. The committee itself has in its files numerous pamphlets issued by the Workers Library Publishers with a 1943 date, 1942, and every year going back to 1932, the time of the publication of this pamphlet. There is absolutely no question about the existence of the concern, and I cannot quite understand how any correspondent would lead Dr. Schuman to believe that the organization was not in existence

when it has been extremely active and has published the bulk of the Communist literature in this country for the last 11 years.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Dr. Matthews and gentlemen, my correspondence of that period was with certain other alleged signers of the pamphlet. I asked some of these people what they knew about who had prepared the pamphlet, under what circumstances it was prepared, whether the signers of it had seen the text of the pamphlet before it was prepared, and the answers which I got were to the effect that the pamphlet had been prepared in great haste, that the records of the group which had prepared the pamphlet had been destroyed; none of these people seemed to care to commit themselves as to whom had actually written pamphlet. It was said that owing to the haste with which it was prepared many of the signers had not seen the pamphlet, and now, as I recall, no reference was made to this Workers Library. In view of what you say, Dr. Matthews, I am prepared to concede that I should at that time have ascertained definitely the status of the Workers Library and should have brought suit against them. I did not do that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The inside cover page of the pamphlet itself states "Published by Workers Library Publishers, P. O. box 148, Station D, New York City, October 1932." Why did you have to look around to find who published it, when the pamphlet itself stated that Workers Library Publishers had published it?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I cannot answer that except on the basis of what must at best be a faulty recollection. The copies of the pamphlet which I saw at that time were the copies distributed by Mrs. Dilling, and I do not at the moment remember that that designation was included on those copies. It may have been and it may have escaped my attention. I may have been at fault in not investigating the publishers of the pamphlet, but I will rest the case there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that the Workers Library Publishers for a number of years advertised your own book on American Policy Toward Russia, and was one of the principal distributors of your own book?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you some excerpts from a catalog of the Workers Library in which your book is listed.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was the same agency which published the pamphlet entitled "Culture and the Crisis."

I believe it is your testimony, Dr. Schuman, that you did not at any time see or hear about the pamphlet entitled "Culture and the Crisis" until sometime in 1934.

Dr. SCHUMAN. My recollection is that the pamphlet first came to my attention under the circumstances I have already stated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which was in 1934?

Dr. SCHUMAN. 1934.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you deny having seen or heard of the pamphlet prior to 1934?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have no recollection of having seen the pamphlet prior to 1934. May I recall that at the time the pamphlet was allegedly published, that is, during the presidential campaign of 1932, I was teaching at the University of Chicago and devoting most of my spare time in collaboration with Beardsley Rumml in a research job for the

Rotary Club of Chicago, which ultimately eventuated in the publication of a volume on the Rotary Club of Chicago. As soon as that job was finished I left for Germany and spent almost the entire year of 1933 in Germany, and it was not until my return from Germany that I encountered that pamphlet.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, is that the same Beardsley Ruml who now advocates a skip-a-year tax plan for the American people?

Dr. SCHUMAN. It is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARNES. Is he the same Beardsley Ruml that appeared here in the early part of the year and testified before the Independent Offices Appropriations subcommittee asking us to continue the National Resources Planning Board, and endorsing the work of the Board?

Dr. SCHUMAN. It is.

Mr. STARNES. Frankly, as a layman and as a member of the subcommittee investigating the matter, Dr. Schuman, I am nonplussed as to why the Daily Worker would publish that story with reference to you and other very learned men in the various professions listed—writers, professional men, and so forth—and as to why a publication like Culture and the Crisis should come out and be purported to be signed by you gentlemen without some authorization or without some association with the movement. I just cannot understand it.

Now, what would be your explanation for that? I really would like to know what reason you could assign, or why that should have been done without any knowledge or consent on your part in such a momentous affair as a national election, and with the times that we had existing during that period—I mean the conditions existing at that time, that such publication should go out and it would be years before it would be brought to your attention.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Mr. Chairman, my explanation, I fear would only be a reiteration of what I have already said. The publication of my doctoral dissertation, as has already been pointed out, was already received with certain satisfaction in these circles, the Workers Library, and so on, not because the dissertation was in any sense a Communist tract or an advocacy of communism in any form, but because it did reach conclusions advocating American diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union.

With regard to the rest of the question, it seems to me that this very committee has on a number of occasions revealed instances of misuse of names and dishonest practices—

Mr. STARNES. Unquestionably it has.

Dr. SCHUMAN. On the part of the American Communist Party and its organization, and I fail to see that we would be justified in assuming that these groups are to be regarded as always having used people's names honestly and with their authorization.

Mr. STARNES. That is all true. The committee has uncovered numerous instances of the improper use of names. On the other hand, here is a Presidential campaign, the most momentous political event in the life of a nation every quadrennium—I think we will all agree to that—when we elect a chief executive for the ensuing quadrennium; and with it goes, of course, a new House of Representatives and a third of the Senate of the United States. There is no greater political significance in our life as a Nation than those quadrennial elections.

Here goes a statement to the voters, the voting public of America. Here goes an appeal to the people of America, the voters of America,

to select a certain group of candidates who follow a certain political philosophy and a philosophy of economics that they think will bring them out of the Slough of Despond. And it is years afterwards that you discover your name has been mentioned, and there is no explanation that you can offer as to why your name should be publicly used and published to the people of the country through the Daily Worker, and later through this publication, other than it might have been because of your doctor's thesis or dissertation.

Dr. SCHUMAN. You would not assume, I take it, Mr. Chairman, would you, that the Communist Party and its sympathizers are necessarily more honest and scrupulous in the use of people's names during presidential election campaigns than at other times?

Mr. STARNES. I am just thinking. I know that sometime during that period—I don't know just what time it was, but certainly just after the Presidential elections—Senator Borah came out openly advocating the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, and of course, as you know, that was done, but no one ever used Senator Borah's name in connection with the election in such a manner.

The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission was mistaken—we will certainly assume honestly so—when he told me, in response to some questions that I asked about this matter when he appeared before us this year, that you were in Germany at that time. The fact of the business is you did not go to Germany until 1933, did you, Doctor?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. You were in this country during the campaign of 1932?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. EBERHARTER. While we are on the subject, Dr. Schuman, do you know anything about the recent elections in Pennsylvania, over the past 2 or 3 years, when many Communist Party members circulated petitions and later they were indicted and convicted of obtaining the signatures on these election petitions through fraud?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I believe I have seen some news reports of such episodes. I don't know of them from personal experience.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, for your information, and for that of my colleague from Pennsylvania who is now a member of the committee, this committee obtained those petitions, this committee exposed those frauds, and then the State authorities in Pennsylvania and other States proceeded to take legal action against them. It did not come to the public's attention except through the work of this committee, and their fraudulent misuse of names was exposed by this committee and prosecutions resulted in State courts for violation of those laws.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You know about that, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; I had heard about that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, I would like to call your attention to your testimony on two previous occasions.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, before you go on, you are making that pamphlet an exhibit?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not yet through with the pamphlet.

You testified in this hearing this morning that you had not heard of the pamphlet entitled "Culture and the Crisis" until in 1934?

Dr. SCHUMAN. To the best of my recollection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your testimony before the Illinois State Senate committee in 1935 you testified, according to the record, "My signature was obtained to Culture and the Crisis, a 30-page pamphlet, under misleading circumstances." And then, on February 3, 1943, before the Civil Service Commission, you were asked this question: "What was your recollection as of that date as to whether or not you actually signed a pamphlet for Culture and the Crisis?" and your answer was, "Frankly, I don't know."

Will you please explain to the committee how these three statements can be put together and make sense?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Dr. Matthews, you are asking me to recall certain matters of detail, important, I grant you, some of them as of 8 years ago, others of them as of 11 years ago. All I can say is that there is nothing in my records, in my correspondence, nor is there anything in my present recollection, which indicates that I gave my permission to sign any pamphlet endorsing the candidacy of Foster and Ford or any other Communist candidates. It is possible, and this is what I had in mind in my testimony before the Illinois State Senate committee—it is perfectly possible, although I have no record of this in my correspondence—that some group or other in New York may have written to me saying, "Would you be interested in collaborating in a pamphlet called Culture and the Crisis?" to which I may have replied that that would depend on the nature of the pamphlet, the purpose of it, and so on.

If there was fraud here, that is to say, if my name has appeared on any letter or communication of any other kind as of 1932, mentioning a pamphlet to be called Culture and the Crisis, the fraud consisted in the failure of said persons to indicate in any way that this was to be an endorsement of Foster and Ford.

That, however, is a hypothesis. I have no documentation for that hypothesis. I have no recollection of having correspondence with anyone about such a pamphlet, or about having given consent for the use of my name in connection with such a pamphlet.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Before the Civil Service Commission on February 3, 1943, which is only about 7 weeks ago, you testified that you frankly did not know whether you had given your name or had not given your name to this pamphlet or for use on that pamphlet. Is that correct?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Will you permit me to consult that record, Dr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your own words are, "Frankly, I don't know," in answer to the question which I read.

Dr. SCHUMAN. My answer, there—may I read it?—is, "Frankly, I don't know." The question is:

What was your recollection as of that date as to whether or not you actually signed a pamphlet for Culture and the Crisis?

My own correspondence showed no letter to me or by me in which I had given my permission for the use of my name on the pamphlet entitled "Culture and the Crisis." My impression now is that I had never given my name for any pamphlet at all at that time. But in the absence of any evidence in my correspondence with regard to who—

there is a gross material error there—

whom I had given my name for use in a pamphlet to be entitled "Culture and the Crisis" I am not able to answer the question definitely.

Would you mind my reading into the record the rest of this?

There are two possibilities; first, that I gave my name for a pamphlet to be issued by a group of writers of nonpartisan character to consist of a statement about the economic crisis from the point of view of a group of intellectuals, and that persons unknown then distorted the pamphlet into an endorsement of Foster and Ford. The other possibility is that no permission was given by me for the use of my name in any such connection, and the persons who prepared the pamphlet misused my name and possibly others without consulting the persons involved at all. I am inclined to believe that the second hypothesis is more likely than the first, but I have no documentary evidence either one way or the other. If anybody else has any documentary evidence I shall be the first one to welcome that evidence and clear up the matter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, boiling that down, your statement is that there are two possibilities; first that "I did give my name" and second that "I didn't."

Dr. SCHUMAN. Just a moment, Dr. Matthews. The possibility that I gave my name was the possibility not that I gave my name on an endorsement of Foster and Ford, but the possibility that I may have given my name for use on a pamphlet to be entitled "Culture and the Crisis" with no indication that it was any endorsement of Foster and Ford.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What about any indication as to its political content, apart from its endorsement of political candidates?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I gave my name to no such pamphlet. The maximum possibility I see under that hypothesis, and I repeat there is no evidence in my records to substantiate it, is that I may have been approached by some group, as I was constantly approached by all kinds of groups or for all kinds of groups, with a view to collaborating in such pamphlet.

Mr. STARNES. That raises an interesting question, and it is one that has been floating through my mind as you have testified. Were you approached by any persons or groups, professional, literary, or otherwise, during the year of 1932, and asked to take an active part in the campaign?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Not to my knowledge; not according to my records or according to my recollection.

Mr. STARNES. You were not solicited to take an active or leading part in the preparation of any discussions or any publications bearing on the Presidential campaign of 1932?

Dr. SCHUMAN. In support of Communist candidates, you mean?

Mr. STARNES. I said "generally." You were not approached generally? That was the question the way I addressed it to you.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I think not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, at that time you were chiefly interested in your profession and you had not become embroiled or engaged in political discussions or political action in a practical way?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. And then, again, there comes back that ever-occurring question to which you have said you can give no other answer than you have, as to why they would take a man with your reputation, which was, from your professional standpoint, striking, and use your name without your permission. I can't realize or can't appreciate how any responsible political party would do it.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference I should like to say that my professional reputation at that time was not very much

to write home about. I had published only one book—I'm sorry; I will take that back. I had published two books by 1932. The second book was a study of French foreign policy, entitled "War and Diplomacy in the French Republic." I had published two books. The second one got no particular attention or market, and I certainly would not say myself that as of that time I was in any way outstanding in my profession. I was a young man, I was an instructor in the university. I was not known nationally or even locally, particularly, but my first book had aroused interest and approbation in radical circles.

That is the only explanation I have to offer.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall having been associated with any of the people whose names are listed in this pamphlet and in that edition of the Daily Worker during that period?

Dr. SCHUMAN. At this time?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I think, Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is no, but if I may look over the list I will endeavor to reply specifically.

Mr. STARNES. You looked over it a moment ago. Look over it again.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I did not at that time know personally any of the other members on this list, and the only one of these people with whom I had had at that time, to the best of my personal recollection, any correspondence, was Mr. Malcolm Cowley, and my correspondence with him at that time related to book reviews which I wrote occasionally for the New Republic.

The other people here I did not then know.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, under whose auspices did you go to Germany in 1933?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I went to Germany as holder of the James Rowe Fellowship of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, at Philadelphia. My mission, on the basis of which the fellowship was awarded to me, was to make a study of the conduct of foreign affairs in the German Republic. That study was subsequently published by the American Academy of Political Science.

Although I spent most of my time in Germany that year, making a study of the Nazi movement, the Nazi revolution, the Nazi Party organization, and published a volume based on my findings there, entitled *The Nazi Dictatorship*—

Mr. STARNES. Did you visit any other countries during that period?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes. I visited briefly Switzerland, Austria, Italy, France, and the Soviet Union in the summer of 1933.

Mr. STARNES. Did you make any subsequent trips to Europe to make studies of this type and character?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I made no subsequent trips for the purpose of studies of quite that type. I revisited the continent in the summer of 1937 for the purpose of making a survey tour of the Balkan area, but I did not publish anything as a result of that.

Mr. STARNES. What countries did you visit in that year?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I visited in the summer of 1937 France, Switzerland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria, Greece, and up back through the Adriatic through Italy, France, and home.

Mr. STARNES. You didn't visit the Soviet Union on that trip?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Not in 1937; no.

Mr. STARNES. When did you next go to the Soviet Union?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have not been in the Soviet Union since 1933.

Mr. STARNES. Under whose auspices did you go in 1937?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That was a purely private trip; under no one's auspices.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wish to offer the pamphlet, Culture and the Crisis, as an exhibit.

(The document entitled "Culture and the Crisis" was marked "Exhibit No. 2").

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the month in which you sailed for Europe in 1933?

Dr. SCHUMAN. March.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you, in February of 1933, endorse the candidacy of Vladimir Janowicz for the position of alderman from the fifth aldermanic district of the city of Chicago?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited your endorsement of the candidacy of Vladimir Janowicz?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Mr. Janowicz.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you personally acquainted with him?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long had you known him?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Perhaps for a year at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was he doing when you were acquainted with him?

Dr. SCHUMAN. As I remember, during part of that period he was a graduate student at the University of Chicago. I may be in error there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you aware of the fact that Vladimir Janowicz was a Communist?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I was not. Chicago aldermanic elections at that time, and now, are nonpartisan, and there is no indication of party affiliation on the ballot or on petitions to get on the ballot. I had no reason to believe from any acquaintance with Mr. Janowicz at that time that he was a Communist or even a Communist sympathizer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you subsequently learned that he was a Communist?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have seen the allegation made that he was a Communist. I have no direct knowledge.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Despite the fact that the elections are technically nonpartisan, is it not true that the various political parties campaign for the candidates in particular, and thereby give a political color to individual candidates?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Unless I am mistaken, Dr. Matthews, the relevant statutes and municipal ordinances of Chicago forbid any such campaigning.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, I have here a pamphlet entitled "Vote for Workers Candidates Endorsed by the Communist Party. Smash the Bosses' Program of Hunger and War!" issued by the Chicago election platform of the Communist Party, aldermanic elections February 28, 1933.

On the inside page, "Candidates endorsed by the Communist Party: Fifth Ward, VI, Janowicz, 5648 Harper Avenue."

Have you ever seen that pamphlet?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No, Dr. Matthews, I have not; and had I known of this endorsement I should not have signed the nominating petition for Vladimir Janowicz. He did not inform me of this, nor had I reason to believe from other sources that he had the support of the Communist Party. I have never knowingly endorsed any candidate supported by the Communist Party for any office.

Mr. MASON. May I ask here, was your endorsement of this Janowicz your signing of his petition?

Dr. SCHUMAN. To the best of my knowledge, it was.

Mr. MASON. I am asking that because I know what signing petitions in Illinois for candidates means. It practically means nothing so far as an endorsement goes by the ordinary person who signs petitions in Illinois, so that unless you took an active part in some other way of endorsing this man's candidacy, the signing of the petition didn't mean very much.

Dr. SCHUMAN. It would mean only that I had decided that his name should be on the ballot.

Mr. MASON. That is all.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Mason. My present recollection is that that was the limit of my endorsement of him.

Mr. STARNES. Did you vote for him?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am ashamed to say that I don't remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you resident in the fifth aldermanic district?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Oh, just a moment; I recall now. I had left the city before the election. The election was February 28; is that correct? It seems to me that I had left the city for New York before the election and was preparing to go abroad, so I voted for no one.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you answer "Yes" to my question as to whether or not you were a resident in the fifth aldermanic district?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I was a resident of the fifth ward at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For some weeks prior to the election there was distributed through the fifth aldermanic district by the Communist Party this mimeographed sheet, copy of which has been furnished to the committee by the Chicago Police Department. Did you see that mimeographed document during the campaign preceding the election?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No; I did not, Dr. Matthews. I perceive that my name is here along with the name of Prof. Robert Morss Lovett, Prof. A. Eustace Haydon, and Prof. Martin Springling, all of whom were residents of the fifth ward and members of the faculty of the University of Chicago. But I do not recall having seen this statement at the time. It would appear to me that this pamphlet is another illustration of the disposition of Communist groups to use names of non-Communists in order to lend prestige to their cause and in order to promote their purposes. I know very definitely that none of these gentlemen is a Communist or was a Communist sympathizer.

Mr. STARNES. You know that definitely about Dr. Lovett, do you?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I knew Dr. Lovett quite well at that period, and I am sure I could make that statement as the considered judgment of his outlook.

Mr. STARNES. You do not know of his having been publicly associated with or a member of, at least, a score or more of what have been denominated as "front" organizations?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; I do know of that. But, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted—

Mr. STARNES. In that connection, your explanation would be that he was just made a dupe through impositions by scheming, designing people who were setting up these organizations?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No, Mr. Chairman; I would not make that characterization of him. If I may be permitted to make the general statement at this time, I would say that Professor Lovett, like myself, took the position during that period that it was perfectly legitimate and permissible to cooperate with organizations of various kinds, including so-called front organizations, for the promotion of certain purposes which we had in common, and neither he nor I felt that cooperation with such organizations identified us with the Communist cause or with Communist purposes.

I take that position now. I have taken that position consistently. I have felt, since 1933, and, indeed, since 1931, following the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, that the greatest single danger to American security and to democratic capitalism lay in the militarist programs of the regimes in Tokyo, Rome, and Berlin, and that it was not only permissible but urgently necessary to cooperate with any and all groups, regardless of their motives, in calling attention to this danger and in bringing about action, if possible, against this danger.

If you would like me to I can document, I believe, my own motives for collaboration with such groups in terms of my writings, in terms of the position on questions of public policy I took at the time, and particularly in terms of my position following the outbreak of the European War and during the period between the outbreak of that war and the Nazi invasion of Russia. During that period, as you know, the Communist Party and all of the front organizations were isolationist, defeatist, pacifist, whereas I was consistently an advocate of all-out American aid to the Allies and of American intervention in the war against Germany.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You say you have documents to prove that position?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; in the form of excerpts from my writings through the years.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think that should be made a part of the record.

Mr. STARNES. If he wants to put them in there, of course, that is quite all right.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I shall be happy to submit for the record a series of excerpts from my published writings since 1931, going back through the whole period since the Japanese seizure of Manchuria, consisting of excerpts from my second book, War and Diplomacy in the French Republic; excerpts from my book on the Rotary Movement; excerpts from my textbook, International Politics; excerpts from Night Over Europe, published in January of 1931; excerpts from my letter in the New York Times denouncing the Soviet attack upon Finland in November and December of 1939; and excerpts from my most recent book Design for Power, published in January of 1942.

These excerpts were submitted to the Civil Service Commission and I should be glad to have them included in this record.

Mr. STARNES. We will be glad to include them. I note they are brief in character, and I presume are concise statements of your position on the points involved.

Dr. SCHUMAN. They are, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

(The document submitted by the witness, dated February 9, 1943, was marked "Exhibit No. 3.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, you testified that Vladimir Janowicz personally solicited your endorsement for his candidacy, and that you gave him that endorsement, did you not?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That is my present recollection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is your testimony. Then, when I showed you this leaflet, you described it as another illustration of the misuse of the names of individuals. Will you please state in what respect this could be a misuse, if you had actually given your endorsement to the candidacy?

Dr. SCHUMAN. The endorsement which I gave, Dr. Matthews, to the best of my present knowledge, was merely a signature on a nominating petition placing Mr. Janowicz's name on the ballot. The leaflet which you have there, and which I have not seen until this morning, at least conveys the impression that the four professors named there did something more than that. The impression which you would get or I would get from reading that would be that these four people are endorsing a candidate of the Communist Party. I certainly did nothing of that kind, nor did they.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you wish to testify that you did sign the nominating petition of Vladimir Janowicz?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That is my present recollection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you wouldn't want to go on record to that effect, would you?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Well, again, you are asking me to recall events of a decade ago, and that is not easy. I believe that I did sign a nominating petition for Mr. Janowicz.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the nominating petitions are still in existence, and we have some of them here, the originals, from the Chicago Police Department, and according to the petitions Dr. Schuman did not sign the nominating petition. Apparently his first testimony was the more accurate, in saying that Vladimir Janowicz solicited his endorsement and he gave an endorsement. That is the way you testified, Dr. Schuman.

Dr. SCHUMAN. My recollection was that I had signed a nominating petition. If the record of the nominating petitions shows that I did not sign a nominating petition, then I presume the record is to be relied upon that I did not. I repeat, however, that I did not at any time or in any way endorse Mr. Janowicz as a Communist candidate for alderman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The workers' organizations listed on this sheet as endorsing the candidacy of Vladimir Janowicz are International Labor Defense, Student League of the University of Chicago, Workers International Relief, International Workers Order, Trade Union Unity League, Communist Party, and League of Struggle for Negro Rights. They are the only organizations listed, Mr. Chairman, and without exception they have been classified as Communist or Communist front organizations by Federal investigative agencies or official Government investigative agencies.

Mr. STARNES. Do you wish to make those a matter of record in connection with the testimony?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

(Pamphlet entitled "Smash the Bosses' Program of Hunger and War" was marked "Exhibit No. 4.")

(Mimeographed sheet entitled "Janowicz for Alderman" was marked "Exhibit No. 5.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know, Dr. Schuman, that Vladimir Janowicz was the organizational secretary of the Trade Union Unity League in Chicago?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the police records of Chicago, at the time he was a candidate he was organizational secretary of the Trade Union Unity League in Chicago.

Do you know, as a political student, whether or not the Trade Union Unity League was a Communist organization?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have no information regarding that organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Attorney General, in his decision ordering the deportation of Harry Bridges, on pages 10 and 11, has the following to say: "The T. U. U. L., as it was called, openly supported and was dominated by the Communist Party." It was partly because of Harry Bridges' connection with the Trade Union Unity League that the Attorney General ordered his deportation.

Vladimir Janowicz was the secretary in Chicago, and William Foster was the national chairman of the Trade Union Unity League.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Schuman, is it your recollection now that Mr. Janowicz personally solicited your support, as you have repeated twice here?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And that he requested you to sign a document endorsing him for the office, either an election petition or some form of paper he presented to you for signature endorsing his candidacy. Is that your recollection now?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; it is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, in the course of the election campaign of 1932, on October 18 of that year, there was held in the city of Chicago, at Alvin Hall, Fifty-first Street and Michigan, a banquet for James W. Ford, Vice Presidential candidate on the Communist Party ticket. You recall that occasion, don't you?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you sponsor that banquet for James W. Ford, the Vice Presidential candidate on the Communist Party ticket?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That banquet was—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you sponsor the banquet?

Dr. SCHUMAN. May I make a statement?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like for you to answer the question first.

Dr. SCHUMAN. The banquet I sponsored, not Mr. Ford.

I was going to say that that banquet was sponsored by, as I remember it, various groups, including a so-called nonpartisan group consisting of people interested in the role of the Negro in Chicago politics. Mr. Ford was a Negro. He was the candidate of the Communist Party for the Vice Presidency. A group of us in the department of political science at the University were at that time interested in the role of the Negro in Chicago politics, and indeed interested in the possible danger of the spread of Communist propaganda among the Chicago Negro population, and I attended that banquet and

sponsored it as a member of the nonpartisan committee, with a view to seeing Mr. Ford as a Negro politician and forming some judgment regarding him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you speak at the banquet?

Dr. SCHUMAN. There was, as I remember the occasion, a series of short remarks made by various people around the table, in which I participated, on the theme of the significance of the fact that a Negro had been nominated by a party as its Vice Presidential candidate. I did not endorse his candidacy. I certainly did not endorse the Communist Party. As I say, I was interested in Mr. Ford as a phenomenon of local, or even national, Negro politics.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you see a copy of the announcement of the banquet at the time?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I would have to look at it, Dr. Matthews, before I could answer that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is a photostatic copy of the announcement of the banquet, entitled "Reception and Banquet for James W. Ford."

Dr. SCHUMAN. I don't recall seeing this announcement. There was another announcement which did not contain this characterization, but I don't recall having seen this one.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The text of the announcement reads:

To the Friends and Sympathizers of the Communist Election Campaign:

DEAR FRIEND: You are cordially invited to the banquet given by the Communist Party and a group of friends and sympathizers of James W. Ford, Vice Presidential candidate, to take place on Tuesday, October 18, 10 p. m., at Alvin Hall, Fifty-first and Michigan, \$1 a plate.

We feel that you understand the importance of the visit of James W. Ford to our city, after the extensive tour he made throughout the country. He will report on the many problems confronting the workers of America.

You also realize that it is imperative that all our friends and sympathizers should welcome the candidate for Vice President of the Communist Party in order to simulate the work for our election campaign and assure a large vote for the candidates of the Communist Party.

May we expect your presence at this banquet?

Fraternally yours,

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
M. BACKALL, *Manager*,
F. HAMILTON, *Secretary*.

Sponsored by: Louis Harper, managing editor of the Chicago Defender, chairman; Frank Hamilton, secretary; Attorney Albert Goldman, treasurer; Prof. F. L. Schuman, University of Chicago; Rev. Raymond Bragg, secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference; Mrs. M. Bragg; Thomas McKenna; Perry C. Thompson, editor of Chicago Review; Rev. O. F. Peterson; Ernest H. Williamson; Dr. H. M. Richter; Dr. A. J. Hill; E. P. Frierson, president, Phylax Club; Miss T. McWater; Dr. J. W. McCaskol; Dr. H. Cooper; Joe W. Clark; John Williamson; Mrs. Blanche Lowenthal, social worker; Carl Haessler, lecturer and journalist.

Did you know Albert Goldman. Chicago attorney?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I believe I met him at one time. I can't say I know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were acquainted with the fact that Albert Goldman was one of the very prominent Communist leaders of Chicago, were you not?

Dr. SCHUMAN. At that time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Dr. SCHUMAN. No. It seems to me that you have there another instance of what we were speaking of before. Some of the people who sponsored that banquet because of their interest in Negro politics, and

Mr. Ford as a Negro, are identified by the party as sympathizers with the Communist election campaign. That was certainly not true in my case, and I doubt whether it was true in the case of several of the other people whose names were read there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congressman, quite a number of these individuals listed as sponsors have public records of Communist Party leadership. Thomas McKenna, for example, was a witness before this committee as secretary of the Communist Party for the city of Chicago. Albert Goldman was a long-time leader of the Communist Party in Chicago, broke with them, became a Trotskyite, and was attorney for Leon Trotsky at the time of his assassination in Mexico.

Carl Haessler has a long Communist record. He was one of the instructors at Commonwealth College, as was produced in the testimony yesterday.

With only one or two exceptions, the committee's records show that all of the individuals who are listed here as sponsors had multiple affiliations with the Communist Party organizations, and not simply with a Negro candidacy.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Is that true of the two clergymen?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. The two clergymen had numerous connections with various Communist Party front organizations. If you like, we could insert those connections of these individuals at this point.

Mr. STARNES. I think it is pertinent that you do that, in view of the explanation that the doctor gave.

Doctor, you did attend the banquet?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did.

Mr. STARNES. And you were one of the sponsors for that particular meeting?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Correct.

Mr. STARNES. And you did make some remarks at that banquet?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did.

Mr. STARNES. You knew that James Ford was a Communist at that time?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did. I would repeat that I did not endorse his candidacy, nor the party for which he was standing.

Mr. STARNES. You didn't see any prominent Republicans at that meeting as sponsors?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I wouldn't know, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARNES. Nor any prominent Democrats as sponsors?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I know of no way of identifying the party affiliations of people at a banquet. There were several hundred people there, as I remember. Some of them may have been Republicans, some of them Democrats. Some of them may have been Communists. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you notice any literature on sale at the entrance of the hall or inside the banquet hall?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Not that I now recall, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MUNDT. Did the mayor of Chicago attend that banquet, or send an official representative?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Probably not.

Mr. MUNDT. Or the Governor of the State?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Probably not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to ask Dr. Schuman this hypothetical question: If James W. Ford had been a candidate for the Vice Presidency

of the United States on a political program which espoused nazi-ism, would you have considered it appropriate for you to be one of the sponsors of the banquet, on the ground that he was a Negro and therefore a unique phenomenon in politics?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I think I should have been equally interested in him as a Negro candidate on a Fascist program. In my various studies of political behavior I have observed the left wing and the right wing. I have attended Nazi meetings, I have attended meetings at which avowed Communists have spoken. I have debated with Nazis and with Communists. I am not prepared to say that I would have sponsored a banquet, but the ideological affiliations of Mr. Ford as a Negro politician would still have interested me equally, whether he were a Communist or a Fascist.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, have you ever sponsored a meeting for any Nazi personage or candidate or exponent of nazi-ism? Have you sponsored or paid tribute to any man, white or black, because he was a Nazi or a Fascist?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; I have.

Mr. STARNES. You can give us incidents of that, exponents of the German nazi-ism and Italian Fascism. Will you give us an example of that?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I can't give you any for Italian Fascism, but I can for nazi-ism.

(Discussion at this point was off the record.)

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., a recess was taken, to reconvene at 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

The subcommittee reconvened at 2 p. m., upon the expiration of the recess.

Mr. STARNES (presiding). The subcommittee will resume its sessions.

TESTIMONY OF FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN—Resumed

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congressman, when the committee recessed before the lunch hour, you had asked Dr. Schuman to be prepared to give some account of his sponsorship of Nazis, I believe.

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might submit for the record at this time a copy of a leaflet listing my various publications and lecture activities and also containing excerpts of reviews of my books published in recent years. May I have that permission?

Mr. STARNES. What is the relevancy of it, Doctor? What is the relevancy of that particular item?

Dr. SCHUMAN. It is not relevant to the point which is immediately raised, but I think it is relevant to my professional competence and my attitude in recent years.

Mr. STARNES. I do not think anybody would dispute that competence. That is not a question, as far as I know. I do not see any particular good or any particular harm in introducing it. Suppose we hold it in abeyance. If you want to offer it later, the committee will be glad to consider it.

Mr. MASON. I would say it would all depend on how and when these excerpts were prepared and for what purposes as to whether they would have any relevancy in the matter.

Mr. STARNES. In the matter under discussion; yes. At the conclusion of your testimony, Dr. Schuman, the committee will ask you if you have any further statement to make, and then we can take it up.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Thank you.

I assume, Mr. Chairman, that the question of sponsorship of or appearance at Nazi or Fascist meetings is raised in connection with my sponsorship of and appearance at the banquet for Mr. James Ford?

Mr. STARNES. Yes. What I had in mind, Dr. Schuman, in order to clarify the situation, was whether there was a Nazi Party or a Fascist Party in this country—a political party—supporting a candidate for office. This was a political meeting or rally, or something in that nature, as I understand it, for the Communist candidate for Vice President in 1932, and my question related to whether or not there was a Nazi political party or a Fascist political party or other groups in support of a Nazi or Fascist candidate for office in this country. That is what I had in mind.

Dr. SCHUMAN. To the best of my knowledge, there was no such group active in this country at that time; and, if I may be permitted to say so, I think I should share the view that an ordinary citizen attending a meeting under Communist auspices or also attended by Communists is open to the suspicion of Communist tendency, and a citizen attending a Nazi or Fascist meeting is under the same suspicion. But I should like merely to state my own opinion, for whatever it may seem to you to be worth, namely, that when a professor of political science attends such meetings that does not necessarily indicate sympathy with the causes espoused at such meetings or with the people involved.

Now, for example, I participated in a symposium at the Foreign Policy Association branch, I believe, in Utica, N. Y., in 1938, along with Mr. Paul Schiffer, who was an avowed Nazi and who was representing the Nazi point of view. I participated in a debate with Mr. Lawrence Dennis, the author of *The Coming American Fascism*, before the Albany branch of the Foreign Policy Association, as I remember it, in the fall of 1937; and I sponsored and participated in another meeting with Lawrence Dennis in the spring of 1940 before Frederick Auhagen's American Fellowship Forum, which I suspect could be described more or less directly as a Nazi-front organization.

Mr. STARNES. The committee has so found officially, Doctor.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; and I also, as you know, spent much more time in Nazi Germany in my travels abroad than in Soviet Russia.

In all of these instances my motives were a professional interest in political extremist movements, since such movements have overrun so many countries abroad, and what I hope I can describe as an honest concern for how American national security and American democracy could best be protected from totalitarian threats either from the left or from the right.

I took the position, which it rather seems to be the course of world events has substantiated, that during this whole period the most serious threat to world peace, the most serious threat to American democracy, the most serious threat to our traditional values and ways

of life was not the Communist threat, but the Fascist threat; and I believed during this whole period, as I believe today, that in order to meet this threat it is not only necessary that there be a solid front of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, China, and others of the United Nations against the Fascist Internationale, but that the scope of the threat is such that it has been necessary and perhaps it is still necessary to encourage in every possible way the collaboration of groups of all sympathies and all viewpoints, including Communist groups, so long as the objective is resistant to Fascist aggression.

Mr. STARNES. In participating in these programs with Lawrence Dennis and the other parties named of Fascist or Nazi sympathies, on each and every occasion that you participated you expressed a strong and a vigorous dissent with that Fascist or Nazi philosophy, did you not, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SHUMAN. Yes, I did.

Mr. STARNES. Because you are passionately, as any true American citizen should be, opposed to the promulgation of those philosophies here in our own country, and you are also opposed to seeing them reach a place of ascendancy in the political and social aspects of the Nation; therefore, you did vigorously dissent with the views expressed by those gentlemen at the time you met with them?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Correct.

Mr. STARNES. At no time did you sympathize with the views of those men, and you were in no wise sympathetic with their movement?

Dr. SCHUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. I want to make the observation that participating in a debate or in a forum in taking the opposite side is not a parallel to participating in a social event which is arranged and put on to bring to the fore a certain gentleman who might represent the opposite political complexion; but certainly, while on those other occasions the doctor could express himself as in violent opposition to the arguments that were going on, in this event he could not even have an opportunity to express himself as violently opposed to the political party that was sponsoring the occasion as it was a pure social affair.

Mr. STARNES. Go ahead, Dr. Matthews. Thank you very much, Dr. Schuman, for your observation.

Dr. SCHUMAN. May I add just a word, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. STARNES. Oh, yes. I thought you had completed.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Well, I would just like to say that I have, in my writings and in numerous lectures, expressed just as much opposition to Communist ascendancy in the United States as Fascist ascendancy. Had I believed in this whole period that the major threat to our institutions was the threat represented by Communism, I should certainly, as a patriotic and a democratic citizen have concentrated my attacks there. But I thought, as I have already indicated, that the major threat to our way of life came from Fascism; that this threat was so serious that we must, whether we liked it or not, even accept Russian collaboration and Communist support in meeting that threat.

That is all I have to say at this time, I think, by way of explaining why it appears that I have been more violent in my denunciations of Fascism than of Communism; but I would not like the inference to be drawn that I have not ever spoken against Communism or opposed it, because I have.

Mr. STARNES. All right, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wish to offer as an exhibit the announcement of the reception banquet for James W. Ford, on which the name of Prof. F. L. Schuman appears as a sponsor.

Mr. STARNES. The exhibit will be incorporated as an exhibit to the doctor's testimony.

(Announcement of reception banquet for James W. Ford was marked "Exhibit 6.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. There was some question about the program of the American League Against War and Fascism. At the time I did not have the printed copies of the League's programs before me. I should like to read point 1 of the program of the American League as it was adopted in New York in 1933, in October. Point 1 of that program reads:

To work toward the stopping of the manufacture and transport of munitions and all other materials essential to the conduct of war, through mass demonstrations, picketing, and strikes.

That program was in effect as the League's official program up until the second congress of the League, which met in Chicago in September of 1934, at which time point 1 was elaborated and made even more strong than it had been in the original program. In its revised form point 1 read as follows:

To work toward the stopping of the manufacture and transport of munitions and all other materials essential to the conduct of war, through mass demonstrations, picketing, and strikes; to likewise withdraw the intellectuals from the service of the war machine and to enlist them in agitation and educational propaganda against war and every aspect of fascism.

That particular program was in effect up until the time of the third national congress of the American League Against War and Fascism, which was convened in Pittsburgh January 3 to January 5, 1936.

The point which I wish the record to show is that throughout the years 1934 and 1935, during which period you testified you had publicly associated yourself with the American League, the League's program did not, as I believe you distinctly remembered, advocate collective security but, on the contrary, advocated a program of sabotage of American war-defensive measures.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Dr. Matthews, may I see the entire program?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is the entire program as adopted at the New York congress in 1933.

Dr. SCHUMAN. And in force during 1934?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; in force until September 1934, at which time it was revised slightly, and remained in force until January of 1936.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not think the time of the committee needs to be taken with a recital of all of the points of this program, but I should like to point out that, apart from the first point read, which I would never under any circumstances subscribe to and never have subscribed to, there are numerous points here in both of these programs expressing opposition to fascism. War and fascism are linked together, but even in the earlier program point 6 says, "To oppose all developments leading to fascism in this country and abroad, especially in Germany."

My feeling about the American League Against War and Fascism, of which, incidentally, I was never formally a member so far as my

records and my recollection show, was simply that this was a movement which had attracted a good many people who were not Communists, who were left wing liberals, if you like, who were bewildered citizens or what not, and at the movement represented a certain value in the direction of a program of collective security.

I felt confident that that was the direction that this organization would take, as I felt confident that that was the direction that Soviet foreign policy would take; and my confidence in that supposition was vindicated by the program and activities of this organization and by the content of Soviet foreign policy between 1934 and 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have one more citation for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Did you attend the Second United States Congress Against War, held under the auspices of the American League in Chicago in 1934?

Dr. SCHUMAN. This was a meeting on the campus of the university?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was the national Congress. It was held in the Washington Boulevard Auditorium.

Dr. SCHUMAN. That would not be on the campus of the university. I do not recall now that I ever attended any meetings of that organization, apart from certain local meetings on the university campus, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Professor Harry Ward was the national chairman of the organization at that time, and this excerpt from his opening speech at the Congress has already been introduced into the record by Dr. Ward's own testimony. In this connection I should like to cite one sentence on which there was considerable testimony at the time Dr. Ward testified, namely:

You all heard the speech of Earl Browder last night. You heard him make a clear, historical judgment that there was only one choice before mankind now, and that was between Fascism and Communism.

Did you understand that the League held to that position?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No, I did not. On the contrary, I would raise a question as to whether that position as there stated did at that time accurately represent the line of the Communist Internationale in general. That was the transition period when the Communist movement on a world scale was veering in the direction of the People's Front slogan against Fascism in the direction of defense of democracy against Fascism, and I would have some doubts as to whether that was a correct description of the tendencies operating in the movement at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. However, you have no doubt about the fact that Earl Browder and Harry Ward made the statement, have you? These are the official proceedings identified by Dr. Ward.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I presume they made the statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And identified by him as his own language.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes. That, of course, is curious, is it not, Dr. Matthews, in view of the fact that the meeting takes place 10 days and more after the admission of the Soviet Union to the League of Nations? I suppose this simply illustrates the certain lag in adaptation of a party line to changes in the international scene.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, they were taking cognizance of the entrance of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations at this Congress. As you say, it was already an accomplished fact, and the

leaders there were aware of it, and in the program of this Congress they make the following reference to the entrance of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, as follows:

While the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States, the failure of the Nazi Putsch in Austria, and the consequent isolation of Germany, the approaches between France and the Soviet Union, and the entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, have strengthened the forces opposing the immediate outbreak of war, the underlying forces that drive toward conflict are gathering momentum. The shifting relationships between the capitalist powers reveal the basic instability of their position. The insoluble contradictions in their economic life are constantly reflected in their diplomacy.

and so on.

I wanted to point out that they were aware, when they made these speeches, of the fact that the Soviet Union had entered the League of Nations.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes. Incidentally, that statement which you just read and which, with the deletion of the adjective "capitalist," I would subscribe to, did represent a correct estimate of future tendencies in world politics.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, do you recall whether or not you delivered a lecture under the auspices of the Chicago Workers School Forum on or about March 3, 1929?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I recall delivering a lecture about that time at a so-called workers forum. I have seen subsequent references to my having been a lecturer at something called the Chicago Workers School. I am not familiar with that organization. I was not a lecturer at any Chicago Workers School, but I did deliver a lecture on Soviet-American relations to a group calling itself the Workers Forum.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wish to show you a copy of the Daily Worker, or a photostatic copy of the Daily Worker, of February 28, 1929, page 5, which contains an advertisement announcing your appearance to deliver a speech on March 3, 1929, at Workers Forum, 2021 West Division Street. Do you recall that you made that address?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Oh, I am sorry. I was thinking of a different date. This is 1929. Well, I could not remember that far back. I may very well have delivered that address. I had just completed my doctor's dissertation and I was doing a certain amount of lecturing before groups of various kinds on that subject—American policies toward Russia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On the same page of the Daily Worker, under "Workers Calendar," the same lecture by you is announced under the head "Chicago Workers School Forum at 2021 West Division Street."

Dr. SCHUMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have no doubt that you did deliver that lecture on that occasion, have you?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I presume I delivered it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, from a slightly earlier edition of the Daily Worker, I have an advertisement of the Chicago Workers School, 2021 West Division Street, listing the courses taught in the Workers School, the instructors, and giving the name of the person to whom application should be made for taking courses.

You did lecture at the Chicago Workers School under the auspices of the school's forum; is that correct?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I presume so, Dr. Matthews. I did not give any courses or any series of lectures at anything called the Chicago Workers School. I did deliver a lecture at this forum you speak of.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not doubt the existence of the Chicago Workers School, do you?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not know whether it exists or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever try to find out whether it existed?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No—oh, may I amend that? When Mrs. Dilling published her Red Network there was a statement in it that I was a lecturer at the Chicago Workers School, and I wondered what that meant and tried to ascertain at that time—that would have been in 1934 when the book was published—what the Chicago Workers School was, and I could not discover that there was any such institution at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your testimony before the Civil Service Commission on February 3, 1943, you stated:

So far as I could discover, there never was any such organization or institution as the Chicago Workers School. Since I am obviously unable to lecture at a nonexistent school, I did not ever lecture at a Chicago Workers School.

Here you state that you did attempt to discover whether there was ever any such institution as the Chicago Workers School, and your finding, according to your testimony, was that there never was any such institution. Would you wish to modify that testimony?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Well, I do not know now that there ever was any such institution. All I know is that I was listed as a lecturer there, that I was not a lecturer there, that I did give a lecture at a Chicago Workers Forum, which I discovered for the first time the Daily Worker linked with something called the Chicago Workers School.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The announcement of the Daily Worker says that it was the Chicago Workers School Forum, and that it was held in the physical plant of the Chicago Workers School. I think you said you are not prepared to deny that you did lecture at the Chicago Workers School at 2021 West Division Street, under the auspices of the school's forum?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did deliver a lecture under the auspices of a Chicago Workers Forum. I have not any more knowledge than you do of the relationship between that and this thing called the Chicago Workers School.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What efforts did you make to find out whether there ever was such an institution as the Chicago Workers School?

Dr. SCHUMAN. The telephone book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that the only place you looked?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I asked several of my colleagues if they had heard of it, and they had not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What colleagues did you ask, for example? Did you ask Dr. Lasswell?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I could not remember that, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was not Prof. Harry Lasswell one of your colleagues at the University of Chicago?

Dr. SCHUMAN. He was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was associated in the political science department with you?

Dr. SCHUMAN. He was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make any effort to ascertain from him if there was a Chicago Workers School?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not recall that I asked him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you did ask other colleagues?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have any recollection at all as to who they were?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Well, I could tell you who was in the department at that time. I probably asked Professor Merriam and Professor Lasswell.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever seen the book entitled "World Revolutionary Propaganda," by Harold D. Lasswell and Dorothy Blumenstock?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Beginning on page 82, there is a chapter on the Chicago Workers School, by Professor Lasswell, colleague of Dr. Schuman, in which the statistics on the Chicago Workers School are given for the year 1934, on page 83, the year in which Dr. Schuman says that his colleagues could not find that there ever was any such school.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am familiar with that. What is the point, Dr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The point is that your department at the University of Chicago, including its head, Dr. Lasswell—

Dr. SCHUMAN. No. Charles E. Merriam was its head.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, one of its principal teachers?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Assistant professor, was his title.

Mr. MATTHEWS (continuing). Was engaged in a study of the Chicago Workers School, which he published in a book.

Dr. SCHUMAN. On the contrary, that study was made in 1936 and 1937, and it was published later that there was such a school. Whether he knew in 1933 or 1929 that there was such a school, I have no means of knowing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you think it would have been easier to find the existence of the school as of 1934 in 1936 than to find it out in 1934?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have no idea.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are satisfied that there was a Chicago Workers School in 1934?

Dr. SCHUMAN. If Dr. Lasswell says that there was a school in 1934, I am satisfied that there was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied that there was a Chicago Workers School in 1929?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Does he say there was?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Then I am satisfied there was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied it was under the control of the Communist Party?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Does he say it was?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He calls it the party's school.

Dr. SCHUMAN. If he says it was, I am prepared to take his word for it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The section is headed, "The Party School," and one characterization says, "Chicago Communist Workers School."

Dr. SCHUMAN. Right. Professor Lasswell made an intensive study of Communist propaganda in Chicago, Communist activities in Chicago, Communist organization in Chicago, much of which is incorporated in that book, and I will be prepared to accept his word as authority on these matters.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to Professor Lasswell, in 1933 the Chicago Hearst press discovered the existence of the Workers School and brought some pressure to bear upon it, which resulted in the school's moving its headquarters. It must have been an institution which was brought to the attention of the public in 1933.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I was in Germany in 1933.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you return from Germany?

Dr. SCHUMAN. In the middle of December.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1934 the school had a branch which it opened in the Chicago South Side. Its main headquarters were in 550 South State Street, Chicago. Are you acquainted with the organization known as the International Workers Order, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have heard the name. I am not acquainted with the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever lectured under the auspices of the International Workers Order?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Not that I now recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a photostatic copy of a throwaway, dated March 5—the year was 1935—in which you are listed as one of the nationally prominent speakers at an antiwar rally under the auspices of the city central committee of the International Workers Order.

Dr. SCHUMAN. So I see.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you address that meeting?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your fellow speakers on that occasion were Prof. Robert Morss Lovett, Rev. Joseph W. Nicholson, Bob Minor, and Al Hamilton, were they?

Dr. SCHUMAN. If the leaflet is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not Bob Minor was one of the speakers on that occasion?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not recall that he was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever met Bob Minor, according to your recollection?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Not according to my recollection, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who Bob Minor is in connection with the Communist Party?

Dr. SCHUMAN. He was a leader of the Communist Party for a number of years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall that he was acting general secretary of the Communist Party during the recent imprisonment of Earl Browder in the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I believe he was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recognize the International Workers Order as an auxiliary organization of the Communist Party or an adjunct of the Communist Party or a front of the Communist Party?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have no opinion on that, Dr. Matthews. I presume it would be one of the organizations that would be so described by a good many people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you be prepared to take the opinion of Dr. Lasswell on the subject of the International Workers Order?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In Dr. Lasswell's book, *World Revolutionary Propaganda*—this is a study of Communist propaganda in the city of Chicago primarily—the International Workers Order is treated as a Communist organization, on page 80 of the volume.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I would share the judgment expressed there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 80 Professor Lasswell lists as party organizations the International Labor Defense, the I. W. O., which was the International Workers Order, the F. S. U., which was the Friends of the Soviet Union, and the T. U. U. L., which was the Trade Union Unity League. In the interdepartmental memoranda which were distributed by the Attorney General to the department heads he characterized the International Workers Order as one of the strongest Communist organizations in this country.

Mr. STARNES. If it means anything to certain people, this special committee has so designated it, and we did that only after we heard leaders of the Communist Party testify under oath before us and the officials of the I. W. O. itself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, is it your view that a person lending his name and prestige to a Communist front organization is wholly relieved of any responsibility for furthering the objectives of the Communist front organization as expressed in the statement which I read to you this morning from the Attorney General's decision on the deportation of Harry Bridges?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No, Dr. Matthews, that is not my view. My view is that during this period these various Communist front organizations were for the most part furthering, among their other purposes, whatever they may have been, a program of collective security against fascist aggression on a world scale. That program I was wholly in sympathy with and am now wholly in sympathy with. That is the only aspect of the program of these organizations that I have ever spoken on or sponsored or favored or sympathized with in any way; and, if you won't mind my saying so, I think it conveys to the members of the committee a somewhat misleading impression to single out from these years the various occasions on which I spoke before Communist front organizations without listing the very much more numerous occasions when I spoke before women's clubs, before Rotary clubs, before Kiwanis clubs, before all sorts of organizations having no taint of this kind at all.

The impression conveyed by the questioning thus far is that I was spending most of my time during those years speaking before Communist front organizations. That is an erroneous impression.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I call your attention again—

Mr. STARNES. Speaking from the chair, Dr. Schuman, the Chair is in disagreement with the purport of that statement. There is no question about your right or your privilege to speak before any group that you want to. The only question involved here is whether you were ever publicly associated or affiliated with Communist fronts or sub-

versive organizations in the country. In other words, by such association the inference would be natural if it was continuous over a period of years.

You are not a man of ordinary intelligence, but a man of high intelligence, and your intellectual honesty will lead you to concede that a long period of public association with known Communist front organizations—or if it had been with Nazi or Fascist organizations—would have had the tendency of leading the public to believe that you were sympathetic with the aims and the purposes and the programs of that particular group or with that party. That is the only thing that the committee is interested in.

That charge has been made because you are a Federal official, as you well know, and that is the only thing we are interested in—whether you did or you did not. Of course, as I tried to state in the beginning, we will afford you an opportunity later, when all the questioning is finished, to make any general statement or specific statement that you care to make as to your purpose or intent in being associated with or affiliated with, in the public eye, at least, these groups over a long period of years. That is our only purpose.

All right, Doctor.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Thank you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should like to introduce as an exhibit the photostatic copy of a circular announcing an antiwar rally to be held under the auspices of the International Workers Order on March 5, 1935.

Mr. STARNES. It may be received as an exhibit.

(Circular of International Workers Order was marked "Exhibit 7-A"; article from Daily Worker was marked "Exhibit 7-B.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. This morning, Dr. Schuman, I believe that you said that you agreed completely with the statement which I read you from the Attorney General's decision on the deportation of Harry Bridges. I should like to read that statement once more:

Testimony on front organizations showed that they were represented to the public for some legitimate reform objective.

Now, I should like to stop and point out that you, if I understand your answers, are saying that you felt that you could associate yourself with these legitimate reform objectives as represented to the public and not have any responsibility with reference to the actual objective as stated by the Attorney General, which was:

But actually used by the Communist Party to carry on its activities pending the time when the Communists believe they can seize power through revolution.

Is that a fair statement of the situation or not? I have no desire for the question to carry any inferences which are not present on the face of them.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I presume that the Attorney General would include in the category of legitimate reform objectives on the part of these organizations championship of international collective security against Fascist aggression and championship of American-Soviet diplomatic collaboration. Those were the only objectives of any of these organizations that I was interested in or gave approval to. I did not give approval to nor was I interested in the alleged ulterior objectives which they may have had.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; exactly. Is not the Attorney General saying that this ulterior and partially, at least, concealed objective was furthered solely by the technique of getting persons like yourself to associate themselves with the organization on the basis of the legitimate reform objective?

Dr. SCHUMAN. He is not saying that.

Mr. STARNES. That was the very question, Dr. Schuman, I wanted to propound. A man of your intellectual attainments and your position being constantly associated, in the public eye, and being affiliated with organizations of this character, regardless of the purity of your motives, lent strength, support, and growth to the ulterior purpose of the party far more than it would have if Earl Browder made those statements himself or if Bob Minor or Ralph Gogenback or somebody else did.

If we say that they had the same intellectual attainments as you, which they do not have, or if they had the same probity of character that you have, which we do not think they have, do you not think you would be serving their purposes far better than they could?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I had believed during this period at any time that these organizations were functioning primarily to promote Communist revolution in the United States or promote the spread of Communism, I should not have associated myself in any way with them. I believed during much of this period, as I believe today, that in terms of the public effect of some of these organizations, at least, that their primary effect was to arouse interest in a program of international security against Fascist aggression. I may have been mistaken in that judgment. That was my judgment at the time. That was my reason for associating myself with them. More than that I cannot say.

Mr. STARNES. All right, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Naturally, the Attorney General's words will have to speak for themselves, but I would like to ask Dr. Schuman if he could answer categorically this question: If the Attorney General is not saying simply that the concealed and ulterior objective of the Communists in the front organizations is served by the misrepresentation connected with these legitimate reform objectives? Is that not what the Attorney General is saying to you in that statement?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I am not sure, Dr. Matthews. It seems to me that he may be saying, or you and I may be saying, that those Communists who were in these organizations were pursuing simultaneously various objectives, one of which was collective security against Fascist aggression. I do not understand the Attorney General as saying there or even implying that this was not a mutual objective of these organizations.

My own impression would be that it was an actual objective and that some of the members of the organizations had their objectives, ulterior motives, secret objectives. My only interest was in that objective.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, you are not by any means, of course, leaving the inference with the committee, or you would not leave that inference with the public generally, that you could best further the interests of democratic government in this country, international security, or security in international affairs by constant affiliation with Communist Front groups?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Not at all, Mr. Chairman. On the contrary, during these years, as I indicated before, I spent much more time speaking on these themes to women's clubs, to Rotary Clubs, to Kiwanis Clubs, to all sorts of other organizations, than I spent before organizations of this type. I did not take the view—and here again I may have been mistaken, but I did not take the view that by speaking occasionally before such organizations as these I was either betraying a trust to my country or defeating the major purpose in which I was interested.

Mr. STARNES. All right. Are you ready to pursue these down to a more recent date?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Did you in the winter of 1932-33 serve as a member of the National Committee for the Student Congress Against War, which was held on the Campus of the University of Chicago, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I believe so, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not you attended any of the sessions of that Student Congress Against War?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not recall specifically. Probably I did, however.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was held in Mandel Hall?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes. That is on the campus of the University, and probably I attended it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether the Student Congress Against War was an outgrowth of the so-called Amsterdam World Congress Against War, which was held in August 1932, in Amsterdam?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not know as to that. All I can say is that the group on the campus of the University of Chicago which interested itself in that meeting was a very heterogeneous group, consisting in part of pacifists, in part of Norman Thomas Socialists, a few Communist sympathizers, some Liberals, some proponents of the Oxford group; and at that time and subsequently, in what contacts I had with these people and with such organizations I was arguing against a pacifist position, against a defeatist position, and I was in favor of international collective security.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer the photostatic copy of the program of the Student Congress Against War as an exhibit. It consists of four photostatic pages, which were made from a single, four-page leaflet; and, together with those, an account of the Student Congress Against War which appeared in the Daily Worker of January 3, 1933. Other prominent participants in the Student Congress Against War were Earl Browder, Joseph Freeman, Scott Nearing—

Mr. STARNES. Is Scott Nearing the one that Dr. Koch referred to in his testimony as being a Communist?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. Scott Nearing was at one time a prominent member of the Communist Party and was then expelled for some deviation which had to do with his interpretation of imperialism. It was in a book which he wrote against it.

Mr. STARNES. Was it a matter of policy or verbal precision?

Mr. MATTHEWS. As I understand the case, he requested his own expulsion and remained on good terms with the party thereafter and frequently lectured for party groups.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Donald Henderson, Henri Barbusse, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana, Corliss Lamont—to name or to single out, may I say, some of these who were recognized as Communists.

Dr. SCHUMAN. You are not implying that all of these people all spoke at Mandel Hall on this occasion?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No.

Mr. STARNES. As I understand it, their names are carried on this particular circular as being sponsors of the movement or officials of the movement and others there are speakers. Who are the actual speakers there?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The actual Communists who spoke were Earl Browder, Joseph Freeman, Scott Nearing, with the qualification which I have given, Carl Geiser and Nathaniel Weyl.

Dr. SCHUMAN. At Mandel Hall?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; and Donald Henderson.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Then I should feel reasonably confident in saying that I did not attend that meeting, because I have no recollection of those people speaking at the university campus at any meeting that I attended at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not wish the record to give any implication or concealment to the Congressmen, but Jane Addams and I also were speakers on one of the programs, and the Daily Worker attacked Miss Addams and myself for our taking a non-Communist view. I do not know why the Daily Worker did that, because the record will show that I was very much of a fellow-traveler at the time, but you had to hew pretty close to the party line not to be attacked by the Daily Worker.

Mr. STARNES. In what connection does Dr. Schuman's name appear?

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a member of the National Committee of the Student Congress Against War.

Mr. STARNES. Will you state what the record shows or what your own information is with reference to this group being a Communist Front group, or a member of the solar system, or a transmission belt, or whatever terminology you would like to use in that connection?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. To cite the interdepartmental memoranda circulated by the Attorney General, the Amsterdam World Congress Against War was convened in Amsterdam in August 1932, under the auspices of the Communist International. They were not formally under the auspices of the Communist International, but the Attorney General is undoubtedly deducing from the evidence available that the Congress was controlled by the Communist International, which the evidence will substantiate.

The leader of the American delegation to the Amsterdam Congress was Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana, of Cambridge, Mass., and the delegates came back with instructions to set up national bodies subsidiary to this world body. They set up the Student Congress Against War, the American Committee for the Struggle Against War, the United States Congress Against War, the American League Against War and Fascism, and that subsequently became the American League for Peace and Democracy. The American League itself has given that genealogy in its own official documents as I have outlined it.

That is the reason I asked Dr. Schuman if he was aware of the connection between the Amsterdam Congress and the Student Congress Against War.

The headline of an article from the Daily Worker of January 3, 1933, says, "Students adopt antiwar stand. Endorse pledge of Amsterdam Congress."

This was a fighting Communist pledge against war, to turn the war into civil war, and the Chicago Student Congress Against War reasserted or reaffirmed that Amsterdam pledge.

Mr. STARNES. Let that be properly identified as an exhibit to the testimony of Dr. Schuman.

(Student Congress Against War documents were marked "Exhibits 8-A and 8-B respectively.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. This morning I believe you testified you spoke under the auspices of the Friends of the Soviet Union on March 31, 1935, or at least you read that from a letter which you had written to Dr. Goodwin Watson.

Dr. SCHUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not you spoke under the auspices of the Friends of the Soviet Union on January 16, 1936?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not recall offhand. It is possible that I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a photostatic copy of a throwaway which announces a mass meeting.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes, I spoke there. I recall that meeting now.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under the auspices of the Friends of the Soviet Union, at North Side Turner Hall on January 16, 1936. The throwaway says the speakers are Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Eugene Bechtold, and other prominent speakers.

The bold wording immediately above the names of the speakers reads as follows:

Learn the truth about the proletarian dictatorship that struggles for a socialist, classless society, the workers' state, the most powerful guarantee for peace.

Then the names of Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Eugene Bechtold, and other prominent speakers appear.

Mr. STARNES. Who is Eugene Bechtold?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who Eugene Bechtold is?

Dr. SCHUMAN. He is, and I guess was at that time, a prominent Communist.

If I may comment on that meeting, the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Soviet purge trials, or the first of the Soviet purge trials during 1935. I took the view at that time with regard to the first of those series of trials that from all the available evidence those accused were guilty and were justly punished. That was the theme in which I spoke at that meeting. I did not share the view, and do not now share the view, of former Ambassador Joseph Davies that in all of the purge trials, including the subsequent ones, all of those accused were guilty. On the contrary, excerpts from my published writings as submitted this morning will show that, with regard to the trials of 1937, I entertained grave doubts as to whether all of the persons accused were guilty; but at that time I took the view which Joseph Davies has taken with regard to all of the trials, and I spoke on that theme at that meeting.

Mr. STARNES. Do you intend to introduce both of these documents to which you refer as exhibits?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; and to supplement Dr. Schuman's statement about Eugene Bechtold as having been a prominent Communist, I may say that he was the Communist Party's candidate for the governorship of Illinois, according to a communication which the committee has received from the secretary of state of Illinois.

I have one more exhibit involving the Friends of the Soviet Union. It is a photostatic copy of a leaflet which announces a speech by Frederick L. Schuman on Sunday, February 25, 1934, at 3 p. m.

Do you recall whether or not you addressed the Friends of the Soviet Union on that occasion on the subject of Political Implications in Recognition of the Soviet Union?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I believe I did, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. These are three exhibits on the Friends of the Soviet Union.

Mr. STARNES. They may be received as exhibits.

(Documents relating to Friends of the Soviet Union were marked "Exhibits 9-A, 9-B, and 9-C," respectively.)

Mr. STARNES. There is no doubt that the Friends of the Soviet Union was a Communist Front organization, is there, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. There was some doubt of it at the time. I should say as of now there is no doubt in my mind, but, for the sake of the record, I think with regard to the references of the three meetings of this organization which I addressed that the first meeting was addressed not only by myself but by the late Senator Lundeen and by Dr. Matthews. It did not occur to me at that time that either Senator Lundeen or Dr. Matthews were identifying themselves as Communists by speaking at this meeting, and I certainly had no intention—

Mr. STARNES. You do know that Dr. Matthews has stated that at the time he was a fellow traveler, in the parlance of the party, and of course you know what that means.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I did not know that then.

Mr. STARNES. He appeared before the committee in 1938 and testified under oath at that time that he was a fellow traveler and had been for a number of years.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I would be interested in knowing, if I might ask Dr. Matthews, if he would have described Senator Lundeen as a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know about the propriety of taking up something about a deceased Member of Congress. Of course, the committee does have documentary evidence touching on the point.

Mr. STARNES. Certainly it does, but I doubt the propriety of bringing that up now.

Dr. SCHUMAN. The only reason I raised the question is that, in view of the compliment paid me, I wonder if I was having the wool pulled over my eyes constantly by those who were participating in these meetings, who said they were not Communists but were in sympathy with these organizations.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Schuman, in all sincerity, after 6 years of service on this committee and listening to the leaders of the various organizations of the country and hearing the testimony of a lot of be-

wildered citizens who had always prided themselves on their liberal views, I have been struck by two outstanding facts as they present themselves to me. State socialism presents an unusual and attractive appeal, apparently, to some of the most intellectual and intelligent men on the one hand and to the impoverished and underprivileged on the other. I cannot explain it, but that is the way it has been shown here, over a period of 6 years, from the lips of the leaders of the movement and those people who were public figures and people like yourself, who are of extraordinarily high intelligent order.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you remember the formation of the Jan Wittenber Defense Committee in Chicago, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes, I recall some committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you serve on the Jan Wittenber Defense Committee?

Dr. SCHUMAN. To the best of my recollection, I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall any of the fellow members of that committee?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not recall the fellow members. The circumstances, as I remember them, were that this Jan Wittenber was arrested in southern Illinois, I believe on a charge of criminal syndicalism in connection with certain efforts which were then being made to organize the miners of some of those districts; and some of us at the university felt, regardless of the merits of the question of whether the miners should be organized, that Wittenber had been arrested without adequate cause and that the arrest was a reflection of opposition to the trade-union organization of the miners, and my interest in the case was motivated by that assumption.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you believe, at the time you served on the Jan Wittenber Defense Committee, that he was a Communist or a Communist sympathizer?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not recall that I was aware of the fact that he was a Communist, but that would not have altered my judgment on a question of freedom of speech and freedom of labor organization. So long as the Communist Party was a lawful party in the State of Illinois, I would feel that even outright acknowledged members of it were entitled to the same constitutional guaranties of freedom of speech and assembly and organizational activities as other citizens.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The account of the setting up of the Jan Wittenber Defense Committee appears in the *New Masses* of September 4, 1934, on page 4 of the publication. Among the members of the Jan Wittenber Defense Committee listed here were Dr. Schuman, also Thomas McKenna, who was mentioned this morning as secretary of the Communist Party in Chicago. Carl Haessler is again president of this committee, as well as others that reference has been made to.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Might I see the whole list?

Mr. MATTHEWS. There are five or six there.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Well, the list includes Dr. Curtis Reese, who was for many years, and still is today I believe, director of Lincoln Center, which is a social settlement on the South Side of Chicago; Prof. James Yard—this would seem to be a list of people some of whom are open to allegations of being Communists, others of whom are not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know whether James Yard and Curtis Reese have had other affiliations or public association with the Communist front organizations, do you?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is offered as an exhibit.

Mr. STARNES. It may be received as an exhibit.

(Document having to do with Jan Wittenber Defense Committee was marked "Exhibit 10.")

Mr. STARNES. Is there any question as to this Wittenber being a Communist?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was on the editorial staff of the Midwest Daily Record.

Mr. STARNES. Which is a Communist publication for that area?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which is a Communist publication for that area. He was also one time secretary of the Chicago League Against War and Fascism.

Did you write at least two articles for the publication Soviet Russia Today, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have written for the magazine I think not more than two articles.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have here an article which appeared in the August 1932 issue of Soviet Russia Today, entitled "Intervention—Myth or Menace?" Do you recall having written that article?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Another in the November 1932 issue, entitled "Soviet Foreign Policy: An Interpretation." Do you recall having written that article for Soviet Russia Today?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes; I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know at the time you wrote those articles that it was a publication of the Friends of the Soviet Union?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This committee has formally found that the Friends of the Soviet Union was a Communist-front organization.

Mr. STARNES. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Professor Lasswell, according to the evidence in the book on page 80, refers to the Friends of the Soviet Union as a party organization.

I ask that these two articles be received as exhibits.

Mr. STARNES. They will be so received.

(Documents referring to Soviet Russia Today were marked "Exhibits 11-A and 11-B," respectively.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Schuman, do you believe in the enforcement of the statute which provides for the deportation of alien Communists?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Would you mind reading me the terms of that statute, Dr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not have the statute here.

Dr. SCHUMAN. The only reason I ask is that it was my impression—I may be in error here—that the statute in question did not refer specifically or exclusively to alien Communists, but to aliens advocating revolutionary overthrow of our Government. Am I in error there?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; you are correct.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Then I, of course, believe in that statute and in its enforcement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The statute does not specifically name the Communist Party, but the courts have consistently held, at least up to the

present time, that membership in the Communist Party is prima facie evidence of the advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Of course, that issue is before the Supreme Court again.

Mr. STARNES. In the *Schneiderman case*.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the occasion of the deportation order issued against John Strachey, a British Communist?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes, I do. I believe that was sometime in the spring of 1935. Mr. Strachey was lecturing throughout the country. I did not hear his lectures. I was somewhat familiar with his writings. I was not then aware, nor am I now, that he was formerly a member of the British Communist Party, nor did I have reason to believe that he was going about the United States advocating a revolutionary overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

I therefore took the position, as did a good many other liberals, that the order for his deportation was unwarranted and that, so long as the American Communist Party was a legal party, so long as the British Communist Party was a legal party, and so long as Mr. Strachey was not, so far as I knew, publicly advocating revolutionary means or methods in this country, that there was not a valid case for the deportation order.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you send a telegram of protest to any Government officials protesting the deportation order against John Strachey?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I joined with a number of other people in so doing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To whom was that telegram addressed?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I believe it was addressed to Miss Frances Perkins.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever affiliated or publicly associated with the National Student League?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I was a faculty adviser at one time of the University of Chicago branch of the National Student League. I do not recall that I had any other connection with it than that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your testimony before the Civil Service Commission on February 3, 1943, you were asked the following question and made the following answer:

The Commission has received information to the effect that you were affiliated with and lectured the National Student League while you were a professor at the University of Chicago. Is that information correct?

Answer. That is correct.

Did you know then or have you come to the conclusion since that the National Student League was a Communist front organization?

Dr. SCHUMAN. What year is in reference there, Dr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know. I am citing from your testimony before the Civil Service Commission.

Dr. SCHUMAN. There is no doubt in my mind that the National Student League—let me not state the League as a whole, since I am not familiar with it as a whole, but the Chicago branch of the National Student League, did ultimately fall under the control of students sympathetically Communists. At the time I was faculty adviser of it that was not the case. It included groups of very diverse views, and I did not regard the local branch there, of which I was faculty adviser at that time, as a Communist front organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, in his deportation order against Harry Bridges the Attorney General has described the National Stu-

dent League as a Communist organization. That appears on page 25 of the Attorney General's decision. The committee's files and testimony show that the National Student League, together with the Students League for Industrial Democracy, set up the American Student Union, the National Student League being the Communist element which joined with the Socialist element in setting up the American Students Union, and the Communist element shortly taking over the new organization, the American Student Union.

I am not speaking with reference to the membership of the National Student League on the Chicago University campus when I say that the National Student League as a Nation-wide organization, from its inception until its disappearance into the American Student Union, was led by Communists and consistently and faithfully expounded the Communist Party line in all the positions which it took as a national body.

The Attorney General's view is completely sustained by the evidence on the National Student League.

Mr. STARNES. If I recall correctly, we had former officials of those organizations to testify before this special committee to the same effect.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. The former executive secretary of the American Student Union, Joseph P. Lash, in his public testimony before this committee, testified to the Communist control of the National Student League, and then subsequently, in executive session, testified to the Communist control of the American Student Union.

Dr. Schuman, in September of 1939, in *Soviet Russia Today*, there appeared an open letter addressed to all active supporters of democracy and peace, which purports to have been signed by you among many others. Do you recall whether or not you did give the authorization for the use of your name in this connection?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Would you tell me the date of that again?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It appeared in *Soviet Russia Today* of September 1939.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes. The letter in question was prepared and signed by a number of writers, journalists, intellectuals, et cetera, in late July or early August of 1939, at a time at which it still seemed possible that there would be consummated an Anglo-Soviet alliance against the Axis. Those negotiations had been going on all during the spring and summer and up until the middle of August—perhaps I had better say up until the 21st of August. These seemed to be, from what we knew publicly, still a possibility that such a mutual assistance pact or alliance would be concluded.

In connection with that issue a good many people in this country and in Britain were saying, "There isn't any difference, after all, between Russia and Germany, between Russian communism and German nazism, and therefore it does not make any difference whether such a pact is made or not, and therefore it is undesirable."

Those of us who signed that letter sought to draw attention to what we thought were certain significant differences between Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. As you know, the negotiations failed and the Nazi-Soviet neutrality and nonaggression pact was signed in Moscow by Ribbentrop and Molotov on the 23d of August 1939. Our letter was released to the press in the middle of August, before that

pact was signed, but did not appear in the journal you have now, Soviet Russia Today, until September, after the pact was signed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not your co-signers listed in this issue of September 1939, of Soviet Russia Today were in many instances the same persons who signed the pamphlet, Culture and the Crisis?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not recall, Dr. Matthews. I should have to look over the lists to answer that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would involve an examination and checking of some 175 names against 35 or 40 names—

Dr. SCHUMAN. I believe, Dr. Matthews, there were 400 signers of this letter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was alleged to have 400, but only 175 names were ever published, and no one would ever release the remaining 225. Very stringent efforts were made to get the other 225 names alleged to be on the open letter, but there was no success in that effort.

Dr. SCHUMAN. May I make a comment there, Dr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Dr. SCHUMAN. The period of that letter was a particularly crucial period in international affairs, and, so far as I know, people who had signed that letter did so in the sincere conviction that nothing would prevent an outbreak of general war except the conclusion that summer of an Anglo-Soviet mutual assistance pact. That was the motivation of the letter. That was the judgment behind the letter. The correctness of that judgment was shown by subsequent events.

The failure of the negotiations and the subsequent conclusion of the Nazi-Soviet pact led immediately to the outbreak of the European war, at which time—and I think you will support me in this, at least—all of the so-called fellow travelers who were really sympathetic with communism rather than interested in collective security against Fascist aggression became isolationists and began adopting a defeatist line with regard to the war.

I took the view, which I have consistently, that America must give all possible aid to the Allies. I joined the Committee to Defend America by Joining the Allies. I spoke on its behalf. I denounced the Soviet attack upon Finland; and, while I am not sure of this, I believe I was denounced, as you were earlier, in the Daily Worker for so doing; and I advocated American entrance into the war from the spring of 1940 on.

I mention this only to underline the contention that during that period the test of an individual's ulterior motives could be found in his attitude toward the war, and my published writings show very clearly what my attitude was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congressmen, among those who signed the open letter in September 1939, who also signed the pamphlet, Culture and the Crises, were such names as Waldo Frank, Granville Hicks, Langston Hughes, Matthew Josephson, and numerous others—in fact, more than a dozen of them who signed the pamphlet, Culture and the Crises, also appear as signers of this letter.

I ask that this be received as an exhibit in the case.

Mr. STARNES. It is so ordered.

(Open letter on Soviet Union was marked "Exhibit 12.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a sponsor in 1940 of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you understand that that organization is and has been from its inception a Communist-front organization?

Dr. SCHUMAN. No; that was not my understanding. My impression of it was—and again I may be in error—that it was an organization designed to combat any efforts that might be made to identify all persons of German descent or all persons with German names as Nazi sympathizers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congressmen, the committee has a considerable body of sworn testimony from such witnesses as Maj. Humberto Galeani to the effect that the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born was one of the earliest Communist-front organizations set up in this country, its name originally having been Council for Protection of Foreign-Born and subsequently becoming the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born; that it was at all times controlled by the party, and that functionaries were appointed by the Communist Party.

I should like to point out to Dr. Schuman that his sponsorship of the organization occurred in March 1940, which is the period during which he states that he was opposed to the party line. That was prior to the Nazi invasion of Russia; and, furthermore, I should like to call his attention to the fact that the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, which he sponsored in 1940, was connected with the American Peace Mobilization. It was an affiliate of the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House in 1941 and took a line opposed to that which Dr. Schuman states he took with respect to foreign policy at that time.

Dr. SCHUMAN. May I comment on that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Certainly.

Dr. SCHUMAN. My only connection with that organization was that of a sponsor with my name on a letterhead along with other names. I did not know that it was in any sense a Communist-front organization at that time. Perhaps I was derelict in not investigating. All I was doing was indicating my approval of the alleged purposes of the organization, namely, the protection of foreign-born from unwarranted accusations.

In the same month in which that letter or communication is dated I debated on the Town Hall of the Air from New York City with Norman Thomas on the issue of American intervention in the war versus American isolationism. The record of that debate is to be had from Town Hall.

That was one of numerous debates and lectures in which I participated at that time, during the whole period from the 1st of September 1939, to the Nazi invasion of Russia, and my record with regard to what American policy ought to be during that period is a perfectly consistent one and completely at variance with the official party line, with the American Peace Mobilization, with the record of all front organizations.

Mr. MASON. Would you not say, Dr. Schuman, that at least in this particular instance you were either very careless or negligent and, in fact, open to censure, for permitting your name to be used as a sponsor on their letterhead without checking carefully the real objectives of the organization?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I might be disposed to agree with that judgment, Mr. Congressman, but that would depend again on a further judgment as to whether its real objectives were quite different from its ostensible objectives.

If on the basis of his very detailed and meticulous research Dr. Matthews comes to the conclusion that the ostensible objectives of this organization were not its real objectives, then I would say I was negligent in not ascertaining what the real objectives were.

Mr. MASON. It really is not a question of Dr. Matthews' research or his conclusions in the matter. It sums up into the evidence which has been presented to this committee by various people associated with it who were in a position to testify as to the real objectives, and the fact that it was initiated in the first place by leading Communists.

Dr. SCHUMAN. That I did not know.

Mr. STARNES. The committee is officially in possession of information about all these organizations, Dr. Schuman, because we have had before us Mr. Browder, and others, and the founders of the Communist Party in the United States—all of them. We have had before us national officials of these various organizations, the people who were responsible in the very beginning for their being set up and who knew their real purposes and their real objectives, and they were resolved to catch the innocent, the unaware, the unsuspecting, the liberal, or whatever term that a man wants to use in describing himself who has certain objectives that he would like to obtain for himself or for his country, and they took advantage of the situation.

As Mr. Mason has said, it is not the conclusion of the committee alone or as a result of Dr. Matthews' personal work, but over a period of years the committee has heard from the lips of the founders of the American Communist Party these stories. Regardless of what the uninitiated or the uninformed or the misinformed might have been led to have said in public print or in a forum or elsewhere about the work of the committee in that connection, we have heard the real purposes and objectives from the people who set up the organization.

The only reason we are accepting these conclusions is that we think we should have the benefit of this work made available to us. It is saving counsel and the committee members much time and effort in not having to do the work that the Attorney General has done and this committee has done to determine whether an organization is a Communist front today. Some of these witnesses are in prison, and some would not be found if they testified. We would have to go through that again.

The findings of this committee accept those works with the same implicit confidence that you accept Dr. Lasswell's.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited you to become a member for the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born on this occasion?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not recall, Dr. Matthews, but if I saw the list I might be able to indicate whether it was any of the people on that letterhead.

(Dr. Matthews handed Dr. Schuman a document.)

Dr. SCHUMAN. If I am not mistaken, it was Mr. Louis Adamic. Let me run down the list. It is a very long list of very diverse people. I believe it was Mr. Louis Adamic who asked me for my signature. I would have to check my correspondence.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congressman, I am sure you will recall that when the fourth annual conference of this American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born met here in Washington in March of 1940 there was a good deal of publicity in the papers due to the fact that a violent explosion occurred at the conference. One of the speakers inadvertently referred in a condemning manner to the Soviet Russia invasion of Finland, whereupon something approximating a riot ensued and almost broke up the meeting. That was in the Washington papers at the time. You may recall that.

I would like to know if Dr. Schuman has seen any reports of that meeting and if he ever was aware of the fact that such an explosion did occur.

Dr. SCHUMAN. I think I recall reading something about it in the press. I got no further report of it than that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you interested to find out whether or not the organization which you were sponsoring took the position which it ostensibly took at that meeting by booing the speaker who criticized the Soviet Union?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I should have been interested, no doubt. Of course, I took exactly the position that the speaker did, and had I been there and had I spoken, I would have been booed, too.

Mr. STARNES. The committee has officially found that this particular organization is a Communist front organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

Have you known Louis Adamic for a number of years, Dr. Schuman?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I have followed his writing for a number of years. I cannot say that I know him well personally. I have had only casual meetings with him, but I respected his writings, I respected his intellectual integrity, I respected what seemed to me at least his honest and sincere liberal interest in foreign-born groups in the United States, and I should be reluctant to think either that he had been taken in by Communists or that he had been instrumental in taking me in.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not he solicited you by word of mouth or by letter?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I believe by letter, but I am not certain.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not recall whether you still have possession of such a letter or not?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I should have to look in my files. I do not remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the letter on the letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born announcing the fourth annual conference to be held in Washington, D. C., March 2 and 3, 1940, as an exhibit.

Mr. STARNES. It may be received in the record as such.

(Letter of American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was marked "Exhibit 13.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you wish to afford the witness an opportunity to make a further statement, I have concluded.

Mr. STARNES. You have concluded your questioning?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Schuman, is there any further statement you care to make to the committee with reference to your association with these various organizations to date? Beyond that we do not care. All we are interested in is whether or not you had been publicly associated

with these groups. It is your admission that you did. You have sought to explain why you were so associated.

Is there anything further you would like to add in explanation of your association and affiliation with these various front organizations and with known Communists in this country, together with your endorsement of at least one candidate for public office?

Dr. SCHUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like at this time, if I may, to submit as part of the record the pamphlet which I referred to earlier, which contains excerpts from reviews of my various books. I do this because there is a list here—a partial list, at least—of my various publications, all of which have been widely reviewed.

There has been no allegation made here during the hearings that any of my writings have indicated sympathy for communism or a Communist viewpoint. Dr. Matthews has called attention to several articles which have been published in Soviet Russia Today, but he did not say, nor, I believe, would he now say, that those articles indicate sympathy with communism or efficacy of communism or anything like it.

The only one of my published books that has been referred to here was the one of my dissertation, American Policy Toward Russia, and it has not been contended that even that was written from a Communist point of view or in any way advocated communism. It is merely to be noted that it advocated American recognition of Soviet Russia and that it was published by a publishing house which has been identified as a Communist publishing house.

My subsequent books are numerous. They are weighty. They are documented. They have been received with considerable interest and enthusiasm by a fairly wide public. No one has seriously alleged that in any of these writings I have advocated communism or taken a position sympathetic with communism in this country.

I mention that and I include this in the record by way of presenting what I hope will be regarded as a somewhat better balanced picture of my intellectual and literary activities.

Mr. STARNES. That pamphlet may be received as an exhibit.

(Pamphlet of Dr. Schuman's writings was marked "Exhibit 14.")

Dr. SCHUMAN. If I may be permitted to do so, I should like to read into the record a letter dated September 15, 1942, to Dr. Watson, of my agency, from a gentleman that Dr. Matthews and I seem to be agreed upon is an authority about a good many of these questions, namely, Dr. Harold Lasswell, and also a letter on the same subject from Mr. Beardsley Ruml.

Do I have your permission to read these?

Mr. STARNES. You may have them listed as an exhibit. The committee will read them. Do you care to have them read here, or do you want them attached?

Dr. SCHUMAN. I do not know whether duplicates are available. It will take but a minute. This letter is dated September 15, 1942, from Dr. Lasswell to Dr. Watson:

I understand that you are recommending Dr. Frederick L. Schuman for the consideration of the commission.

I have known Dr. Schuman since he was an undergraduate at the University of Chicago many years ago. I was acquainted with him also during his graduate

work, and was later for many years his colleague in the department of political science at the University of Chicago.

Dr. Schuman has established himself as one of the most vigorous young scholars in the field of political science in the United States. He has demonstrated extraordinary capacity to master great bodies of material and to weld it into systematic and vivid shape. His numerous publications have not only been welcomed in scholarly circles but have won for him a substantial following among the opinion-makers of America, especially in the field of foreign policy.

There is no question of Dr. Schuman's thorough loyalty to the ideals of our country. He is a man of the highest personal integrity and is in every way an outstanding citizen and specialist.

I think you would be very fortunate to secure the assistance of Dr. Schuman in the extremely important and delicate work that you have in hand.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. LASSWELL.

The much shorter letter from Mr. Beardsley Ruml is also to Mr. Goodwin Watson, under date of September 11, 1942, and reads:

DEAR MR. WATSON: Dr. Frederick L. Schuman was at the University of Chicago when I was dean of the division of social sciences.

I have no hesitancy in commending him from the standpoint of loyalty, judgment, and trustworthiness. In fact, as a person to do a penetrating job of analysis, I can think of no one who would be Dr. Schuman's equal.

Very sincerely yours,

BEARDSLEY RUMBL.

I should like, by way of summation, if I may, to suggest that the evidence which has here been presented leaves no doubt whatever, nor did I have any idea to cast out upon the matter, that I have at various times identified myself with or affiliated myself with or spoken before various Communist front organizations.

The chairman made reference earlier to his conclusion that among intellectuals and literary people there seemed to be a considerable interest in state socialism and that this interest perhaps helped to explain the disposition of certain intellectuals to collaborate with Communist front organizations. I should simply like to say on that point that I have never advocated state socialism. I have never been a Socialist. I have taken issue with the whole state Socialist philosophy in my published writings repeatedly, and my motive for collaborating with these organizations had to do entirely with the international scene, with the growing crisis in world politics, with my conviction that not only must America, Britain, China, France, and Russia act together against the menace of Fascist aggression, but with my conviction that inside the United States all the groups that were opposed to Fascist aggression and in favor of international collaboration against it were worthy of support.

I may have been mistaken in my judgment in that matter. It may have been an error on my part to give my sponsorship or support to such organizations, but I would repeat that my motive in so doing had nothing to do with sympathy with state socialism and certainly nothing to do with sympathy with communism.

My lecture and my public writings for more than a decade present a perfectly consistent picture of my outlook with regard to political and social philosophy and my outlook with regard to international affairs. I take a certain pride in the circumstance that I foresaw earlier, and a good many other people did, the danger of Japanese imperialism, the danger of Italian fascism, the danger of German national socialism; that I began advocating international opposition to these movements

at a fairly early period and that I participated in various kinds of organizations and spoke before various kinds of groups and sponsored various kinds of groups, including Communist front groups, with that purpose in mind.

If the members of the committee wish to conclude from the evidence that my activities in this regard, in spite of my present statement, demonstrate that I am a Communist or that I am sympathetic with communism or have ever been sympathetic with communism in its domestic program, that, of course, is a liberty which the members of the committee have at their disposal. I can only rest my case on the general statement of my orientation which I tried to give you. Thank you very much.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I would not want the witness to leave under any misapprehension concerning the question of the articles which have been introduced into evidence. I did not read these articles into the record because they are lengthy. I did offer them as exhibits on the theory that they would speak for themselves as to Dr. Schuman's political views. Since he has raised the question and has assumed that nothing was to be implied as to their pro-Communist content, I think I ought to state that it is my view of the articles that their orientation politically is decidedly pro-Communist.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Dr. Matthews, with your indulgence, I would like to permit a judgment on that question to be passed by the members of the committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, the articles are in evidence and for that purpose.

Dr. SCHUMAN. May I ask that the articles be evaluated in connection with the excerpts from my other published writings which I submitted this morning?

Mr. STARNES. We will have all of them before us and we will undertake to pass on them. Whatever judgment the committee will pass on them you may rest assured will be in the light of all the circumstances, and the circumstances which you have explained and the documents which you have introduced or invited to our attention will receive the same consideration.

If there is nothing further, the committee stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Dr. SCHUMAN. Does this conclude my testimony?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

EXHIBIT 1

[Daily Worker, September 14, 1932, p. 1]

WRITERS IN SUPPORT OF COMMUNISTS—BIGGEST NAMES IN ART, LITERATURE, AND EDUCATION—SCORE BOSS PARTIES—PLEDGE SUPPORT TO FOSTER AND FORD

NEW YORK.—A group of educators, writers, architects and artists issued a call today for the formation of committees throughout the country in "support in the national elections of the Communist Party and its candidates, Wm. Z. Foster and James W. Ford." The call signed by the group including Lincoln Steffens, Winifred L. Chappell, Executive Secretary, Methodist Federation for Social Service; Prof. Newton Arvin, Smith College; Sidney Howard, author of "They Knew What They Wanted." Pulitzer Prize winner; Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, University of Chicago; Bruce Crawford, editor, Crawford's Weekly,

Norton, Va.; Sherwood Anderson, John Dos Passos, Theodore Dreiser, novelists; Adolf Dehn, Alfred Frueh, artists, and Maxwell Hyde, architect, stated, "that the only effective way to protest against the chaos, the appalling wastefulness, and the indescribable misery inherent in the present economic system is to vote for the Communist candidates."

The statement in full reads:

"We are convinced that both the Republican and Democratic Parties represent the interests of the moneyed classes, that is, of the big manufacturers, capitalists, and bankers, and not the interests of the people at large; that there is no way out of the crisis through either of them. Both parties are hopelessly corrupt, and both will try to save the profits of the rich at the expense of the rest of the population.

The socialists aim, in theory, to abolish the present system, but are doing nothing to organize a labor movement by which this may be accomplished. They have no convincing plan. And the example of the British and German socialists is far from reassuring. In Great Britain and Germany, the socialists went to the side of the rich as soon as the capitalists state seemed in danger.

VOTE COMMUNIST

"We believe that the only effective way to protest against the chaos, the appalling wastefulness, and the indescribable misery inherent in the present economic system is to vote for the Communist candidates.

"The Communist Party alone is working to educate and organize the classes dispossessed by the present system, so as to make them an efficient instrument for establishing a new society based on equal opportunity to work, equable distribution of income, and ownership by the people of the national resources.

FORM COMMITTEES

"We therefore pledge our support in the national elections to the Communist Party and its candidates, Wm. Z. Foster and James W. Ford and call upon all educators, writers, engineers, social workers, artists, architects and intellectuals in general to join us in this move and form Foster and Ford Committees throughout the country."

(Signed):

Sherwood Anderson, Newton Arvin, Emjo Basshe, Slater Brown, Erskine Caldwell, Robert Cantwell, Winifred L. Chapell, Lester Cohen, Louis Colman, Lewis Corey, Henry Cowell, Malcom Cowley, Bruce Crawford, H. W. L. Dana, Adolph Dehn, Alfred Frueh, Miriam Allen De Ford, Howard N. Doughty, Jr., John Dos Passos, Theodore Dreiser, Waldo Frank, Murray Godwin, Horace Gregory, Louis Grudin, John Herrmann, Granville Hicks, Sidney Hook, Sidney Howard, Langston Hughes, Maxwell Hyde, Orrick Johns, Matthew Josephson, Alfred Kreymborg, Louis Lozowick, Grace Lumpkin, Felix Morrow, Samuel Ornitz, James Rorty, Isidor Schneider, Edwin Seaver, Frederick L. Schuman, Norman Simpson, Lincoln Steffens, Charles R. Walker, Edmund Wilson, Ella May Winter, Robert Whitaker.

EXHIBIT 2

CULTURE AND THE CRISIS

An Open Letter to the Writers—Artists—Teachers—Physicians—Engineers—
Scientists—and Other Professional Workers of America

LEAGUE OF PROFESSIONAL GROUPS FOR FOSTER AND FORD

PREFACE

We of this generation stand midway between two eras. When we look backward, we see our American past like a great tidal wave that is now receding, but that was magnificent indeed in the sweep of its socially purposeless power. When we look ahead, we see something new and strange, undreamed of in the American philosophy. What we see ahead is the threat of cultural dissolution. The great wave piled up too much wreckage—of nature, of obsolete social patterns and institutions, of human blood and nerve.

We who write this, listed among the so-called "intellectuals" of our generation, people trained, at least, to think for ourselves and hence, to a degree for our time and our people—we have no faintest desire to exaggerate either our talents or our influence. Yet on the other hand, we are not humble, especially with respect to the power that measures itself in dollar signs and ciphers, the thought that is not thought, but merely the stereotype of habit, the action that is not will, not choice, but the reflex of fear. Why should we as a class be humble? Practically everything that is orderly and sane and useful in America was made by two classes of Americans; our class, the class of brain workers, and the "lower classes", the muscle workers. Very well, we strike hands with our true comrades. We claim our own and we reject the disorder, the lunacy spawned by grabbers, advertisers, traders, speculators, salesmen, the much-adulated, immensely stupid and irresponsible "business men". We claim the right to live and to function. It is our business to think and we shall not permit business men to teach us our business. It is also, in the end, our business to act.

We have acted. As responsible intellectual workers we have aligned ourselves with the frankly revolutionary Communist Party, the party of the workers. In this letter, we speak to you of our own class—to the writers, artists, scientists, teachers, engineers, to all honest professional workers—telling you as best we can why we have made this decision and why we think that you too should support the Communist Party in the political campaign now under way.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE INTELLECTUAL WORKERS OF AMERICA.

There is only one issue in the present election. Call it hard times, unemployment, the farm problem, the world crisis, or call it simply hunger—whatever name we use, the issue is the same. What do the major political parties propose to do about it?

The Republicans propose, in effect, to do nothing whatever. Twelve to fifteen million men and women have lost their jobs; twenty-five to thirty-five million people will go hungry this winter; nobody knows the exact figures. The Republican Party, three years after the crash, does not even promise to take a census of our misery. The best its candidate can offer is a pledge to continue the policies which are depriving these millions of work, food and shelter.

Somebody must pay the cost of the depression: will it be the rich or the poor, the capitalists or the workers and farmers? In the battle now raging between them, the Republican administration has taken the side of the rich. To banks, railroads and industrial corporations, it has offered government loans, millions, billions, anything to keep them from going bankrupt. To the Rockefellers and Mellons it has offered a pledge to keep their taxes down—by discharging government employees and refusing government help to the unemployed. It offers nothing to the poor except higher taxes, lower wages and the chance to share their misery. If they ask for more, it gives them bayonets and tear-gas.

The Democrats, in the present election, have tried to appeal to both sides. Their candidate has promised as much as he safely could to as many people as he thought were influential. He has promised progressivism to progressives and conservatism to conservatives. He has promised to lower the price of electric power without lowering the inflated value of power company stock. He has promised more and less regulation of the railroads. He has promised to lower the protective tariff and at the same time make it more protective. He has promised higher prices to the farmers by means of a measure which cannot be put into effect until hundreds of thousands of farms have been sold for taxes and mortgages. He has promised beer to industrial workers, if they have the money to buy it. On the one real issue he promises nothing.

If Roosevelt is elected—and Wall Street expects him to win—there will be changes here and there in the machine of government. The leaks in the boiler will be stuffed with cotton waste, the broken bolts mended with hay wire. A different gang of engineers will run the machine for the profit of the same owners.

The causes of the crisis will be untouched. The results of the crisis—hunger, low wages, unemployment—will still be with us. If there is a temporary return to a limited degree of prosperity, it can only be succeeded by another crisis. The United States under capitalism is like a house that is rotting away; the roof leaks, the sills and rafters are crumbling. The Democrats want to paint it pink. The Republicans don't want to paint it; instead they want to raise the rent.

THE NATURE OF THE CRISIS

The economic crisis of 1929-1932 has been likened to a world war. There is indeed little to choose between the one and the other; both display the same barbarities, destructions, dislocations of human masses.

Like the imperialist war of 1914-18 the economic disaster was long overdue. It sprang from the same deep-rooted causes; the instability, the disorder chronic in capitalist society, ruled alternately by greed and fear, by the desire to expand, at enormous profit, or to protect itself at enormous loss; to speculate and exploit. The crisis, too, came as the sequel to a period of uncontrolled expanding, profit-making and competing. And as the peace which followed the war was stamped with the passions of the warring forces, nourishing all the germs of new wars, so the attempted solution or peace after the crisis is conceived in the limitations, the hypocrisies and exploitations of those same elements which produces world-wide economic catastrophe; it would furnish the setting only for new disasters.

This crisis in its characteristic aspects is similar to previous depressions, a recurrent and inescapable feature of capitalist society, although this one is more catastrophic than its predecessors. The causes are rooted in the economics of capitalist production. The "prosperity" which comes after depression generates its own collapse. Real wages rose somewhat in 1922-23, but were thereafter comparatively stationary, limiting mass purchasing power, while the farmers' income was disastrously reduced by the agricultural crisis. Corporate profits, on the contrary, rose enormously. There was a 100% rise in the concentration of income, stimulating unnecessary investment and speculation. Capital flowed into old and new industries; and while this helped prosperity by increasing the production of capital goods, it ultimately undermined prosperity itself. Excess plant capacity multiplied and aggravated competition (the "new" competition). Speculation broke loose on an unprecedented scale, capitalizing the labor of our people. Underlying these developments was the increase of 1,500,000 in unemployed workers due to the accelerated introduction of technological improvements and labor-saving devices. Investors, bankers, producers, speculators—all were dominated merely by the urge for larger and larger profits. There was no ordered economic plan, no social direction of industry, only the exploitation which is the characteristic of capitalist production. Inevitably the precarious equilibrium which is capitalist prosperity was upset.

But this crisis is characterized by other than the usual cyclical features. In the past, depressions were followed by prosperity on a larger scale, because of undeveloped forces within capitalism—the expansion of home and foreign markets and the growth of new industries. In the United States the undeveloped lands out west were an additional stimulus to expansion. But these lands are no more, there are no new industries in sight, home markets are saturated, and the competition for foreign markets is enormously aggravated. The decline of capitalism, which has tormented Europe since the World War, is now also an American phenomenon. American capitalism has plunged into imperialism, and imperialism marks the decay and decline of capitalism. This decay and decline is primary cause of the unprecedented severity and duration of the depression, and it projects the prospects of successively more violent cyclical collapses. The nature of this crisis (which is world-wide) is characterized by the fact that it occurs in the midst of the break-down of capitalist society.

THE LOGIC OF CAPITALISM

The value of the debacle of 1929, to all thinking persons, must have been that it revealed, as in a lightning-flash, the fatal character of the post-war society. The equilibrium of this society was false; its rotten foundations had been changed in no way. Outside of Soviet Russia, nearly all human services were still administered through the profit-seeking of capitalists. From this condition arose the contradictions, the frauds and imbecilities which became so apparent after the coming of depression.

Our industrialists and bankers, for all their patriotic promises to continue the New Era, to maintain "high wages" (which had been practically stationary from 1923 to 1929), began at once a work of ruthless deflation. They discharged labor, lowered wages, speeded up operations. It was a vast work of *hoarding* which they had begun, a hoarding of which they accused the masses of people. With one hand they opened charity "drives" or conducted "block-aid" campaigns, but with the other they hoarded. And the left hand could not withstand the

destructive labors of the right hand. The workers and professionals have been forced to pay for relief of the unemployed.

The prosperity spree of bankers had over-capitalized our industries, added productive power beyond people's buying capacity to already over-extended enterprises. To save the banks, the government revenues were to be raised by means of taxation, further reducing the national buying power. Thus, capital, after years of profiteering and speculation, exacted prodigal doles for itself while opposing the "dole" (unemployment insurance) for the workers and other forms of adequate relief for professionals, workers and farmers.

To a dispassionate scrutiny the statesmanship of the depression, in government and big business, seems like the random movements of lunacy; yet such a course as we have watched, such reasoning as we have been able to distinguish, represents the "logic" of capitalism.

SERFS AND VAGABONDS

After 3 years the flag is still at half mast, the economic activities of the country are at a rate of approximately 50 per cent of capacity. Our heavy industries are almost motionless; the giant steel plants, the magnificent motor factories, such as those of Ford, are shut down in great part. Our means of production, efficient enough to sustain all of us in comfort, function at half-pressure or rust away. Whole regions seem devastated as if by a plague or a war; whole industries on which millions depend seem permanently blighted. Thus the farming population, the largest and most conservative section of the country, has been driven to violence, after deepening poverty of many years standing. They have too much food to sell in a country whose masses are hungry. Though their produce is fearfully needed, it may not be sold save at terms which drive them from the land. In addition to 12,000,000 or 15,000,000 unemployed workers, other millions are employed only part time. One of the most tragic aspects of the capitalistic-made depression are the 300,000 children who, according to government reports, are completely homeless, wandering to and fro.

At a given day in 1931 the heads of several great industrial corporations, such as the United States Steel, the General Motors, the Standard Oil, in concert announced universal wage-cuts for all their workers, of 10 to 20 per cent. (Soon afterward the railroads and many other industries followed their example.) By this command most of the 40,000,000 workers in this country had their earnings and their standard of living deeply altered. And we saw at once what oppressive power a few men exercised: and how the mass of workers, largely unorganized—the conservative labor unions dare not strike back at any rate—were literally returned to serfdom. Unable to control their own destiny they became simply the army of slave-labor which capital requires.

But a great part of the army of workers were totally deprived, by the same command, of the means of living. Some of them grouped as army veterans or starving miners participated in mass uprisings or hunger riots. Many of them began to wander about hopelessly, on freight-cars or cast-off automobiles.

"Hooverville", the new No Man's Land of tin and paper covered shanties, located along the fringes of civilization, by the freight yards or ports of cities, now became the transitory gathering place of the unemployed. "Hooverville", monument to the depression, is incredible: yet, in the long run, given our present conditions and philosophy, "Hooverville" must grow larger. The future, more and more, is bound up with "Hooverville" as new classes of the population steadily fall under the system of depression.

THE PROFESSIONALS SUFFER TOO

The brain workers who give technical or education services are not spared from misfortune. As an illuminating instance of the experience of the middle class, we need only look at the political-financial chaos which has come to such an urban center as Chicago. Here, the school teachers had, up to recently, received only five months pay out of the previous thirteen months. Two thousand of them had lost their savings in bank failures. Yet at one moment the city government undertook to sell for tax defaults the houses of its employees, unable to pay their taxes, because of the city's own default in wages!

In New York City alone there are about 8,000 unemployed teachers. The American Association of University Professors has revealed that a Nation-wide drive of wage-cuts and lay-offs is on. By closing classes for adults, cutting the

school year and doubling the size of classes, the rulers of the educational system throw increasing numbers of teachers out of work. In one New Jersey town, more than 100 white-collar workers have turned to ditch-digging, competing with underpaid workers for their jobs. Dean Williamson, of the Columbia University School of Library Service has declared that students must be barred since there are already "too many" librarians. Last June, the New York City school system had to eliminate 85 per cent of its architects, engineers, and draftsmen. The New York City Chemists Club reports large numbers of trained chemists out of work. The head of the Medical Society of New York State, reports that doctors have taken to taxi driving and similar jobs to keep alive. The Dental Association reports that its members average 25 percent of their incomes of 3 years ago. An engineering school opened free graduate courses for unemployed alumni. The Journalism College dean reports that there are as many students as jobs, and the jobs are already filled to overflowing. Theatres close while actors and playwrights starve. Musicians suffer not only from the crisis but permanently from technological unemployment through the development of radio, talking-movies and the like. Artists find no market for their wares. Writers find no publishers, or much accept miserable terms, and then can count upon only a most limited sale of books. Even those business posts which require some technical training have become scarce. The personnel managers of the great trusts no longer comb the colleges for bright seniors whom they will set on on a royal road to riches. Department stores have their pick of Ph. D.'s at \$12 a week. Anxious employers seek to stem the flood of trained applicants for jobs. Professor F. W. Taussig and C. S. Joslyn, of Harvard, have shown that business leadership is in the hands of a caste, selected by birth and connections, and Professor A. B. Crawford and S. N. Clement, of Yale, have armed employers with a plan to further bar the way to jobs by instituting an "interneshp" for business. And down at the bottom, scores of thousands of students struggle through college barely able to keep alive, since adults have taken away their part-time jobs, and wonder what they will do when they graduate. All this unemployment and misery, all this training and talent thrown away, not because there are too many doctors, teachers, artists, writers, and the like, but despite the fact that this country has never yet been able to provide its population with a sufficiently large body of trained intellectuals and professionals to satisfy its cultural needs. This cultural crisis of course grows directly out of the economic crisis.

TOMORROW'S CRISIS

Turn whichever way we will, we cannot escape from the conclusion that the crisis is being managed by those who produced the crisis. They would "deflate" labor and agriculture; but they would preserve the inflation of their own capital by looting the government treasury at the cost of the people at large. To increase the rate of business activity, they seek directly to expand credit, through the central banking system, so that speculation may increase—the same speculation and heedless profiteering which contributed enormously to the present crisis. But the excesses of such a movement will inevitably generate a new depression. Will it be like this one? Smaller or greater? Greater, one is forced to assume, in the long run.

The technologists of capital have not been sleeping during these lean years. They introduce daily new means of mechanization which dispense still further with labor. A new business revival, if it is at all possible, must be brought about in the presence of a larger standing army of paupers than before. The sharing of work, in the form of part-time employment, will be organized so that poverty may be general. Thus the historic cycle continues; the pressure of surplus populations laboring at a subsistence level increases. But this condition may be relieved at almost any moment by a favorite expedient: the adventure of imperialist war.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Before and throughout this crisis, the Republican Party has controlled the Federal Government. It has not only been unable to create or maintain "prosperity," but has been interested solely in protecting privileged groups by shifting burdens to workers, farmers and professionals.

President Hoover has attacked proposals of government unemployment relief as proposals for "doles". He has set up a charity organization which, when not aiding in fighting strikers and radicalism, leads a nationwide effort to extract

pennies from the hungry so as to feed crumbs to the starving. To farmers, Republican relief through the Farm Board has meant decreased prices for products on which speculators later reap high profits, while through the Farm Loan Banks it has meant an increase in farmers' debts and a bumper crop of mortgage foreclosures. The "twelve Des Moines points" are merely warmed over dishes empty of nourishment for the poor farmer. The latter can get no better help from the administration than the cynical advice that, since he cannot sell his crops, he burn one-third of them. The Administration "relieves" professional groups by inviting them to compete for manual labor jobs, already insufficient for the population, at starvation wages.

All the Administration's financial "relief" measures have been devised by financiers for relief of financiers, and financiers have carried them out. For twelve years, a group of millionaires ornamented every Republican cabinet. Of the twelve members of the Young Committee set up by the Federal Reserve Bank to control credit, eleven were identified with the House of Morgan; most Reconstruction Finance Corporation directors belong to the financial oligarchy. Republican tax policy has protected high; and squeezed low income groups, partly by refusing to make the rich pay higher income taxes and by sales and other direct taxes bearing most heavily on the poorest elements of the population. Public works, which might temporarily somewhat mitigate unemployment—as Hoover stated when he was a Cabinet officer—have been cut.

Unwilling or unable to relieve the mass of the population, the Administration turns to magic. To a nation plunged into crisis by individualist economy, it prescribed "rugged individualism". Almost daily it announces the "return of prosperity." It floods us with slogans ("Business IS Better", "Keep Smiling", etc.) "to induce prosperity by psychological action". Eating a hair of a dog that bit him and mumbling incantations are, perhaps, creditable performances in a jungle savage; their practice by the Administration disqualifies it as a responsible element in modern civilization. In short, Republican economics maintains all prerogatives of financial and industrial interests by shifting the costs of the crisis onto those least able to bear them.

HOOVER'S FOREIGN POLICY

Republicans have abandoned the 1920 pretense of forbidding the tides of international affairs from washing our shores. They now argue that the crisis began abroad, as though their Government had not played a major role in world economic and political affairs, as though Republican Presidents had not sent representatives to every important international congress, and had not employed armed forces to carry out their foreign policy. What has this policy been?

The Government has continued imperialist aggression in Latin America, supported the bloody rule of Machado in Cuba and Gomez in Venezuela, and refused independence to the Filipinos. It has blocked the Chinese road to freedom from foreign domination, helped crush the German masses with war debts, and through financial pressure, taken the initiative in setting up the MacDonald-Tory reaction in Great Britain. It has introduced reactionary immigration laws and, while denouncing other countries for raising tariffs, has utilized tariffs in a sweeping commercial war. While dealing in comity with Italy, Hungary and other Fascist-ruled lands, as well as with the Junker von Papen, perpetrator of crimes against the workers and peasants, it has obstructed Socialist construction in the Soviet Union, denying recognition to and participating in a crusade of slander against the Soviets. In general, it has helped perpetuate the system built upon the Versailles Treaty, the oppression of colonial countries, the isolation of the Soviet Union, and the alternation of agreements to loot, and wars for loot, among imperialist powers.

The culmination of this policy is preparation for war. The Administration talks disarmament while expending huge sums on new chemical and bacteriological poisons and war machines. A few weeks ago, Hoover's army air chief demanded increased armament for war against Japan. Espionage goes forward in Japan, the Soviet Union and elsewhere. A skeleton structure for military and industrial mobilization is ready. The Administration has assembled timber enough for a conflagration more horrible than that of 1914-18.

TEAR GAS AND BAYONETS

For three years the growth and protest among our population has been steady and strong. Mr. Hoover's disastrous attempts at healing by faith and statistical

falsification have latterly been abandoned for more realistic measures. The administration's final answer to the bonus marchers was not relief but tear gas and bayonets. Both before and after Mr. Hoover provided this instructive example, local and state authorities have given a similar answer to striking workmen and the starving unemployed. Increasingly official violence is employed to break strikes, destroy unions, scatter political opposition, and gag professional groups competent to formulate criticism. The Republican Party, the party of Lincoln has of course utterly failed to oppose Jim-Crowism and Negro peonage in the South and hence bears its share of responsibility for recent outbursts of mob violence against Negroes, such as the Scottsboro case. The administration has, on the flimsiest pretense deported foreign-born workers to foreign countries where jail or the axe awaited them. It has sanctioned the Dies Bill to revive the heresy-hunts of A. Mitchell Palmer. Its Department of police has scattered its *agents provocateurs* among all militant groups that oppose its policies.

THE OFFICIAL ENEMIES OF CULTURE

We who share in the task of crystalizing, disseminating and perpetuating American culture are deeply concerned about the effect of the Republican Administration on our culture. What has it been?

All the way from Ballinger to Sam Koenig and James J. Davis, through Harding, Newberry, Fall, Daugherty, Forbes, Hays, Stephenson, the Ohio Gang and the Little Green House on K Street, Republican leaders and organizations have wallowed in speculation, embezzlement, graft and bribery. The Republican standard-bearers, Coolidge and Hoover, sat quietly in a Cabinet which systematically looted "public" property. A stench still rises in Washington and elsewhere from many a half-revealed swamp of corruption. The marriage of highly placed speculators with a vicious underworld of bootleggers and bandits has brought forth a degenerate spawn that rots the fibre of our culture, and stultifies large sections of our people.

The establishment of political censorship has led to cultural censorship. By its control over radio broadcasting, newspaper and magazine mailing privileges, and subsidies for educational institutions, the Administration has fostered reactionary propaganda and destroyed free speech and thought. It has called upon scientists in government services to stultify themselves by manufacturing lies in support of Administration propaganda. Pressed for money, it has not preferred to increase taxes on great wealth or cut high official salaries and military expenditures, but rather to cut sums destined for cultural activities. As though such actions were not enough, Hoover refuses in a bullying manner to receive or converse with a delegation of leading American writers; Secretary of Labor Doak persecutes foreign students; Secretary of the Interior Wilbur jubilates because the crisis has hobbled organized child care and training. In a hundred ways the Administration has shown that from top to bottom it is indifferent to the fate of our culture, contemptuous of its protagonists, and prepared at every moment to degrade it or stamp it out rather than sacrifice the slightest political advantage.

In short, the Republican Party, devoted to the interests of a ruling oligarchy of bankers and industrialists, is an enemy of the masses of our people, of workers, farmers and professional groups, and the organizer of their material and cultural poverty and decay.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Are there any real differences between the parties? Certainly there is a difference of language. Franklin D. Roosevelt purveys a mixtum compositum of Populist leavings, "cheap money" quackery, municipal-ownership platitudes, pious welfarism, and stale dregs of economic liberalism, in a language sometimes heated enough to invite the Republican charge that he and his party are "dangerously radical". An examination of the position and records of the Democratic Party and its candidates reveals that this is an unjustified charge. The Republican Party deals with the crisis by shifting its burdens to the masses of our people and defending the prerogatives of financiers and industrialists. The Democratic Party does not propose to do otherwise. For example, its program of nationalizing railroads is not one of benefiting the masses of the people but a proposal to purchase railroad stock at rates above the market value. It is as bold a plan to use money squeezed from the whole population for relief of the rich as Republicans have ever conceived. The rest of Democratic economics, insofar as it is concrete at all, is of the same character.

On foreign questions there is no serious divergence from Republican policy. Little is heard about the League of Nations, but there would be no gain for the

mass of our people if a Democratic Administration sent official delegates to replace Republican "unofficial observers" at League meetings; the cooperation or struggle between American and other imperial interests would be the business of those meetings just as before. As for problems centering in Latin America, China, Germany, Italy, Japan and the Soviet Union, not a word comes from Democrats to suggest that they sponsor a new policy. On the question of war, Democrats are good Republicans, perhaps the most active naval expansionist being an important Democratic Congressman.

On the question of civil rights there is no serious difference between the two parties. Roosevelt, looking to the white rulers of the South for support, utters no word of protest against even so flagrant an example of legal lynching as that perpetrated by Democratic police, prosecutors and judges in Scottsboro, Alabama. New York State troopers commanded by him as Governor join police under Republican command in the national campaign of terror against any protest from the mass of the people.

The Democratic stand on prohibition is somewhat less vague than the Republican. What either would or could do in the matter is uncertain, for both are divided between wets and dries. But what if the Democrats would modify and the Republicans would not? Is this not a Hobson's choice, between the vice bred in the illicit liquor trade under Federal Republican rule and the old vice that would return, bred by the alliance of urban Democrats and liquor interests? Above all, it is essential to note that however the parties may differ on prohibition, the question is insignificant in a time of world crisis; beer will not solve that crisis.

In the cultural field we find no significant difference between the two parties. Moral decay is as much the blood and bone of the Democratic as of the Republican Party. The oil of Teapot Dome smeared both, the division of political loot in New York City is scrupulously bipartisan. Democratic state administrations have censored and suppressed cultural activities, fostered reactionary propaganda by use of public power, and poured out money on their own behalf and that of the interests they serve while making "economies" at the expense of educational and cultural enterprises.

It cannot be overlooked that during these twelve years Democrats have dominated many states, some continuously, and have for the past year controlled the House of Congress. They have always used their share of power like the Republicans, and on many basic economic questions simply fell in line behind Hoover. The personal records of the Democratic candidates resemble those of the staunchest Republicans. Roosevelt, a wealthy New Yorker, reached his present eminence through political deals with Tammany Hall, whose good friend he remains in spite of the dust kicked up at Albany. John Nance Garner, Texas banker, exploiter of Negro and white poor farmers and workers, is a representative of one of the most brutal traditions in American life.

ARE THERE TWO PARTIES OR ONLY ONE?

No, the rock-ribbed Republican is not to be taken seriously when he calls the Democrats radical. Such a conservative as Nicholas Murray Butler, such a careful liberal as John Dewey, have repeatedly affirmed that there is no difference between the two parties. Indeed, when that corporate crook, Samuel Insull, filled the war-chests of both; when Hoover, seeking a conservative to head the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, turns to an Ohio Democrat; when New York City political spoils are neatly divided between Republican Sam Hofstadter and the Tammany Steuer family; when Republican Senators support a Democratic presidential ticket without leaving their party, and vice versa—at such times one wonders are there two parties here or only one?

In any case, there is little difference, and what there is, is verbal. Republican pretense that it monopolizes the field of serving the great financial and industrial interests of the country is unfounded. Frank Hague, Mayor of Jersey City and a member of the National Democratic Committee, is justified in proclaiming as he did last month that despite Roosevelt's campaign demagoguery "the Democratic Party is the party for the interests." Those great Democrats, Owen D. Young and John J. Raskob, heartily agree with Hague. It is the logical alternative of the Republican Party, just as Tweedledum is the logical alternative of Tweedledee—for the same job. It is the demagogic face of Republicanism, and it too is the creature of the privileged few, the enemy of the material and cultural well-being of the mass of our people, of industrial workers, farmers and professionals.

TOWARD A NEW SOCIETY

The spectacle of catastrophic economic collapse—the magnificent and recurrent capitalistic spectacle of starvation in the midst of plenty—presents the issue of social reorganization as the major issue in this campaign. The history of capitalism shows that crises and depressions are inevitable under the system of production for profit, of money making, and that the development of capitalism aggravates their violence. This depression, moreover, is no mere dip in the business cycle; it is a manifestation of the general crisis and collapse of capitalism. Even capitalist economists admit that capitalism cannot survive “as is.”

Fundamental social reorganization must eliminate the basic causes of cyclical fluctuations and depressions—production for profit, speculation, the anarchy of production, the unequal distribution of income which creates a disparity between production and consumption, the exploitation of the working class. Only Socialism can eliminate the exploitation and misery which prevail under capitalism.

Social ownership and management of the means of production and distribution become the starting point of social reorganization, economic and cultural. Industry ceases being a means of exploitation, of the accumulation of profits and fortunes; it ceases being the master of life and becomes the server of life. Socialist industry is planned; deliberately, purposively, unhampered by predatory capitalist interests—there can be neither the poverty which prevails under capitalism even in the most prosperous times nor the catastrophe and aggravated mass misery of depression. Industry becomes the creative technical problem of calculating social needs and mobilizing and reorganizing the necessary labor, machinery and raw materials.

THE PROFESSIONAL CLASSES WILL BE LIBERATED

Under Socialism science and technology are freed from their dependence upon private profit; their scope and social application are enormously increased. The professional workers, whom capitalism either exploits or forces to become exploiters, are liberated to perform freely and creatively their particular craft function—the engineer need consider only the efficiency of his work, the economist and statistician can purposively plan the organization, management and social objectives of industry, the architect is released from profit and speculative motives and may express his finest aspirations in buildings of social utility and beauty, the physician becomes the unfettered organizer of social preventive medicine, the teacher, writer, and artist fashion the creative ideology of a new world and a new culture.

It is an ideal worth fighting for, and it is a practical and realizable ideal, as is being proved in the Soviet Union. It would, moreover, be much easier to build Socialism in the United States than in Russia because of the infinitely higher development of our technology and our means of production and distribution.

THREE FALSE ROADS OUT OF THE CRISIS

The great issue of fundamental social reorganization is completely ignored by the two major parties. There are, however, three groups which recognize and distort the issue—the Fascists, the liberal intellectuals and the Socialist Party.

FASCISM

American Fascism is still insignificant, although its potential threat is great. But Fascism means social reaction and stagnation, not social reorganization, Fascism is the final resort of capitalism desperately determined to preserve its domination and prevent its own collapse.

It has been clearly demonstrated that Fascism means preservation of the dictatorship of capital under new forms, the subjection of the workers and crushing of the labor movement, the degradation of the professional groups. We know from the experience in Italy and Germany that Fascism represents the most reactionary national, imperialist and cultural ideals, and lets loose the most barbarous prejudices and appetites. We know that in Italy under the Fascist dictatorship there is economic stagnation and cultural decay, in contrast with the new world and the new culture being created in the Soviet Union. Fascism means the collapse of civilization, a new Dark Ages. It is the death rattle of decaying capitalism.

ECONOMIC PLANNING

The liberal intellectuals also base their program upon decaying capitalism, which they wish to revitalize by means of national economic planning. They admit the success of planning in the Soviet Union, but they evade the fundamental issue: Soviet planning is *Socialist* planning, possible and successful *only* because the capitalists have been deprived of their power, and industry is socially owned and managed. The liberal intellectuals wish to resort to planning merely to patch up capitalism, not as an element in the creation of a new world and a new culture.

In its larger objectives—the elimination of cyclical fluctuations and depressions—national economic planning is necessarily wrecked by the capitalist system of profit, speculation and competition, and by the unequal distribution of income which creates a disparity between production and consumption—the fundamental cause of cyclical disturbances. National economic planning in various forms has been practiced in Germany, Italy, France and England, yet these countries are also in the midst of depression, unemployment and starvation.

The liberals assume that capitalism can organize itself socially. But capitalism has been organizing itself for years—trusts, cartels, state capitalism, national planning—and the capitalist world is now in the midst of the most catastrophic depression in history. In fact, capitalist “organization” aggravates and prolongs the depression, as it prevents the free play of economic forces—the “blood letting” of liquidation—which is the only method capitalism knows of restoring “prosperity.” In its limited (and practical) objectives, national economic planning strengthens state capitalism, which constitutes the economic aspect of the Fascist dictatorship.

THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY

The Socialist Party also believes in national economic planning under capitalism. It merely insists that the planning must be done by Socialist politicians and must include a measure of government ownership. They have faith that planning is possible under capitalism; in fact the German Socialists insist that capitalism is becoming “organized”, capable of preventing crises and depressions! The Socialists do not believe that the overthrow of capitalism is the primary essential for successful economic planning, and in this sense their proposals are not much different from those of the liberal intellectuals.

Despite its pretensions the Socialist Party is only a party of “progressivism” and “good government”, of mere reformism which builds up state capitalism, and thus strengthens the capitalist state and potential Fascism. Norman Thomas has vague aspirations for the “good life”, but his socialism is practically non-existent (as is admitted even by many members of his own party). “Good government” may help the tax-payer, but it cannot help industrial and professional workers tormented by unemployment, wage-cuts and exploitation. What benefits can these expect to gain from the cry of Norman Thomas and his party in New York City to “clear the Tammany rascals out”?

In the present campaign the Socialist leaders are considered safe and sane by the capitalist press, which is giving the Socialist candidates, particularly Norman Thomas, an unprecedented amount of favorable publicity. The ultimate purpose of these maneuvers is to prevent the unemployed and dispossessed from voting Communist and initiating a real struggle against capitalism. A more immediate purpose of the Republican Party is to switch the “protest” votes to Norman Thomas and thereby help to re-elect Hoover. The capitalists may dislike Socialists but they do not fear them; the capitalists make use of the Socialists wherever necessary—to preserve capitalism in Germany, to bolster capitalism and empire in Great Britain, to build capitalism in Spain, to head off the Communists in the United States. This is not what the Socialist Party members and voters may want, but it is what they get from the Socialist policy and leaders.

A PARTY OF INACTION

The Socialist Party leaders do not stress the need of a recreated labor movement; wherever they are in power in the unions they pursue a policy identical in general with that of William Green and Matthew Woll and the other misleaders of labor. They do not emphasize industrial unionism and the organization of the unorganized workers, without which there can be no militant labor movement in the United States. What the Socialists expect primarily from the unions is that they vote the Socialist ticket, in return for which the union leaders will be allowed

to misgovern the unions in peace. Nor is the Socialist Party waging an aggressive campaign in favor of economic and social equality for the Negro; in fact the party maintains "Jim Crow" locals down South. The Socialist Party asks for votes, playing practical politics; but it evades all real struggle and enlightenment on fundamental issues.

The Socialist Party does not participate actively as a party in the vital everyday struggles—the struggle of the workers against wage cuts, the demonstrations of the unemployed for relief and unemployment insurance and their resistance to evictions, the defense of political prisoners, the fight of the Negro against racial discrimination and lynching, the struggle of professional groups to formulate their grievances. When individual Socialists engage in these struggles, they do so either under Communist leadership or else by adopting Communist tactics—and they are not encouraged by the leaders of their own party. The aim of the Socialist Party is not to fight but to get votes and elect its candidates to office.

Votes—these are all it asks of the professional groups, but it makes no attempt to understand the problems and social functions of the professionals. Nor does the Socialist Party wage a struggle on the cultural front. It almost completely ignores cultural problems. It ignores the fact that the Socialist revolution is also and necessarily a cultural revolution.

The Socialist Party claims that it is against imperialist war. But the party does not wage an aggressive campaign against war. The experience of history, moreover, proves that Socialist words are not to be trusted. The European Socialists, with the exception of the left wing groups which later became the basis of the Communist International, supported the imperialist war of 1914–1918. The American Socialist Party, under pressure of the left wing which two years later seceded and formed the Communist Party, adopted a resolution against American participation in the war, but the resolution was largely ignored by the leaders. Two months after his "anti-war" campaign in New York City, Morris Hillquit abandoned the implications of the party resolution against the war when he said: "If I had believed that our participation would shorten the world war and force a better, more democratic and more durable peace, I should have favored the measure, regardless of the cost and sacrifices to America." (*New Republic*, December 1, 1917.) The party's representative in Congress and its representatives in the New York City Board of Aldermen also largely ignored the anti-war resolution. Moreover, Victor L. Berger and his paper, the *Milwaukee Leader*, had for years urged the American conquest and annexation of Mexico. In a series of articles during 1915 the *Leader* argued that it was a "perfidious illusion" to hope that "American intervention can and must be prevented", and continued: "If Mexico is annexed, the Mexican people will lose their national independence, but they gain admission to the American labor movement and the American Socialist Party." Victor Berger was not expelled, he was not even disciplined. Nor is the Socialist Party actively engaged in the struggle against capitalist intervention in the Soviet Union, while Socialist enmity against the world's first proletarian republic encourages the hopes of the interventionist forces.

Norman Thomas stresses the danger of an American Fascism. But his own party is indirectly helping Fascism by its insistence on democracy, evading the issue of militant organization and struggle. To insist on democracy as the answer to Fascism is to oppose air to bullets, for Fascism repudiates democracy and develops out of bourgeois democracy. In Germany, for example, the Fascist danger has been enormously aggravated by the policy of the German Socialist leaders: The Socialist government saved democracy against the Communist "menace" and the result was—the nationalist reactionary government of Hindenburg and Von Papen and the growth of the Fascist danger.

The Socialist Party claims that it works for Socialism. But the unalterable granite facts are:

—wherever the Socialists have had the power they have rejected the task of building Socialism.

—only in the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Communists, is Socialism being built up.

And what is the Socialist attitude to the Soviet Union? It is in large part an attitude of hostility, of hatred, of hope that the great endeavor may collapse. European Socialists are among the most active forces of the intervention movement.

In America the Socialist Party is two-faced on the great issue of Socialism in the Soviet Union. One group is openly hostile, joining hands with the most venomous European Socialist enemies of the Soviet Union. Another group has

words of seeming praise, they say there are many good things about the Socialist "experiment" in the Soviet Union, but that "we" must do it "differently". Thus they try to "cash in" on the great achievements of the Soviet Union while refusing to organize the struggle for Socialism in the United States.

By its record in Germany, France, Spain, England and in Russia during the Revolution, the Socialist Party has proved itself to be a bulwark of the capitalist system. Is it any different in this country? American Socialists sometimes says, "We are not responsible for what Socialists do in Europe", but that is an evasion. The party is the same all over the world, a member of the Second International, which everywhere is a bulwark of capitalism; in America it has had little political power and therefore has not exposed itself completely; but the Socialists of Milwaukee, Allentown, New York, Schenectady and Reading have acted exactly like their European brethren.

The Socialists are the third party of capitalism.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist Party stands for a Socialism of deeds, not of words. It appeals for the support of the American working classes, not like the Socialist Party on the basis of broken and unfulfilled promises, but with concrete evidence of revolutionary achievement both at home and abroad.

Already in Soviet Russia, under the leadership of the Communists, unemployment has been wiped out, a gigantic reconstruction of industry to extend a Socialist planned economy has been undertaken, and a cultural revolution of tremendous dimensions has been won on many fronts. The Soviet Union has freed women from age-old social disabilities and discrimination, provided national and racial minorities with an opportunity to develop their own cultural life, broken down the barriers between city and country and adopted the most advanced system of social insurance in the world. For the first time in recorded history a civilization has emerged unified by a living faith in man's ability to create a classless society in which "the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all", in which every human being is privileged to participate in the collective effort of the whole.

Whatever burdens must be shouldered fall upon all alike. These will be conquered in the future just as famine, blockade, invasion, have been conquered. Until then no one lives in luxury and no one suffers from need. Contrast this with capitalist America in which the luxury of a few is flaunted in the face of hungry and homeless millions.

The Communist Party of America proposes as the real solution of the present crisis the overthrow of the system which is responsible for all crises. This can only be accomplished by the conquest of political power and the establishment of a workers' and farmers' government which will usher in the Socialist commonwealth. The Communist Party does not stop short merely with a proclamation of its revolutionary goal. It links that goal up with the daily battles of the working class for jobs, bread and peace. Its actions and achievements are impressive evidence of its revolutionary sincerity.

The Communist Party is the only party which has stood in the forefront of the major struggle of the workers against capital and the capitalist state. It has unflinchingly met every weapon of terror which frenzied capitalist dictatorship has let loose upon it—clubbings, imprisonment, deportation and murder. It has rallied thousands of workers to resist the onslaught upon their already low standard of living. It has fought the Jim Crow system used by the capitalist class to divide and weaken the working class. It has fought the evictions of the unemployed. It has fought and is prepared to fight in the struggles of every group of exploited workers in the country—the miner, the steel worker, the farmer, the ex-serviceman. It has unmasked the class character of justice dispensed in American courts and led mass demonstrations in behalf of victims of legal frame-ups—notably Tom Mooney and the Scottsboro boys and against the deportations of militant workers. In the present crisis the Communist Party has been the only party which has thrown down a militant challenge to the ruling class and unfolded a program of mass activity.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY PLATFORM

Let us judge it by its election program of immediate demands:

1. The Communist Party demands *unemployment and social insurance at the expense of the state and employers*. This demand is radically distinguished from all other programs for unemployment insurance in that it does not seek to saddle the worker with the costs of his own insurance. All other schemes involve a form of insurance in which payments made to workers are in part, at least, noth-

ing but deferred wages. Since the total profit of capitalist enterprise is derived from the unpaid labor of the workers, the Communist Party as an immediate measure demands that the cost of insurance be paid by those who appropriate the profits.

2. The Communist Party demands a *militant struggle against Hoover's wage-cutting policy*. The attempts made to conceal the extent of unemployment by spreading work through the stagger system, the Share-the-Work movement, is the most transparent device for reducing the wages and standards of living of the working class. An acceptance of a wage-cut by any group of workers not only tends to induce wage cuts among other groups; it undermines the fighting morale of their organizations and leaves them helpless for further action.

3. The Communist Party demands *emergency relief for the impoverished farmers without restrictions by the government and the banks; exemption of impoverished farmers from taxes and no forced collection of rents or debts*. No other measures can save the poorer farmers from losing their heavily mortgaged farms and being thrust into peonage or pauperism. While in the cities the demagogues cry "back to the land," the working farmers are actually being put off the land.

4. The Communist Party demands *equal rights for the Negroes and self-determination for the Black Belt*. It calls for an end to the policy of supine acceptance of legal and extra-legal lynchings, of social discrimination and political disfranchisement. It holds that the necessary condition for all equality is social equality and that social equality can only be won by the joint struggle of white and Negro workers against their common oppressors. It breaks with the policy of empty promises, deceit and betrayal which has characterized the attitudes of the Republican, Democratic and Socialist Parties towards the Negro masses. It has sealed its sincerity in the struggle for the liberation of the Negroes with the blood of its organizers—heroic white and colored workers who have fallen victims of the lynch terrorism of the Southern landlords and the Northern capitalists.

5. The Communist Party appeals for a united front *against capitalist terror; against all forms of suppression of the political rights of the workers*. The more the crisis eats its way into the vitals of capitalist society, the more ruthlessly does the capitalist class set itself to destroy all militant workers' organizations. It does not hesitate to sweep aside its own "sacred" constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and assembly and at the same time accuses Communists of attempting to undermine constitutional rights. It has met peaceful demonstrations for bread with bullets. It has resorted to the crudest frame-ups in order to railroad working-class leaders to jail. As the crisis sharpens, the campaign of injunctions, deportations and violence threatens to develop into an organized war against radical trade unions, unemployed councils and workers' defense organizations. The Communist Party alone calls upon the working class for action to meet capitalist class terror.

6. The Communist Party appeals for a united front *against imperialist war; for the defense of the Chinese people and of the Soviet Union*. Capitalism breeds war as inevitably as it breeds crisis. The quest for profits leads to the search for foreign markets—the search for foreign markets, to struggle with suppressed nationalities and rival capitalist groups. War is welcomed by the capitalist class as a method of disposing of surplus commodities and surplus wage workers. War under modern conditions of technology and science recognizes no distinction between the front and the rear, between combatant and non-combatant. It means pitting the workers of one country against the workers of another in order to call them off from the war of class against class. At the present moment imperialist war is raging in China; tomorrow world capitalism is prepared to launch its holy crusade against the Soviet Union. The Communist Party demands an open war against capitalist war. It rallies the workers in munition factories and on the sea-front to strike against shipping war materials. It calls upon the working class to be prepared to transform the coming imperialist war against mythical enemies without into a revolutionary war against the real class enemy within.

THE COMMUNIST ROAD TO A NEW SOCIETY

What is the relationship between these immediate demands and the revolutionary goal of Communism? It does not require much reflection to see that they are integrally connected. The immediate demands of the Communist Party differ from those of the reformist parties in that they are not proposed as sops to be thrown to discontented workers and farmers in order to prevent

revolution. They are the first steps, under existing conditions, toward the overthrow of capitalism. Each demand furnishes the basis for a broad mass organization and mass activity.

The so-called reform plans in the election platforms of other parties call for the perpetuation of the capitalist system under the guise of patching up either the currency system or the tariff or the farm policy. Their voice of protest against the abuses of capitalism is merely the swan song of the middle classes which the processes of centralization of industry and concentration of wealth have put on the auction-block. Those parties of reform first confuse the minds of the workers with radical words and then betray them by their official acts. They no more can prevent wage cuts, unemployment and war than their soup kitchens can wipe out want.

The Communist Party does not sit back in sectarian blindness waiting for Communism to come by gentle inevitability in the distant future. It organizes the workers in the factories and mines, in offices and schools, in the city and country, in the army and navy, to fight for their rights, and to resist the attempt of the capitalists to make the masses shoulder the burdens of the world crisis.

WHY VOTE COMMUNIST

Why vote for the Communist Party? Because it offers the only practicable solution of the crisis—a workers' and farmers' government. Because it leads in the attack on the capitalist class and its tool, the capitalist state. *Because it is the only organization which can now wring genuine concessions from the ruling classes.*

No ruling class ever surrenders voluntarily a morsel of its power. It must be forced by the threat of the growing power of a militant revolutionary organization to do so. That is why those who are not prepared at the present moment to accept the full revolutionary program of the Communist Party should support it in the coming election. For only if the Communist Party rolls up a strong vote can the capitalist be frightened into acceding to its immediate demands. The capitalist class does not fear the Socialist Party, which it praises for moderation and sweet reasonableness. It fears and hates the Communist Party because it knows it really means to work towards a Socialist State.

The history of the class struggle in America since 1929 proves that it has been the revolutionary demands of the Communist Party which have forced the national and local governments to recognize unemployment and at least make gestures at relief. It was only after March 6, 1930, when Communist demonstrations against unemployment had been broken up throughout the country, and Wm. Z. Foster served six months in prison after his arrest for leading the demonstration, that the country awoke to the effects of the collapse of the previous fall. In New York it was only after a deputation of unemployed under Communist leadership had been clubbed by the police, that the Board of Estimate was compelled to make grants for relief. In St. Louis it required a march on city hall by thousands of workers under Communist leadership before the municipal government restored hungry families to the relief rolls. Even where the Communist Party fails to attain its immediate objective, its failure, by bringing into action great masses with potential revolutionary capacities, accomplishes more for the workers than the successes of the capitalist parties.

A vote for any party but the Communist Party is worse than a wasted vote. It is a vote for the class enemies of the workers. A vote for hunger, war, unemployment; for the thousand-fold material and spiritual oppressions which flow from capitalism. A vote for the Communist Party is not a wasted vote. It is an effective protest against a system which permits the necessities of life to be destroyed rather than let them be consumed by those who cannot pay for them.

Why should intellectual workers be loyal to the ruling class which frustrates them, stultifies them, patronizes them, makes their work ridiculous, and now starves them? There are teachers on the bread lines, engineers patching the sheet-iron shacks in the "Hooversvilles," musicians fiddling in the "jungles." The professionals are not yet starving as the proletariat is starving. But since 1929 there reigns a permanent superfluity in the ranks of the professional groups. We "intellectuals," like the workers, find ourselves superfluous. Is that because there is too much civilization, too much "culture"? No, it is because there is not enough.

We, too, the intellectual workers, are of the oppressed, and until we shake off the servile habit of that oppression we shall build blindly and badly, to the lunatic specifications of ignorance and greed. If we are capable of building a

civilization, surely it is time for us to begin; time for us to assert our function, our responsibility; time for us to renew the pact of comradeship with the struggling masses, trapped by the failure of leadership in the blind miseries of a crumbling madhouse. In a few years dwindling opportunities for employment brought on by progressive rationalization of industry, capitalist economies in the social services of government and the whole anarchistic system of education which prevails under capitalism—will mean the pauperization of the most highly creative groups in society.

What is worse, the spiritual degradation which every independent intellectual or professional worker suffers when false money-standards are applied to his creative craft, will grow deeper. Today it is difficult for the professional conscientiously to perform his work in the face of demands made by his employers—that he use his art, his science, his skill for ends that are foreign to his professional activity. Tomorrow it will be impossible for the intellectual to function as a free personality under the pressure of vocational unemployment and the necessity of serving those upon whom he is dependent.

It is important that the professional workers realize that they do not constitute an independent economic class in society. They can neither remain neutral in the struggle between capitalism and Communism nor can they by their own independent action effect any social change. Their choice is between serving either as the cultural lieutenants of the capitalist class or as allies and fellow travelers of the working class. That for them is the historic issue which cannot be straddled by the multifiform varieties of personal escape or settled by flying to the vantage points of above-the-battle moralities.

The struggle for the emancipation of society from the blight of capitalism is not only an economic question, it is a cultural question as well. Both in theory and in practice, capitalism is hostile to the genuine culture of the past and present and bitterly opposed to the new cultural tendencies which have grown out of the epic of working class struggle for a new society. "The bourgeoisie has robbed of their haloes various occupations hitherto regarded with awe and veneration. Doctor, lawyer, priest, poet and scientist have become its wage-laborers . . . it has left no other bond between man and man . . . but crude self-interest and unfeeling 'cash payment.'" No genuine culture can thrive in a society in which malnutrition is a natural cause of death, the exploitation of man by man the natural cause of wealth, and foreign war and domestic terror the natural means of retaining political power. It is capitalism which is destructive of all culture and Communism which desires to save civilization and its cultural heritage from the abyss to which the world crisis is driving it.

The intellectual worker is confronted on all sides by the massed unity of capitalism—chaotic and benighted in itself, yet organized enough when it works with its pawns—enforcing its own needs, confining them to its own limited and sterilizing program. How long will he suffocate within this narrow house? When will he attempt to break through this closed circle by alliance with the only militant force which seeks renovation?

In the interests of a truly human society in which all forms of exploitation have been abolished; in behalf of a new cultural renaissance which will produce integrated, creative personalities, we call upon all men and women—especially workers in the professions and the arts—to join in the revolutionary struggle against capitalism under the leadership of the Communist Party.

Vote Communist—For Foster and Ford—on November 8.

ORIGIN OF THIS PAMPHLET

In September, 1932, a group of over fifty American writers, painters, teachers and other professional workers declared their support of Foster and Ford and the Communist ticket in the 1932 national election. The following statement was given to the press:

"We are convinced that both the Republican and Democratic parties represent the interests of the moneyed classes, that is, of the big manufacturers, capitalists and bankers, and not the interests of the people at large; that there is no way out of the crisis through either of them. Both parties are hopelessly corrupt, and both will try to save the profits of the rich at the expense of the rest of the population.

"The Socialists aim, in theory, to abolish the present system, but are doing nothing to organize a labor movement by which this may be accomplished. They have no convincing plan. And the example of the British and German Socialists is far from reassuring. In Great Britain and Germany, the Socialists went over to the side of the rich as soon as the capitalist state seemed in danger.

"We believe that the only effective way to protest against the chaos, the appalling wastefulness, and the indescribable misery inherent in the present economic system is to vote for the Communist candidates.

"The Communist Party alone is working to educate and organize the classes dispossessed by the present system, so as to make them an efficient instrument for establishing a new society based on equal opportunity to work, equable distribution of income, and ownership by the people of the national resources.

"We therefore pledge our support in the national elections to the Communist Party and its candidates, William Z. Foster and James W. Ford, and call upon all educators, writers, engineers, social workers, artists, architects and intellectuals in general to join this move and form 'Foster and Ford' Committees throughout the country."

In October this group was organized as The League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford. An editorial committee was appointed and instructed to expand the original statement into a 10,000 word "Open Letter," and publish it as an election pamphlet. This pamphlet is now issued under the title of "Culture and the Crisis."

Leonie Adams
 Sherwood Anderson
 Newton Arvin
 Emjo Basshe
 Maurice Becker
 Slater Brown
 Fielding Burke
 Erskine Caldwell
 Robert Cantwell
 Winifred L. Chappell
 Lester Cohen
 Louis Colman
 Lewis Corey
 Henry Cowell
 Malcolm Cowley
 Bruce Crawford
 Kyle S. Crichton
 Countee Cullen
 H. W. L. Dana
 Adolf Dehn
 John Dos Passos
 Howard N. Doughty, Jr.
 Miriam Allen De Ford
 Waldo Frank
 Alfred Frueh
 Murray Godwin

Eugene Gordon
 Horace Gregory
 Louis Grudin
 John Herrmann
 Granville Hicks
 Sidney Hook
 Sidney Howard
 Langston Hughes
 Orrick Johns
 William N. Jones
 Matthew Josephson
 Alfred Kreymborg
 Louis Lozowick
 Grace Lumpkin
 Felix Morrow
 Samuel Ornitz
 James Rorty
 Isidor Schneider
 Frederick L. Schuman
 Edwin Seaver
 Herman Simpson
 Lincoln Steffens
 Charles Walker
 Robert Whitaker
 Edmund Wilson
 Ella Winter

Five cents per copy; \$1.00 for 25; \$3.50 for 100.

Send orders to: League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford, 35 East 12th Street, New York City.

EXHIBIT 3

FEBRUARY 9, 1943.

To: The United States Civil Service Commission.

From: Frederick L. Schuman, Political Analyst, German Section, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission.

EXCERPTS FROM PUBLISHED WRITINGS SINCE 1931

The following quotations from my published writings are designed to supplement and illustrate the testimony presented in the hearing of February 3. They are not offered for the purpose of suggesting that I am at present anti-Russian in my outlook or opposed to the present American-Soviet alliance or to further lend-lease assistance to the Soviet. They are offered as proof that my attitudes and convictions regarding international affairs during the past twelve years have never been motivated by sympathy toward Communism or toward Russia, but exclusively by the belief that American security and the democratic way of life were threatened primarily by Fascist and Japanese aggression and that this threat could be met only by the cooperation of all anti-Fascist forces on a world scale and by common action against the Axis by all the

Powers including Russia, which are now united in the United Nations. I have consistently praised Soviet foreign policy when it worked in this direction and have consistently cooperated with all groups in the United States, of all political complexions which have favored common resistance to international aggression. I have consistently attacked Soviet foreign policy whenever it sought to appease the Axis or to indulge in aggression on behalf of the U. S. S. R. I have consistently denounced all groups in the United States standing for isolationism, pacifism, appeasement or defeatism, whatever their motives or affiliations.

My views have never reflected any "party line" save the "line" of the League of Nations in the earlier period and the "line" of the United Nations in the more recent period. My sole concern has been with the preservation of democratic capitalism and with the interests and safety of the United States of America. The extent to which the views of other individuals and groups have approached toward, or deviated from, by own convictions as to how these purposes could best be served has at all times been purely coincidental.

The following quotations represent but a small sample of my voluminous publications and public utterances during the past decade. They could readily be supplemented by numerous other statements in similar vein from my frequent articles in popular and scholarly periodicals and by my observations on various Nation-wide radio programs, particularly the University of Chicago Round Table and the Town Hall of the Air. I would call particular attention in this connection to my radio debate with Norman Thomas on the Town Hall Program of March 28, 1940, in which I urged all-out American aid to the Allies as the best guarantee of American peace and security, and to my article in the *New Republic* of July 8, 1940, urging an American declaration of war on the Axis. During the period when Moscow was pursuing an appeasement policy and when American Socialists and Communists, as well as many Democrats and Republicans, were urging isolationist neutrality, I remained a firm and consistent advocate of intervention and of national and international solidarity against the menace of Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany and Imperialist Japan.

QUOTATIONS

On Communist Parties and the Communist Danger (from *WAR AND DIPLOMACY IN THE FRENCH REPUBLIC*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, N. Y. 1931.)

Page 16: On the ultra-right l'ACTION FRANCAISE constitutes a noisy, intensely nationalistic, antiparliamentary group of Royalists, while on the ultra-left, as a result of the split in the Socialist ranks in 1920, there has appeared the *Communist Party* as the French section of the Communist International—equally noisy and antiparliamentary, and committed to violent international social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Page 422: War between Great Powers under modern conditions means financial bankruptcy, economic collapse, and social revolution. If it recurs on a grand scale, the final consequences may be *general ruin—and out of ruin the triumph of communism*, i. e., of the will to power of the Fourth Estate striving to demolish nationalism, capitalism, and the whole Western State System at a blow. Security and peace demand a subordination of national interests to general interests and the building of new attitudes and institutions which will transform international anarchy into international government and permit national States to pursue power through discussion and compromise on the basis of a common consensus of higher and more permanent values transcending lesser and more immediate goods * * * the strides which have been taken toward the goal since the creation of the League of Nations have been long and steady—so much so as to render plausible the hopes of those who insist that *international education and international organization can achieve peace* even in a civilization as disorderly, anarchic, and resistant to new values as that which now stands at the crossroads. Another decade should reveal whether the new or the old is to triumph.

On the Profit Motive (from *ROTARY: A UNIVERSITY GROUP LOOKS AT THE ROTARY CLUB OF CHICAGO*. University of Chicago Press, 1934).

Page 90: In the last analysis, the problem of reconciling the profit incentive with the service ideal is, objectively considered, an unreal problem. It is a subjective problem only insofar as a certain type of Rotarian makes it one by his unconsciously repressed guilt-feelings about profits, which have no rational basis. *The assumption of the present report is that honest profits are perfectly legitimate and desirable, that Rotary contacts may legitimately be used for business purposes, and that Rotary service—to the member's vocation, to his community,*

to his country and to the world—is a worthy ideal so long as it is not viewed as a means to profit or as a disguise for the profit incentive. From a rational point of view, the goal should be not service “for” profit nor service “instead of” profit, but service “and” profit, each a unique good in itself, unrelated to the other.

On Individualism, Fascism, Communism and American Business Leadership
(from ROTARY).

Pages 93-95: The old individualism promoted national prosperity and general welfare, in addition to business profits, during the period of rapid economic expansion and inexhaustible markets. But in a period of economic stagnation it brings a train of evils in its wake—deflation, the collapse of credit and of currencies, unemployment and poverty, interclass hostility, tariff wars, and international conflict on an unprecedented and disastrous scale. These are the fruits of the uncontrolled and unintegrated strivings of business men for high profits, of labor unions for high wages, of patriots for power, of diplomats for prestige.

The present world-crisis is in all probability not “just another depression” which will pass if only people wait around patiently, like Mr. Micawber, for something to turn up. It will not be resolved by any “return to fundamentals,” by any backward steps to the values and attitudes and policies of the nineteenth century. It will in all probability be resolved only by collective action, by the mobilization of collective social intelligence, by the establishment of social controls and economic planning bodies to integrate and co-ordinate the activities of individuals and groups into a program of collective progress.

*Such steps may be taken sanely and gradually, while there is yet time, if they are not resisted by the forces of inertia and reaction. They do not necessarily imply “socialism” or an expansion of governmental functions. They do imply collective action by the leaders of the industrial societies of western civilization in thinking through problems, in working out a co-operative program of remedial measures. If they are not taken in this wise, they may be taken in a violent and destructive fashion highly perilous to American business institutions and to American political traditions. The extreme right road to collectivism leads to Fascism. The extreme left road leads to Communism. Neither of these gospels of despair is relevant to American conditions so long as there is still a possibility of intelligent self-direction on the part of the American business community. But the need of intelligent self-direction is urgent and desperate if American business and the business of the world are to emerge safely from the morass into which they are slowly sinking. * * * The attempt now under way to set our economic machinery functioning again is Rotary’s great opportunity. It calls for vigorous and intelligent leadership of the highest type on the part of outstanding business and professional men. The crisis will be resolved, if it is resolved, not by farmers or laborers, nor yet by petty merchants and shop keepers, but by those business leaders possessed of social prestige, economic power, and political influence. These leaders must necessarily act not individually but collectively, if the fruits of the old individualism are to be preserved.*

On the Communist Conspiracy and the Road to Chaos (from INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE WESTERN STATE SYSTEM, 1st Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., N. Y., 1933) (N. B. This Book has gone through two other editions, 1937 and 1941, and has been adopted as a Standard text book in its field by over 100 American Colleges and Universities.)

Pages 840-841: Communism is obviously a road to world unity which leads to the goal through oceans of tears and blood. It postulates the inevitability of complete chaos and irremediable catastrophe before chaos can be replaced by a new order. * * * The world revolution might see most of the western societies reduced to ashes and wreckage. In so immense a catastrophe the debris might prove insufficient for reconstruction, even in the event of speedy Communist victory. In the absence of victory, or in the event of victory after a long combat of mutual exhaustion and destruction, the triumphant comrades might find the world a charnel house of smoldering ruin—scarcely a fit scheme of social and economic experimentation. * * * The Communist International, as the “General Staff of the World Revolution,” is already preparing the blueprints of this open conspiracy against the established order. If the sequence of events unfolds as the Communists anticipate, and if their plans are eventually carried into successful execution, the world, or most of the world, will indeed attain political unity before the close of the present century. But it will be a world over which the four horsemen of the Apocalypse have ridden roughshod on hoofs of steel.

It will be a world so broken, so gutted, so bloodstained and weary and hungry that the survivors may easily become more interested in merely keeping alive than in the splendid vision of the future cooperative commonwealth of the world proletariat. This road lies through the valley of the shadow, and none who still hope for peace and the triumph of reason can willingly accept it.

On the Hitler Stalin Pact of 1939 (from NIGHT OVER EUROPE, Alfred A. Knopf, N. Y., January, 1941).

Pages 282-284: Stalin threw away the sympathy of Western liberals and radicals who had admired the U. S. S. R. for its firm opposition to Fascist aggression and had hoped that Soviet society would evolve into a socialist democracy. In grasping Hitler's hand, Stalin revealed himself to be but another Caesar, conniving in aggression against the weak and preparing himself to become an aggressor. In so doing he not only rendered the surviving Communist parties in the West ridiculous by their ludicrous ignorance of what was happening and their pretense of self-righteous omniscience, but he turned admiration to disgust among millions of sympathizers. Communism's anti-Fascist role was played out, no less than Fascism's anti-Communist role. * * * Stalin's basic error lay in the fact that his initial assumption was as wrong as Hitler's was right. This assumption was all but irrevocable. The U. S. S. R. had thrown away its only possible allies against Great Germany. Chamberlain and Daladier were doubtless impossible as allies. But they and their kind would not survive the war in any case. If France and Britain as Powers also failed to survive, Russia would be left alone to confront a foe so formidable as to leave the Soviet Union without hope of survival. For Hitler the pact of August 23 might spell world hegemony. For Stalin it might spell annihilation. In the short run, it was clever and perhaps necessary. In the long run, it threatened to be catastrophic.

On the Soviet Attack on Finland 1939 (from a letter in the New York Times of Dec. 10, 1939, quoted in NIGHT OVER EUROPE).

Page 406 (following a review of the treaty obligations violated by the U. S. S. R.): All of these obligations, which the U. S. S. R. took the initiative in proposing, are still binding today. All of them cover precisely the situation arising out of the Finnish-Soviet dispute of November. All of them have been wantonly swept aside by the U. S. S. R. in a fashion *legally and ethically indistinguishable from the lawless aggressions committed by Japan, Italy, and Germany*. None of the possible justifications which can be adduced in defense of Soviet policy toward Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania applies to Finland. *Moscow stands condemned by the language of its own treaty obligations*. The commitments assumed under the Pact of Paris, moreover, mean that Moscow, along with Berlin, Rome, and Tokio, has violated its treaty obligations toward the United States.

The U. S. S. R. has thus joined the forces of international anarchy and criminality. Since the treaty rights of America, no less than those of Finland, have been infringed upon, the United States is legally entitled to protest and to retaliate. And, since Americans are not and cannot afford to be "neutral" in any conflict between order and lawlessness, it is to be hoped that the President and the Secretary of State will find effective means of bringing home to the rulers and people of the U. S. S. R. the *enormity of the crime which they are committing and the revulsion with which American citizens view the outrageous conduct of the Kremlin*.

Williamstown, Mass., December 6, 1939.

On the Folly of Soviet Appeasement of Hitler (from DESIGN FOR POWER, Alfred A. Knopf, N. Y., January, 1942).

Pages 203-204: After mid-summer of 1939, however, *the U. S. S. R., in the name of "peace", "Neutrality" and "nonintercention", pursued exactly the same course toward the Nazi menace which Chamberlain and Daladier had pursued so long and with such bitter results*. There was a slight difference of vocabulary: the Western Munichmen praised Hitler early for saving Europe from "Bolshevism", while the Eastern Moscovemen praised him late for fighting the Anglo-French "plutocrats" and "imperialists". There was also a slight difference in geography; the Anglo-French appeasers sought safety by turning Hitler against Russia, while the Muscovite appeasers sought safety by turning him against the Western Powers. Downing Street and the Quai d'Orsay failed miserably in their enterprise. The Narkomindel, or Soviet Foreign Office, succeeded brilliantly.

But successful appeasement is as fatal as unsuccessful appeasement. For appeasement is weakness, and the wise aggressor will always attack the weak first and leave the strong to be dealt with later. Power, moreover, is relative, and the aggressor who is aided by one of his neighbors to destroy another is thereby

strengthened to destroy the neighbor who has helped him to his first success. France, Britain and all the lesser States of the Continent learned this lesson too late. Russia and America learned it even later, to the vast delight of the Fuhrer and his allies. Isolationism is the pleasant drug with which aggressors dope and dupe their victims. The drug is fatal, whether taken with vodka or with wine or Scotch or cocktails.

On the Soviet Purge Trials (from DESIGN FOR POWER).

Page 215: As in all dictatorships, ruthless means were held to be justified by ideal ends. But to critics the ends seem to be destroyed by the means.

"The tyrant, if he means to rule," wrote Plato, "must get rid of those who speak their mind until he has made a purge of the State. And the more detestable his actions are to the citizens, the more satellites and the greater devotion in them will he require." Apart from celebrities, thousands and possibly tens of thousands of humble men and women lost their liberties or their lives. There was little publicity given to the proceedings, save in the case of the "Old Bolsheviks"—and of these only those who agreed to confess were given public trials. When asked by Lady Astor how long he proposed to keep shooting people, Stalin replied imperturbably: "As long as necessary." The victims doubtless included many actual or potential Fifth Columnists and Trojan Horses. Unlike the leaders of the democracies, Staline believed in placing such figures not in Cabinet posts or in army commands, but in prison or in the cemetery. *The victims also included many who were liquidated out of personal malice.* The principal scapegoat, Leon Trotsky, was assassinated in his home near Mexico City on August 21, 1940. Trotskyites said the killer was a Stalinist tool. Stalinists said he was a disgruntled Trotskyite who felt that Trotsky had betrayed Trotskyism.

EXHIBIT 4

VOTE FOR WORKERS CANDIDATES ENDORSED BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY

SMASH THE BOSSES' PROGRAM OF HUNGER AND WAR

2 cents

CHICAGO ELECTION PLATFORM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY—ALDERMANIC ELECTIONS
FEBRUARY 28, 1933

CANDIDATES ENDORSED BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY

First Ward.....	R. Martin, 1910 S. Dearborn St.
Second Ward.....	Brown Squire, 3911 Dearborn St.
Fourth Ward.....	L. Armstrong, 4727 Langley Ave.
Fifth Ward.....	Vl. Janowicz, 5648 Harper Ave.
Eighth Ward.....	Ben E. Knox, 7515 Dobson Ave.
Ninth Ward.....	J. Joseph Daly, 11903 Union Ave.
Eleventh Ward.....	M. Miller, 3157 Emerald Avenue
Twelfth Ward.....	J. Thomas Teare, 2251 W. 38. Pl.
Thirteenth Ward.....	A. Wachowiak, 4617 S. Komensky
Fifteenth Ward.....	Ch. S. Phillips, 5254 S. Washtenaw
Sixteenth Ward.....	J. Puzevich, 5853 S. Ashland Ave.
Twentieth Ward.....	Laura Osby, 549 West 13th St.
Twenty-first Ward.....	Mr. Swiecki, 2124 W. 19th Street
Twenty-Second Ward.....	J. Gruca, 2321 So. Kedzie Ave.
Twenty-Fourth Ward.....	G. Ferdinandson, 1223 S. Kedzie A.
Twenty-Eighth Ward.....	Ch. C. Dunn, 336 N. Fairfield Ave.
Thirty-First Ward.....	M. J. Michels, 831 N. Francisco
Thirty-Second Ward.....	Daniel Rakowski, 1349 Holt St.
Thirty-Fourth Ward.....	R. Hinds, 3128 Bloomingdale Ave.
Thirty-Sixth Ward.....	H. W. Pfeiffer, 2205 Lowell Ave.
Thirty-Seventh Ward.....	P. E. Greenlimb, 710 N. Larimie
Thirty-Eighth Ward.....	Henry LaBeau, 3328 Panama Ave.
Fortieth Ward.....	H. L. Hall, 4155 No. Sacramento
Forty-Second Ward.....	John Willis, 1015 Larrabee St.
Forty-Fifth Ward.....	N. Blattner, 2424 N. Marshfield
Forty-Sixth Ward.....	W. O. Lamson, 3230 N. Clark St.

SMASH THE BOSSES' PROGRAM OF HUNGER AND WAR!

WORKING MEN, WOMEN, NEGRO AND WHITE, NATIVE AND FOREIGN-BORN :

In the aldermanic elections February 28, the workers of Chicago must act as a class. As we struggle in the factories against wage cuts, speed up and bosses terror, in demonstrations for increased relief and unemployment insurance at the expense of the bosses and their government, and against imperialist war, so must we continue the fight in this election campaign to strengthen our struggles to win further victories.

In Crosby, Minnesota, the miners have for the first time in the history of the United States elected a Communist mayor. Comrade Emil Nygart immediately upon taking office made only such changes in the city administration which entirely benefited the working class. The first act was to increase the relief of the unemployed by 50%. Second, he established a Workers' Advisory Committee elected by the workers in the mines and other workers organizations to run the city of Crosby in the interests of the workingclass. We, the workers of Chicago must follow the foot steps of the miners of Crosby, Minn.

Our election struggle in Chicago should be carried on the basis of unity of all workers, employed, unemployed, working part time, Negro and white, women, youth, native and foreign born. We all have a common interest. Let us, therefore, make one united fighting front in this election.

The city aldermanic elections are called "non-partisan". There is no such thing. In every ward parties of capitalism, Democratic and Republican and their assistants who catch the votes through a lot of sweet promises, the Socialist and Farmer Labor parties, are all running candidates. Every candidate represents a definite class interest. We, the workers in Chicago, in this aldermanic election must put forward our class interest. Only with united forces based on struggles for relief, for better conditions, for unemployment insurance, against wage cuts and police terror can we defeat capitalist and social fascist candidates. Let us rally around our own candidates and platform.

WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS FACING THE WORKERS OF CHICAGO?

In over 10,000 factories and work shops in the city of Chicago, the bosses, with the support of the city, state and national government and with the cooperation of the officials of the Chicago Federation of Labor, Railroad Brotherhood, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, are slashing the wages of the workers still employed. The total pay roll of all workers in Chicago has dropped in October, 1932, 68.6 percent compared to 1925-27. Employment dropped 50% or more. Those still in the factories only work a few hours a day. In the Building Trades 90% are totally unemployed. The wages of the workers in the stockyards, Western Electric, Crane, International Harvester, Northwestern, Needle Trades, transportation, street car and elevated employees have had wage cuts from 50 to 75%. The city government is cutting wages of the city employees. Fourteen thousand Chicago teachers have not been paid since April, 1932. They are now facing a new cut of 15% with back wages of \$24,000,000 coming to them.

Some workers deprived themselves of necessities and bought homes. These homes are being foreclosed because there is no money to meet the taxes. Small depositors have been robbed of their savings by bank failures. The big money makers control the buying and selling prices and are keeping them up in order to make more profits. The farmers are forced to sell below the cost of production. The prices on basic necessities of life, such as bread, milk, gas and electricity, transportation and rent have not been reduced.

750,000 workers in Chicago are unemployed. One-third of the children in the Chicago public schools are hungry. Many of them have no clothing or shoes. Tens of thousands of workers are forced to live in miserable hovels and flop houses, while there are hundreds of thousands of empty apartments in the city.

The suffering of the Negro workers is indescribable. The bosses' system of dividing the Negro from the white workers forces upon the Negroes the worst kind of discrimination. In the charities their cases are only handled when they are backed up by strong workers' committees. They are segregated into the poorest sections of the city, herded together, six families or so in three rooms, pay the highest rents and are every day being thrown out into the streets. In many sections of the city Negro workers are forced to live in condemned houses and filthy alleys. If there are any jobs, the Negro workers are discriminated against and not hired. In the city of Chicago, compared to the population there are more Negroes unemployed than whites.

Negro and white workers, the above are the "blessings" of the bosses' system and government under the administration of Democratic Mayor Cermak and his City Council.

TERROR AGAINST WORKERS

Mayor Cermak and the City Council with their Police Department and the notorious "red squad", are conducting war against the working class of Chicago.

On August 3, 1931, three Negro workers, Abe Gray, John O'Neil, and Frank Armstrong were killed by the police when they, together with hundreds of others, attempted to stop the eviction of a 70 year old widow, Mrs. Diana Gross. The unemployed worker Sposob was killed because he participated in a demonstration against the Illinois Emergency Relief, demanding relief for the hungry. When 5,000 Chicago workers demonstrated in front of the Japanese Consulate against the bloody massacre of Chinese people, the peaceful demonstration of workers was broken up. The police beat, clubbed and shot into the demonstration. An unemployed worker, Steve Chuck, who protected himself against the attack, was sentenced to three years in the penitentiary. The capitalists of America protected the Japanese imperialist attack on the Chinese people. In two years 2,000 workers were arrested for participation in demonstrations, in meetings, in selling literature and fighting for relief. The immigration authorities, working hand in hand with Mayor Cermak's police, are deporting fighting unemployed workers and their leaders such as Nels Kjar. Bill Gebert, District Organizer of the Communist Party and seven other workers were picked up for participation in a strike of So. Illinois miners and are charged with Criminal Syndicalism and held for deportation.

Mayor Cermak recently made a speech before the Illinois Senate in which he declared: "We must have money or we must have troops."

The Illinois National Guards issued a 104 page pamphlet called "Emergency Pamphlet For Drastic Disturbances." In this pamphlet the generals of the Illinois National Guard declared:

"This winter, at its many conferences, the staff has been considering and setting plans for suppression of radical disorders."

They also give instructions to the police on how to best attack the workers. They say as follows:

"Never fire over the heads of rioters. Blank cartridges should never be fired at a mob."

More arrangements are made to fill the hungry workers with lead. The instructions further say:

"In case martial law is declared the civil authorities have no authority to indicate how the officers are to carry out duties".

The answer of the boss class to the starvation and misery of the workers is bullets instead of bread.

The police terror is especially vicious against the Negro workers. On the South Side of Chicago the workers are constantly subject to police brutality. The leaders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Urban League, the Republican leaders such as Congressman Oscar DePriest and Conklin Simmons are helping the bosses attack the Negro masses. The NAACP has betrayed the Scottsboro boys, has united with the white lynchers of the Negro masses and now gives complete support to the Chicago Democratic administration in carrying through the terror against the Negro men and women workers in Chicago.

Foreign born workers are being deported by the hundreds. Recently immigration authorities proposed \$450,000 for deportations of those workers who get relief. The County Commissioner, Democrat P. Kelley, said,

"I favor this plan and will propose to present it in detail to the Council Board"

and further

"Between 15 and 20% of the unemployed families and 14,000 single persons might be eligible for deportation under the federal administration."

Foreign born workers who piled up huge profits for the bosses in the factories are now faced with starvation and deportation because the bosses do not need them any more.

The officials of the American Federation of Labor—Oscar Nelson, Vice-President of the Chicago Federation of Labor, a floor leader of the Republican Party has never raised his voice in protest against the attacks on the workers. The officialdom of the A. F. L. supports and gives aid to this terror. They themselves use gangsters against militant workers. Hansel Weisenberg was beaten to death by gangsters because he exposed the treachery of the officials of the A. F. L. In many local unions gangsters of the Chicago Federation of Labor terrorize the workers and are part and parcel of the Police Department.

FIGHT AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR DRIVE

In the city of Chicago as well as elsewhere the big financial magnates are squeezing out the small or middle man. In the present crisis this is more true than ever. The big banks and trusts are concentrating everything in their own hands. They dictate the policies to the city administration as to wages, relief and the conditions of the workers in general. In a situation where most of the population is living from hand to mouth on the verge of starvation, the working class suffers cruelly under the iron fist of the finance magnates.

The big money powers, with their center in Wall and La Salle Sts., are trying to get out of the present crisis through greater exploitation of the workers, through preparing a war against the Soviet Union and its chief rivals for profits, Great Britain and Japan. Silas H. Strawn, head of the Montgomery Ward Company, said that the "Soviet Union is a sword over our heads." The Soviet Union is a sword over the heads of the capitalists because it is the only country in the world where there is no unemployment, where the conditions are constantly improving, workers work six and seven hours a day, there is a complete system of all kinds of insurance. The workers all over the United States and the rest of the world see in the Soviet Union an inspiration to overthrow capitalism and establish a workers' government. The Soviet Union is the only workers' government. We, the workers, must defend it against all attacks. An attack on the Soviet Union is also an attack on us workers of this country.

The American money bags also penetrated the countries of South and Central America and China and are exploiting and starving the mass of people there. The burden of capitalism in the colonial countries is even worse than in the home country. The masses of people of colonial countries and the Chicago working class have one enemy, the American boss class. We should establish a fighting front with the oppressed peoples of Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Haiti, and other countries occupied and exploited by the American boss class and fight our enemies together. In Chicago we have many thousands of workers from Latin American countries. They are persecuted, deported and discriminated against. We should defend these workers and support the struggles of the colonial peoples.

BIG MONEY BAGS CONTROL CITY

The city administration of Chicago, the City Council, aldermen, and Mayor Cermak, are controlled by the bankers and industrial magnates. They control the city through the so-called Citizens Committee, headed by Fred Sergent, a LaFollette Republican, who is chairman of the Northwestern Railroad. Mr. Sergent's salary, which he draws from the sweat and blood of the railroad workers, is \$61,000 a year. And Mr. Sergent talks about "economy". Behind this Chicago Citizens Committee are Silas H. Strawn, chairman of the Committee of the International Chamber of Commerce, Alvin Traylor, president of the First National Bank and other banks such as The Continental Illinois Company, Harris Trust and Savings, Northern Trust Company, "The Chicago Tribune", "The Chicago Daily News", and similar organizations of the capitalist parasites and the industrial magnates. These men dictate to cut the city budget from \$68,000,000 to \$51,000,000 at the expense of the city employees and specify that this cut must not affect the Police Department. The cut means less schools, less playgrounds and an added cut of 15% on the unpaid teachers. The cut in the Cook County budget will affect the relief given to the unemployed. The financial magnates' "economy" means cutting the miserable relief and the low wages of the workers. There is no cut in the Police Department, jails, instruments of terror and persecution. No extra burdens on the rich landlords and large corporations. The big landlords pay next to nothing compared with the worker home owners.

Another scheme to save money for the boss class is the sales tax. \$48,000,000 a year in the State of Illinois will be made through this tax by increasing the

cost of living. The sales tax will put on every day commodities and food. The city administration of Cermak was characterized by the former assistant State Attorney of Cook County, Fletcher Dobyns as follows:

"Chicago and Illinois are in the iron grip of a political machine which is as corrupt, as ruthless, and as effective as Tammany Hall of New York."

ROLE OF THE A. F. L., SOCIALIST PARTY AND CARL BORDERS OUTFIT

The big financial magnates are able to carry through their war on the working class with the help of the so-called "friends" of the workers. John Fitzpatrick, Oscar Nelson, Durkin of the Building Trades, the heads of the Socialist Party, the Farmer Labor Party, *Karl Borders* and others are doing their utmost to prevent the workers from establishing a real united struggle against wage cuts and for relief. In this election they are giving their support to the capitalist candidates and are talking about non-partisan elections. Thousands of workers in Chicago see through this non-partisan policy. They see that there can only be one policy against the system of starvation and hunger and that is a policy of class struggle. In cases where these misleaders cannot prevent struggles, they attempt to lead them in order to behead them. The Karl Borders Committee on Unemployment is set up in order to break up the movement of the unemployed, to divide them and prevent united struggles for the best interests of unemployed workers.

The Chicago Federation of Labor is forced to speak for Unemployment Insurance, but it conducts a campaign to defeat the struggles for unemployment insurance. The bankers' organ, "The Daily News" in discussing why the officialdom of the A. F. of L. changed its policy from opposition to supporting Unemployment Insurance, it says:

"It is gratifying to know that the Federation plan suggests no provision for contribution by the state."

This is true. The American Federation of Labor plans for Unemployment Insurance only applied to those workers now working and does not hold the State responsible together with the employers to furnish this insurance. *In the coming election workers of Chicago must repudiate these misleaders and unite together on the basis of struggle for the interests of all workers.*

Mr. Olander, Secretary of the Illinois Federation of Labor, John Fitzpatrick, President of the Chicago Federation of Labor, and Agnes Nestor, Secretary of the Women's Trade Union League, are members of the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, supported the 50% cut in relief in October and are now giving support to the scheme to stretch out grocery orders, to cut down boxes and to get the cut through other means.

UNITED ACTION WINS VICTORIES!

By united action on October 31, the working class of Cook County forced the bosses and their flunkies, the city administration and the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission to withdraw the 50% cut in relief. Fifty-thousand hunger marchers, led by the Unemployed Council, Trade Union Unity League and the Communist Party mobilized the working class to defeat the 50% cut. Today we call upon the workers to rally behind the same organizations in the neighborhoods to fight against the new schemes for cutting down relief and to elect into the City Council working class aldermen who will continue the fight in the capitalist city council. We workers, by united forces of our class can force concessions from the boss class. By united action in the neighborhoods and in the shops and factories, we can fight for relief against wage cuts, for increased wages and shorter hours without reduction in wages.

We must also remember that it was the militant struggle of the workers, again led by the Unemployed Councils and supported by the Communist Party who forced the State Legislature and Reconstruction Finance Corporation to appropriate millions of dollars for relief of the Chicago hungry. In Chicago approximately 150,000 families are being given relief on the average of \$20 a month. This amount of money was gotten through bitter struggles on the part of the workers. In other cities in the State, where the struggles are not quite as sharp, the workers do not get even the miserable amount of \$20.00. Workers of Chicago must continue during the Aldermanic Election Campaign by united action of Negro and white workers to force the government to establish a system of

Unemployment Insurance at the expense of the bosses and the government and to defeat all attempts at relief cuts.

DEMANDS OF WORKERS CANDIDATES IN THE ALDERMANIC ELECTION ENDORSED BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist Party in the Aldermanic election endorses the candidates of the workers in their respective ward who have been nominated at united front working class conferences. They are the leaders of the fighting working class in their territories. Some of them are members of the Communist Party and others revolutionary non-partisan workers. By endorsing these candidates, (the names are printed elsewhere in this platform) the Communist Party pledges to mobilize all of its forces and energy and mobilize the masses of workers to unite them in struggle to win the following demands:

(1) Immediate appropriation of \$50,000,000 for Emergency Relief for the unemployed in Chicago, which is to be raised through the taxation of the bankers, industrial magnates and big landlords and by cutting the salaries of all city officials to the average wage of a worker. (This does not apply to the city employes). This fund, together with the funds obtained from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, State Legislature, etc., to be administered through committees elected by employed and unemployed workers, by the trade unions, etc.

(a) A minimum of \$7.50 immediate cash relief to all unemployed and part time workers, and \$2.00 additional relief for each dependent. Five dollars immediate cash relief for unemployed single men, women and young workers. Free lunches for the children in schools.

(b) Complete stoppage of evictions, lowering of rents, no shutting off of gas, electricity, water of unemployed or part time workers.

(c) Federal or State Unemployed Insurance at the expense of the State and employers.

(2) Immediate inauguration of a city program of public works, including building of houses for the workers in place of the existing slums of the city; building more schools, parks and hospitals and subways in working class neighborhoods. Workers to be employed at the union wage rates. Five cents fare on street cars, elevated and busses. Against sales tax. Full payment of back wages to teachers and city employes.

(3) No foreclosures. Exemption of taxes on homes of unemployed and part time workers.

(a) Immediate refunding to depositors of all bank deposits amounting to \$5,000.

(b) Bonus for all ex-servicemen.

(4) Support the impoverished farmers in the struggle for emergency relief exemption of poor farmers from forced collection of rents, debts, mortgages against foreclosures on farms.

(5) No wage cuts. Seven hour day in all industries. Six hour day for young and women workers without reduction in pay. Equal pay for equal work for all young and women workers.

(6) For full social, political and economic equality of Negro masses—self determination in the Black Belt. Against discrimination at relief stations, in giving out of city jobs; against high rents in Negro neighborhoods; against segregation and Jim-Crow of Negroes in particular sections of the city, in restaurants and city beaches.

(7) Abolition of the red squad. For complete freedom of speech, assembly, organization and strike. Abolition of the vagrancy laws, injunctions, for the repeal of the Illinois Criminal Syndicalist law, no deportation of foreign born workers.

(8) Against military training and militarist propaganda in schools. Against imperialist war, for the defense of the Chinese people and the Soviet Union.

To carry out this program of immediate demands and tasks of the working class the Communist Party calls upon all the workers in the shops to organize shop locals of the Trade Union Unity League, to organize into the industrial unions such as the Packing House Workers Industrial Union, the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union, Metal and Steel Workers Industrial Union, the Railroad Workers Industrial League, etc.; calls upon the workers in the shops to organize grievance committees and other committees on a united front basis,

which are to embrace all workers in the shop in struggle against bad conditions.

The Communist Party supports the struggle of the Rank and File Opposition inside the local unions of the A. F. of L., Railroad Brotherhood, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, etc.

The Unemployed Councils established themselves in many struggles as the organizer and leader of the unemployed workers in Chicago. The Communist Party gives leadership to the Unemployed Councils. The Communist Party gives aid and support to the Unemployed Councils and calls upon the unorganized unemployed workers to join into block committees, ward branches of the Unemployed Councils. The Communist Party calls upon the workers who are organized in other organizations of the unemployed, which are led by the social fascist misleaders, to join hands with the Unemployed Councils for a real struggle against hunger.

The Communist Party is the Party of the Working class. Its strength lies in the strength of the working class. The Communist Party states clearly that the working class can not be free under capitalism. The task of the working class is to overthrow the existing capitalist system and to establish a workers and farmers government—a dictatorship of the proletariat. The way out of the crisis of capitalism is the revolutionary way. The successful building of socialism in the Soviet Union proved conclusively that a workers government will open the factories, mines and mills and insure every worker an opportunity to work at the highest standard of living. A workers government will open apartment houses and hotels and give shelter to the workers. It will open the ware houses and distribute food and clothing to the hungry masses. The aldermanic election struggle gives an opportunity to the workers of Chicago to strengthen our fighting front against the bosses and bosses government. The Communist Party calls upon every worker, Negro, white, native and foreign born, working women, young workers, workers' organizations, workers in the shops, in the trade unions, in the Unemployed Councils to support the platform and the candidates endorsed by the Communist Party. We must now as never before fight with all our might against the offensive of the bosses, for Unemployment Insurance at the expense of the bosses and the State; against wage cuts; for equal rights for the Negroes; against capitalist terror, against the bloody imperialist war; for the defense of the Soviet Union and the Chinese people, for the freedom of the colonial peoples. We must fight for the workers' way out of the crisis—the revolutionary way out.

Build the Communist Party, the organizer and leader of the struggles!

Vote for candidates endorsed by the Communist Party!

(Subscribe & read the "Workers' Voice," 2019 West Division Street, Chicago, Illinois)

EXHIBIT 5

JANOWICZ FOR ALDERMAN

Workers of the Fifth Ward:

Let us not be misled any longer by old-line politicians. Let us organize for our own interests on the basis of the following platform in the coming aldermanic elections:

1. ADEQUATE RELIEF

Cash for food, rent, gas and electricity for all unemployed and part-time workers; and for their school children hot lunches, carfare and clothing.

Free dental and medical care.

2. UNEMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL INSURANCE

To demand insurance at the expense of employers and government. All war funds to the unemployed.

3. WAGES

No cuts; prompt payment of all wages due teachers and other city employees.

4. UTILITY RATES

Drastic reduction in street-car, elevated, gas, and electricity rates.

5. **EQUALITY FOR NEGROES AND FOREIGN-BORN**
No economic, political, or social discrimination; no deportations.
6. **POLICE TERROR**
No police brutality nor legal injustice. Abolition of the Red Squad.
7. **MORATORIUM FOR SMALL HOME OWNERS**
No foreclosures; no payments on interest and taxes during the crisis.
8. **CLOSED BANKS**
Receivers to demand funds from R. F. C. to repay small depositors.

Our platform was adopted and candidate nominated by a convention of workers' organizations of the Fifth Ward.

Vladimir Janowicz, our candidate, of 5618 Harper Avenue, was born and reared on the South Side and knows the needs of the workers of this area. He is well known to us as a defender of the interests of the working-class. An an I. L. D. lawyer he has exclusively devoted himself—without pay—to the defense of workers arrested in their militant struggles for food, clothing, and shelter.

Prior to his activity as a lawyer he was a high-school teacher on the South Side, and is a man of recognized ability. He is endorsed by the following:

Leading educators: Prof. Robert Morse Lovett, Prof. A. Eustace Haydon, Prof. Frederick Schumann, Prof. Martin Springling.

Workers' Organizations: International Labor Defense, Student League of the U. of C., Workers International Relief, International Workers Order, Trade Union Unity League, Communist Party, League of Struggle for Negro rights.

OUR PLATFORM AND OUR CANDIDATE MERIT YOUR SUPPORT!

Fifth Ward Campaign Committee Headquarters: 1505 Cable Court

(Cable Court is located between 56th and 57th Sts. and between Harper and Lake Park Avenues.)

EXHIBIT 6

RECEPTION BANQUET FOR JAMES W. FORD, VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

To the Friends and Sympathizers of the Communist Election Campaign:

DEAR FRIEND: You are cordially invited to the Banquet given by the Communist Party and a group of friends and sympathizers of James W. Ford, Vice-Presidential candidate, to take place on Tuesday, October 18th, 10 P. M., at Alvin Hall, 51st and Michigan. \$1.00 a plate.

We feel that you understand the importance of the visit of James W. Ford to our city, after the extensive tour he made thruout the country. He will report on the many problems confronting the workers of America.

You also realize that it is imperative that all our friends and sympathizers should welcome the candidate for vice-president of the Communist Party in order to stimulate the work for our election campaign and assure a large vote for the candidates of the Communist Party.

May we expect your presence at this Banquet?

Fraternally yours,

COMMUNIST PARTY OF U. S. A.
Arrangements Committee.
M. BACKALL, Mgr.
F. HAMILTON, Sec'y.

Sponsored by: Lucius Harper, Managing Editor of the Chicago Defender, Chairman, Frank Hamilton, Secretary, Attorney Albert Goldman, Treas., Prof. F. L. Schumann, Univ. of Chicago, Rev. Raymond Bragg, Sec'y. of the Western Unitarian Conference, Mrs. M. Bragg, Thomas McKenna, Perry C. Thompson, Editor of Chicago Review, Rev. O. F. Peterson, Ernest H. Williamson, Dr. H. M. Richter, Dr. A. J. Hill, E. P. Frierson, Pres. Phylax Club, Miss T. McWater, Dr. J. W. McCaskill, Dr. H. Cooper, Geo. W. Clark, John Williamson, Mrs. Blanche Lowenthal, Social Worker, Carl Haessler, Lecturer and Journalist.

EXHIBIT 7-A

WORKERS!—MEMBERS OF FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS

Unite Against War NOW!

Defend Your Rights to Live!

ATTEND THE HUGE ANTI WAR RALLY

Tuesday, March 5th, 8 p. m.

Ashland Auditorium, Van Buren Street and Ashland Boulevard

HEAR NEW WAR MOVES EXPOSED BY NATIONALLY PROMINENT SPEAKERS

Prof. Robert Morss Lovett Rev. Joseph W. Nicholson Prof. Frederick L. Schuman
 Bob Minor Al Hamilton

Fellow Workers and Brothers!

The United States mobilizes War Forces; New War Threats against the Soviet Union; Army of Fascist Italy marches on Ethiopia; this is the news that echoes open preparations of imperialist powers for another world war.

Roosevelt-Wall Street war maker calling for 64.1 percent increase of the year 1935 war budget. Millions have been appropriated for war purposes, while clothing and food have been denied to the millions of unemployed and their families. American workers have been flatly refused Social Insurance. Roosevelt's wage-smashing program, with his \$50 a month standard set on government works, is part of the war program.

It is to the interest of every American worker to fight this war program not only as a bloody sacrifice of the American masses on the altar of the Wall Street profit, but as an immediate defense of wages and living conditions, for the passage of the Social Insurance Bill, H. R. 2827, for the defense of the Soviet Union, where billions are spent every year for Social Insurance, for education, vacations, better housing conditions, better food and clothing for the toiling masses. Where workers and farmers are successfully building a new Social Order on the basis of equality and everlasting brotherhood.

CRUSH THE ADVANCEMENT OF FASCISM!

ALL WAR FUNDS TO THE UNEMPLOYED!

STOP THE WAR PLOTS AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION!

DEFEND YOUR RIGHT TO LIVE!

COME TO THE HUGE ANTI WAR RALLY

Admission 20c

Printing donated

CITY CENTRAL COMMITTEE

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS ORDER

Agitate in Your Lodges, Shops and Unions for One Mighty May Day Demonstration and Parade

EXHIBIT 7-B

[Daily Worker, May 7, 1935]

GARDEN IS FILLED TO CAPACITY AS I. W. O. MARKS ANNIVERSARY AND OPENS BIENNIAL PARLEY

Business sessions of the third biennial convention of the International Workers Order began in New York yesterday, following the formal opening rally in Madison Square Garden on Sunday evening, which was attended by more than 17,500 persons, including 1,100 delegates from virtually every important city in the country. The Madison Square Garden meeting also marked the fifth anniversary of the founding of the organization.

Yesterday's convention business consisted of a general assembly of the delegates which heard a report on the growth of the organization by Max Bedacht, general secretary.

CIRCLE RALLY HELD EARLIER

The spirited unity and enthusiasm of the mass meeting in Madison Square Garden on Sunday night was in sharp contrast to events which marked the opening of the Workmen's Circle convention in the same hall several hours earlier.

The International Workers Order meeting, opened by Nathan Shaffer, secretary of the city central committee, was presided over by William Weiner, national chairman and was addressed by Max Bedacht and Earl Browder.

HAS 73,000 MEMBERS

Following greetings by Rubin Saltzman, secretary of the Jewish section, and Louise Thompson, field organizer, Max Bedacht reviewed the onward march of the organization from a membership of 9,000 in 1930 to its present roster of 73,000.

"We can report further," he said, "that the final unification with the Russian National Mutual Aid Society, an organization of more than 8,000 members, is merely a matter of months.

"Basing ourselves on the loyalty of our members and upon the self-confidence which our organization has developed in the progress of the last five years, we promise that with the year 1935 we will do everything in our power to raise the membership to at least 100,000."

Deriding the false principle on which workers are urged to create social security for themselves by their individual efforts, Bedacht said:

"The capitalists urge the worker to save for a rainy day. But when the rainy day comes, the worker finds that someone has stolen the umbrella."

Earl Browder, after greeting the organization in the name of the Communist Party, declared that "the Communist Party stood at the cradle of the I. W. O. when it was born in the midst of a world of enemies," and reiterated that although the I. W. O. is not a political organization, it is a revolutionary mutual benefit organization.

FRIENDLY CONTACT

"Because of its revolutionary features, it necessarily finds many points of friendly contact and cooperation with the only revolutionary party, the Communist Party," Browder said.

"The I. W. O.," he continued, "was a child of the present period of wars and revolutions. If the I. W. O. wants to grow in the future as it has in the past it must cling with all its strength to the revolutionary position."

Praising the efforts of the organization in the fight for the Scottsboro boys and in the campaign for the Workers Unemployment Insurance Bill, Browder pointed to new battles for the working class in which the I. W. O. must engage, citing the attack on the miners of Gallup, New Mexico and the kidnaping of Robert Minor and David Levinson.

Vociferous cheers greeted Browder's mention of "your fellow member, Charles Krumbein, who is in a federal prison as punishment for his service to the working-class."

COLORFUL PAGEANT

"We Built America" a colorful pageant depicting the role of the International Workers Order in the struggles of the working class, concluded the program. The production, executed by the New Theater League under the direction of Stephen Karnot and written by Philip Barber, received tremendous applause.

Incidental music for the pageant was provided by the International Workers Order symphony orchestra under the direction of Irving R. Korenman. The orchestra also performed three compositions in an earlier part of the program.

EXHIBIT 8-A

FIGHT WAR!

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDENT CONGRESS AGAINST WAR

STUDENTS, GIVE US YOUR ANSWER

WHAT WILL YOU BE DOING IN THE NEXT WAR? Will you, too, serve as a lever in the destructive war machine?

IF YOU ARE A STUDENT IN THE R. O. T. C., YOU CANNOT IGNORE THIS QUESTION. Because the War Department is now preparing you for the dying and killing of the next war. You cannot point to the standing army and say, "they will bear the burden,—the problem of war is theirs." No. Plans have already been made that the chief role in war be played by you, the student of R. O. T. C. In the "Herald Tribune" of February 16, 1930 is outlined the "New Mobilization Plan" which enables the U. S. to muster an army of 4,000,000 men in ten months. Reserve officers will constitute the foundation of this army. And there is no mistaking the source from which they will be drawn. "The reserve officers of the future will come from the R. O. T. C. and C. M. T. C." The Annual Report of the Secretary of War for 1929 tells us: "This important element of our national defense continues to supply the life-blood for the Organized Reserves, furnishing, as it does, approximately 5,000 young officers each year." **YOU WILL FIGHT THE WAR. THE DANGER OF WAR IS YOUR DANGER.** You cannot ignore it.

Students of science and technology, your part in a war was clearly revealed in the events of 1917. Scientists and engineers then became adjuncts of the army and figured out methods for bigger and better destruction. Massachusetts Institute of Technology led with the establishment of a Chemical Warfare unit and with instruction in the use of poison gas. Will these events repeat themselves? You who seek to devote your lives to the conquest of nature, will you become tools for the conquest of men? You too cannot ignore the question.

Students of the Humanities, concerned with the progress of human thought and behavior: In 1917 all your aims were destroyed and your achievements defiled. The country was swept by a wave of hysteria deliberately provoked by the imperialists and their press. Culture that was not stifled under the weight of military propaganda appeared in hideous caricature as a part of that propaganda. Men trusted as intellectual leaders of the nation betrayed that trust. Even the schools became instruments of incitement to hatred and war, manipulated by the "Committee on Public Information." From the Annual Report of the Educational Director of the National Security League (August 1917-18) we learn that "an appeal was sent asking colleges and universities to release professors on full salary for the work of the Campaign of Patriotism through Education. In response to the invitation, the presidents of ten universities beginning with Columbia, Harvard, Williams, Johns Hopkins, also Michigan, Princeton, Colorado, and Stanford, at once intimated a willingness to release the best qualified professors who could be spared from their academic work." These representatives were sent into various sections of the country with the understanding that they should "push propaganda for interpreting the meaning of the war in every possible way, in co-operation with public officials, educators, newspapers, churches, universities, granges, labor organizations, and other available agencies." Can you permit a recurrence of these shameful acts of intellectual prostitution? How will you safeguard your progressive aims and achievements? Where will you stand when a new war threatens to engulf us all? The question confronts you as well as those who will handle the guns of the next war.

THE QUESTION IS OF IMPORTANCE TO ALL STUDENTS IN EVERY PART OF THE COUNTRY. WE CANNOT IGNORE IT.

But some of you may ask, "why bring that up now? Will not the peace pacts prevent them?" General Hanson E. Ely, Commandant of the 2nd Corps Area, has given the answer: "We all know there will be a next war, despite talk of peace pacts . . . We can get around these disarmament pacts."

Even now there are wars raging on both sides of the Pacific. In Manchuria, Japanese soldiers are fighting Chinese peasants, and are provoking Soviet Russia on the Siberian border. Late September headlines in the "New York Sun" announced: "Japan Speeds Plans For War—Foreign Military Attaches Tell of Reports—Some Scent Soviet Clash—Army and Navy Supplies Being Bought in

America." In South America, students and workers are killing one another to decide whether British or American companies shall control the oil deposits of the Chaco region. The United States is involved in both disputes and has its entire navy in the Pacific Ocean, ready for action. **THE DANGER OF WARS IS IMMEDIATE, AND THREATENS EVERY COUNTRY IN THE WORLD.**

OUR QUESTION THEREFORE REQUIRES AN ANSWER NOW! All students should join in that answer at **THE STUDENT CONGRESS AGAINST WAR.** Immediate steps must be taken to formulate a program of effective opposition to war.

The Student Congress Against War will be held at the University of Chicago during the last week of December. Send delegates from your campus clubs, your publications and your fraternities. The Congress will unite students of every race, creed and political inclination in an effective struggle against war.

ALL EYES ARE ON CHICAGO!

PROGRAM

All sessions at Mandel Hall, University of Chicago

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1 p. m. to 10 p. m.—Registration and Arrangements.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28, 9:30 A. M. to 1 P. M.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS by Temporary Chairman Edmund Stevens, Chairman of the National Committee.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS—Joseph Cohen, Student delegate to the World Congress Against War at Amsterdam.

GREETINGS.

ELECTIONS, Presiding Committee, Resolutions Committee, Tellers Committee, Credentials Committee.

SYMPOSIUM: "IMPERIALISM AND WAR"

Speakers: UPTON CLOSE—Author and Lecturer on Far Eastern Affairs.

JOSEPH FREEMAN—Author of "The Soviet Worker," co-author of "Dollar Diplomacy."

EARL BROWDER—Secretary of Communist Party, U. S. A.

2:30 P. M. to 5:30 P. M.

SYMPOSIUM: "ANTI-WAR MOVEMENTS"

Speakers: J. B. MATTHEWS—secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

JANE ADDAMS—Winner of Nobel Prize, 1932.

SCOTT NEARING—lecturer, former Professor of Economics University of Pennsylvania.

Discussion by Delegates

7:30 P. M. to 10:30 P. M.

—STUDY GROUPS—

Group I: Militarism in the Universities. Leaders: J. B. Matthews, Mac Gordon.

Group II: Students and Workers Opposition to War. Leaders: Earl Browder, Carl Geiser.

Group III: Nationalism and War. Leaders: Scott Nearing and Nathaniel Weyl.

Group IV: Imperialism and the Revolt of Colonial Peoples. Leaders, Upton Close, Joseph Freeman

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 29—9:30 A. M. to 12:30 P. M.

HOW SHALL STUDENTS FIGHT WAR?

Preliminary Remarks, Donald Henderson. Discussion by Delegates.

2:30 P. M. to 5:30 P. M.: Report of Resolutions Committee. Discussion by Delegates.

7:00 P. M. to 9:00 P. M.: Final Adoption of Resolutions. Permanent Organization.

9:30 P. M.—ENTERTAINMENT.

This call is issued by a joint committee of students, faculty members and intellectuals. It is addressed to all those students who, sincere in their opposition of war, wish to find a common ground for effective action.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDENT CONGRESS AGAINST WAR

Sherwood Anderson	Donald Henderson	Scott Nearing
Henri Barbusse	H. W. Longfellow Dana	Margaret Schlauch
Eleanor Copenhaver	Corliss Lamont	Frederick L. Schumann.
George S. Counts	J. B. Matthews	Thomas Woody
Leo Gallagher	Herman J. Muller	Robert Morss Lovett

Edmund Stevens, Chairman, Columbia University, N. Y.
 Dora Zucker, Secretary, College of the City of New York.
 Margaret Bailey, Treasurer, New York University.
 Gregory Bardacke, Syracuse University, N. Y.
 Jack Owen, University of Chicago.
 Ann Chess, Smith College, Mass.
 Joseph Cohen, Brooklyn College, N. Y.
 Edwin L. Diggs, Lambuth College, Tenn.
 Henry Forblade, Commonwealth College, Ark.
 Carl Geiser, Fenn College, Ohio.
 Edward Hartshorne, Jr., Harvard Univ., Mass.
 Richard Lake, State University, Mont.
 George Perazich, University of California.
 Eugene Schaffarman, University of Michigan.
 Norman Spitzer, Cornell University, N. Y.
 Nathaniel Weyl, Columbia University.
 Ira Latimer, Le Moyne College, Memphis, Tenn.

Any campus club or organization may elect delegates to the congress on the basis of one delegate for every fifteen members.

Any group of fifteen students may elect a delegate.

Delegates will require credentials. Requests for credentials, accompanied by the names of the delegates and the students endorsing them, should be sent to the National Committee.

On their arrival for the congress delegates should go directly to Mandel Hall, University of Chicago and register.

Arrangements are being made to house the delegates on or near the campus. Funds for the sending of delegates should be raised by securing of student and faculty support.

Registration fee: Fifty Cents.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDENT CONGRESS AGAINST WAR,

P. O. Box 327, Grand Central Annex, New York City, N. Y.

I am interested in the Student Congress Against War and should like to cooperate with you.

Name-----

Address-----

EXHIBIT 8-B

[Daily Worker, Jan. 3, 1933]

STUDENTS ADOPT ANTI-WAR STAND—ENDORSE PLEDGE OF AMSTERDAM CONGRESS

CHICAGO, Jan. 2.—Seven hundred student delegates representing eighty nine universities and schools attended the sessions of the Students Congress which adjourned Thursday night after two days of deliberations. The delegates hitch-hiked or came by buses from thirty states and were a typical cross section of the American student body.

The speakers at the opening session were Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party, and Upton Close, bourgeois newspaper man and "expert" on Far Eastern affairs. Speaking on the burning question of war and imperialism, Browder gave a penetrating Leninist analysis of the causes of modern conflicts, differentiating between wars of imperialist aggression and revolutionary wars.

IMPERIALIST AGENT TALKS

Upton Close, a notorious agent of U. S. imperialism, attributed wars to psychological factors and characterized them as inevitable under any system, thus attempting to obscure the real causes of imperialist wars in the fight for markets and new colonies and for a redivision of the world. Close's arguments gave objective support to Japan's robber war against China as well as to the undeclared wars in South America which were instigated by U. S. imperialists in their bitter rivalry with British imperialism for control of the markets and natural resources of the semi-colonial countries.

At the second session, Scott Nearing spoke, as did Jane Addams and J. B. Matthews of the Society of Reconciliation on types of opposition to war. Matthews stated that although he considered himself a pacifist he was opposed to violence in opposing war, thus clearly showing that he opposed to violence except when it is used by the exploiting class. Jane Addams came out even more openly in an attempt to throttle the growing anti-war sentiments of the students, declaring that it was useless to talk of opposing imperialist war since there were no longer any, this, despite the fact that Japan is pushing its robber war against China and threatening armed intervention against the Soviet Union, and that the two undeclared wars raging in South America are threatening to plunge that entire continent into a bloody slaughter as a prelude for the new world war for which all the imperialist bandit powers are frantically arming.

WORKERS POWER CAN END WARS

Scott Nearing pointed to the present wars in the Orient and South America in sharp refutation against the deliberately misleading statement by Jane Addams: He declared that wars have been going on incessantly in various parts of the capitalist world since 1910, that imperialist war is the chief business of the capitalist governments, that it is a continuation of their class policies "by other means." He declared that only the seizure of power by the working-class can end war by abolishing the capitalist system which breeds war.

Nearing was followed by a student delegate from Colombia, whose government is now engaged in the undeclared war with Peru. The Colombian delegate told of the heroic struggles of the illegal Communist Party and revolutionary workers against this war. He pointed out that the socialist deputies there, as elsewhere, had voted war credits along with the bourgeois deputies.

ADOPT UNITED FRONT PROGRAM

The evening session was devoted to study groups where the delegates had an opportunity for individual discussions under capable leaders. The delegates ranged from pacifists to Communists. Considerable discussion and clarification was therefore necessary for the adoption of a united front program. Accordingly, the entire second day was set aside for this purpose. Finally a minimum program was unanimously adopted against imperialist war. This program correctly analyses the causes of war, calls for the unity of students with the workers and endorses the pledge of the Amsterdam Congress to vigorously fight against imperialist war.

Resolutions were adopted demanding the recognition of the Soviet Union, and supporting the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples. The resolutions expose the war-making role of the League of Nations behind its sham peace manouvers and warns against such betrayals of the toiling masses as carried out by the socialist leaders of the Second International in 1914.

SOCIALISTS TRY SPLIT

This program was accepted by all groups despite the objection of socialist leaders who sought to split the Congress on technicalities but were finally forced into line by pressure from their own rank and file membership.

A permanent committee, composed of students of all shades of opinion, was elected, as well as a delegate to the South American anti-war Congress to be held in Montevideo, Uruguay, beginning Feb. 26. The meeting then adjourned.

EXHIBIT 9-A

[Daily Worker, March 30, 1935]

WAR THREATENS SOVIET RUSSIA!

U. S. Breaking Off Soviet-American Negotiations Strengthens Fascist Germany
in War Plans Against U. S. S. R.

MONSTER PROTEST RALLY

Sunday, March 31st, 3 P. M.—Coliseum, Wabash Ave. at 15th St.

Speakers: Congressman ERNEST LUNDEEN, J. B. MATHEWS, Prof. FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, THYRA EDWARDS, HARRY SHAW.

DEMONSTRATE FOR FRIENDSHIP

Between the American and Soviet Peoples in the Interests of Peace!

Admission, 25c—Unemployed, 10c

Auspices: Friends of the Soviet Union, 6 North Clark St.

EXHIBIT 9-B**ARE THE SOVIET EXECUTIONS JUSTIFIED?**

WHO ARE THOSE "INNOCENT" VICTIMS OF RED TERROR?

WHY DO THE ENEMIES OF THE SOVIET UNION AND
THE AGENTS OF COUNTER-REVOLUTION HOWL?

MASS-MEETING

Wednesday, Jan. 16, 7:30 P. M.—North Side Turner Hall, 820 North Clark Street

Working Men and Women, Professionals and Intellectuals:

Come to this mass-meeting and learn the truth about the recent executions of a band of White Guard terrorists, who, at the behest of international adventurers and scoundrels, war-makers and implacable enemies of the workers' state, had conspired and instigated the heinous assassination of

SERGEI M. KIROV

**ONE OF THE MOST OUTSTANDING AND BELOVED LEADERS
OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT**

The Social-fascists and professional enemies of the Soviet Union are shedding crocodile tears about the executed white guards by the stern hand of proletarian, revolutionary justice. The Chicago Tribune has intensified its usual campaign of lies and vilification against the Soviet Government. It weeps over "the extermination of the fit and the torture of the opposition"; it cynically assures the readers that "the czaristic government was more humane", that it "treated its enemies with greater consideration."

Refute the lies and slander about the workers' fatherland, now wide-spread in the capitalist press; expose the rattlesnakes scattering their venom in an attempt to poison the minds of the friends of the Soviet Union, to discredit the government of the toiling masses, to divert the attention of the American masses from their own misery and suffering in their fifth year of the economic crisis.

What was the object of murdering SERGEI M. KIROV at a time of tremendous achievements of the workers and farmers of the Soviet Union under the Second Five Year Plan; when the steady, triumphant advance of the toiling masses of the USSR is beginning to seriously disturb the peace of the ruling class in all capitalist countries; when the material and cultural well-being of the Soviet masses rise to new heights in the face of ever growing unemployment, hunger and misery in the capitalist world?

LEARN THE TRUTH ABOUT THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP THAT STRUGGLES FOR A SOCIALIST, CLASSLESS SOCIETY—THE WORKERS' STATE—THE MOST POWERFUL GUARANTEE FOR PEACE.

The speakers are Professor FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, EUGENE BECHTOLD, and other prominent speakers.

Admission 10c; Unemployed Free.

Auspices Friends of the Soviet Union

EXHIBIT 9-C

[Sunday, February 25, 1934, 3 P. M.]

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, "POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS IN RECOGNITION OF THE SOVIET UNION"

Dr. FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, of the Department of Social Sciences and International relations returned from the Soviet Union the later part of last December. There is hardly a student of political science in Chicago, or even just an average reader on international politics to whom the name of Dr. Schuman is not known. There is none who can afford to miss him on this occasion on a subject which by February the 25th may be, indeed, a burning one.

Join the Friends of the Soviet Union. Dues: Employed 15c a month; Unemployed 5c a month. Initiation for Employed, 25c.

EXHIBIT 10

[New Masses, Sept. 4, 1934, p. 4]

The persecution of militant intellectuals is not limited to California alone. For more than two months, Jan Wittenber, Chicago John Reed Club artist, and others have been imprisoned in Hillsboro, Illinois, under the most miserable conditions. They have been indicted by the Grand Jury. Wittenber and John Adams, marine organizer, were charged with conspiracy to overthrow the U. S. government. They face a penitentiary sentence of twenty to thirty years, under the Criminal Syndicalist Act of Illinois which was passed at the time of the Palmer Red Raids in 1919. Their "crime" is that of organizing unemployed farmers and miners in a struggle for adequate relief. Adams and Wittenber have been separated from the local prisoners. They are not permitted to receive THE NEW MASSES and other literature. The Jan Wittenber Defense Committee, which includes Carl Haessler, Llewelyn Jones, Lawrence Lipton, Thomas McKenna, Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Dr. H. M. Richter, Prof. Frederick Schuman, Dr. William Twigg, Prof. James M. Yard, and other Chicago intellectuals, calls on individuals and organizations to flood Governor Henry Horner, Springfield, Illinois, with letters and telegrams protesting against the unreasonably high bail and demanding the release of Wittenber, Adams, and the others in the Hillsboro jail.

EXHIBIT 11-A

[Soviet Russia Today, Aug. 1932]

INTERVENTION—MYTH OR MENACE?

By Frederick L. Schuman¹

In the bourgeois press of the world, the view is frequently expressed that the very genuine apprehension in the Soviet Union over the possibility of a new armed attack from abroad is without foundation. This apprehension is said to be inspired either by fantastic fears or by a desire on the part of the Kremlin to divert attention from alleged "internal difficulties" (nature unspecified) and

¹ Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, of the Department of Political Science of the University of Chicago, is the author of "American Policy Toward Russia Since 1917," published by International Publishers.

to unify the population against non-existent foreign enemies. The Communist Party is alarmed over the non-fulfillment of the Five-Year Plan quotas, say the bourgeois editors—the same editors who are alarmed over the success of the Five-Year Plan!—and in consequence it must hold up the bogey of foreign intervention before the disgruntled populace to inspire greater effort and it must tilt against scarecrows and windmills to spur on the lagging comrades. For in reality, says the bourgeois press of the United States, Japan, and Western Europe, the Soviet Union is secure from all possible danger.

Any objective examination of the record of the past and of the facts of the present will reveal the speciousness of this logic. At no time since 1917 has the Soviet Government been free from the danger of armed action against it by bourgeois States. At no time since 1921 has the menace of overt hostilities been so great as at present. A brief resumé of the interventions of the past, followed by a view of the contemporary world situation, should afford a measure of the threat which the Soviet Union and its friends abroad must be prepared at all times to meet.

The great intervention of 1918-21 has faded from the recollection of those whose government and newspapers deliberately concealed its purposes and misrepresented its results. But the memory of it burns like an open wound in the minds of the workers of Russia. In the summer of 1918 the Russian proletariat found itself murderously assaulted from all points of the compass by the forces of capitalism and imperialism. It found itself threatened with death at the hands of the White Terrorists and their foreign supporters in Paris, London, Tokio, and Washington. Six thousand American troops, accompanied by larger British forces, were permitted to seize Archangel by the Menshevik Social-Democratic enemies of the Soviet. Ten thousand American troops and other British and French divisions were permitted to invade Siberia by the same Menshevik and Socialist Revolutionary traitors to the Revolution, who were in both regions brushed aside by Tsarist reactionaries as soon as the foreign troops secured control. While seventy-five thousand Japanese soldiers seized Eastern Siberia, the American forces to the rear of Kolchak's White Army kept open the railway in order that war supplies of all kinds might be shipped from the United States to aid in the destruction of the first workers' republic. The British and American troops in north Russia attacked the Red Army in a vain attempt to reach Vologda and Moscow. In the Caucasus and the Ukraine, Denikin's counter-revolutionary legions were supplied with British uniforms and tanks, French artillery and airplanes, and were actively aided by British and French troops and battleships. In the Baltic, a British squadron enabled Yudenitch to seize Esthonia and direct a drive upon Soviet Petrograd. These attacks were accompanied by a world-wide economic blockade and by efforts to stir up revolt within the territories still held by the Soviet Government.

While Kolchak was beaten back from Kazan in May, 1919, Denikin and Yudenitch closed in on Moscow and Petrograd in the fall of that darkest year of the Revolution. Only by the most heroic resistance and by almost incredible sacrifices on the part of the Red Army and the workers and peasants supporting it, was the intervention defeated and the Soviet government saved from the fate of the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Bavarian and Hungarian Soviets of 1919. No sooner were the foreign invaders driven out than the Pilsudski imperialists of Poland launched their attack upon Kiev and the Ukraine in the spring of 1920. The Polish war enabled the last of the White Guard leaders, Baron Wrangel, to seize the Crimea and to obtain additional allied assistance. Wrangel was not merely supported, but was granted official diplomatic recognition as the ruler of Russia by the French Government. Not until the winter of 1920-21 was he driven into the Black Sea and the last embers of counter-revolution and interventionist invasion stamped out.

At no time since have the bourgeois governments dared to repeat the ghastly experiment of attempting to drown Soviet Russia in blood. "Peace" has prevailed between capitalism and communism for over a decade, but the peace is little more than armed truce. The might of the Red Army, the power of Communist Parties abroad, and the necessities of trade have dictated caution on the part of the anti-Soviet states and their émigré partners. The U. S. S. R. has been granted diplomatic recognition by all the Great Powers except the United States. Trade relations between it and the outside world have been restored. But to imagine that there has been any diminution of hostility toward Moscow on the part of its enemies or any disposition to refrain from renewing the attack at the first favorable opportunity, is to be blind to the events of the past 10 years.

The mere listing of the anti-Soviet outrages, the assassinations of Soviet agents, the outbursts of rage and hatred in the press, the acts of provocation, insult and injury directed against the U. S. S. R. from abroad during these years would require as many pages as there are words in this brief survey. In May, 1923, Vorovsky, Soviet representative to Italy, was murdered in Lausanne with the anti-Soviet press and the Swiss Government applauding the crime. In May, 1927, the Conservative Government of Great Britain raided Arcos in London and severed relations with the U. S. S. R. In December, 1927, following a long series of raids and outrages, the Nationalist Government of China broke off relations with Moscow. Two years later the same government, at the instigation of foreign powers, attempted to wrest the Chinese Eastern Railway from the Soviets; but was promptly repulsed. In January, 1930, the government of Mexico followed suit on the flimsiest of pretexts. Almost innumerable efforts have been made by foreign governments to ruin Soviet trade, while anti-Soviet press campaigns have broken out periodically with increased virulence.

That the menace of intervention was never more grave than in the present year of capitalist collapse, increased diplomatic tensions and fanatical Fascist nationalism, is apparent to even the most casual observer of the international scene. In the Far East Japan has seized Manchuria, refused to sign a non-aggression pact with Moscow, and provoked the puppet regime of "Manchukuo" to a series of absurd allegations against the Soviet Union. The militarists in Tokio are reported to be definitely "interested" in the offer of the French stockholders of the defunct Russo-Asiatic Bank to sell their bogus title in the Chinese Eastern Railway to Japan. Japanese recruitment of White Guard exiles in Europe, Japanese seizure of the Chinese Eastern Railway, half-owned by the U. S. S. R., possibly foreshadow a renewal of Japan's frustrated ambitions to conquer Eastern Siberia. In the West the nonaggression pacts with the Soviet Union's neighbors remain initialed but unsigned, because Rumania, with the support of France and the Little Entente, demands Moscow's express approval of the rape of Bessarabia as a condition of ratification. The Von Papen Cabinet in Germany is more definitely anti-Soviet than any German government since the war—so much so as to lend credence to reports of a projected Franco-German military alliance against the Soviet Union. That Hitlerism when it comes into power will be even more anti-Soviet goes without saying. In Great Britain the violently anti-Soviet Conservative Party supporting MacDonald has the largest majority ever possessed by any party in the House of Commons. At Washington anti-Sovietism remains a guiding star of the State Department and the Administration, with no promise of a reversal of the non-recognition policy, whatever may be the result of the November election. Meanwhile, the bourgeois world sinks ever deeper into the morass of economic ruin and bankruptcy and the political conflict between the status quo States and the revisionist States of Europe becomes ever more acute. Under these circumstances, voices of reaction whisper everywhere that a concerted attack upon the U. S. S. R. from East and West might avert the worst consequences of the crisis of capitalism and nationalism.

To arrive at concerted action the bourgeois governments must iron out their own enmities and rivalries. This process serves to delay the creation of a united front against the Soviet Union; also the recollection that intervention was tried and failed in 1918 when Soviet Russia was young and weak and the bourgeois States were strong and armed to the teeth. That it could succeed in 1932, when the bourgeois States are prostrate and Soviet Russia is growing to immense power must appear improbable even to the maddest of imperialists and emigrés.

And yet in the last analysis it is precisely here that the danger lies. The longer the attack is deferred, the more remote become the chances of success. To those who regard an eventual armed clash between communism and capitalism for world mastery as inevitable, it is plain that time is on the side of the Soviet Union. When Kuznetstroy and Magnitogorsk are in operation, when the U. S. S. R. outstrips the west in metallurgy and heavy manufacturing, when the second Five-Year Plan is completed, Soviet Russia will not be merely unconquerable but able to crush its enemies completely in the event of war. It is this fear which haunts the chancelleries and the counting houses of capitalism. And it is this fear which dictates an attack upon the U. S. S. R. while there is still time for an attack. Those who minimize the danger speak in ignorance or with willful deception as their motive. It is obvious that unceasing vigilance and preparedness for all eventualities is the price of the preservation of the proletarian revolution.

EXHIBIT 11-B

Soviet Russia Today, Nov. 1932

SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY: AN INTERPRETATION—THE 15-YEAR FIGHT FOR PEACE

By Frederick L. Schuman

The foreign relations of Soviet Russia during the fifteen years of its existence have passed through four well defined periods. The first was from November, 1917, the period of the establishment of the Soviet regime, to August of 1918, the beginning of the intervention. During these ten months, the Soviet Government attempted to bring the Great War to a close by general negotiations and, failing this, it took Russia out of the war by the separate peace of Brest-Litovsk of March 4, 1918. In this period it also published the inter-Allied secret treaties, repudiated the debts of the Tsarist and Kerensky regimes, and confiscated the property of foreign investors and entrepreneurs, along with that of the Russian nobility and bourgeoisie. The second period—from August of 1918 to March of 1921—was the period of civil strife, blockade, military intervention, and foreign war, first with Great Britain, France, the United States, Japan, and then with Poland, who not only sent armies of intervention, but actively supported the White Guards. The Red Army finally triumphed over its enemies, domestic and foreign, and the Soviet Government was more secure than ever at the close of the struggle, though Russia was prostrate as a result of the destruction and suffering inflicted by the invaders. The third period was that between the New Economic Policy, proclaimed in March, 1921, and the beginning of the first Five Year Plan in 1928. This was a period of internal reconstruction and of the restoration of diplomatic relations with the bourgeois States. All of the Great Powers save the United States, and many of the Minor Powers, extended diplomatic recognition to the U. S. S. R. during these years. The fourth and contemporary period is that of Socialist construction under the Five Year Plan, accompanied by increased trade relations with the outside world and by efforts to attain security from attack through the promotion of peace, disarmament, and non-aggression agreements.

The interests of the U. S. S. R. in international politics, like those of all other States, are intelligible by reference to the attitudes and values of its ruling class which in the Soviet Union is the working class. While all other States are dominated politically by nationalistic business men or land owners, moved by profit motives, these classes have been destroyed in Russia and replaced by the proletariat. The Russian proletariat, as represented by the Communist party, is anti-national, anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist. Social and political cohesion in Soviet society is not achieved through the symbols of national patriotism, but through those of the revolutionary international proletariat. For the Communists, lines of cleavage and conflict based on language, race and nationality are effaced by the universal class war between the workers of the world and their exploiters. The Soviet State is composed of numerous linguistic and national groups. It is regarded by its builders, not as a national entity, but as the Socialist fatherland, as the citadel of the world proletariat, as the precursor of that world federation of Soviet republics which will follow the world revolution. Its historic mission is the creation of a Socialist society and the organization of the class conscious workers of all countries for the revolutionary seizure of power on a world scale. Its foreign policy is necessarily dominated by the exigencies of this mission.

In view of the "temporary stabilization of capitalism" following the Great War, the U. S. S. R. has directed its energies toward building Socialism on firm foundations in Russia, rather than toward working for an immediate world revolution. The view of 1917-1919 that a single Socialist State could not survive in a hostile capitalistic world has been abandoned in favor of the view that peaceful political and economic relations with the bourgeois States can be advantageously employed to contribute toward the immediate task in Russia. The world revolution seemed imminent in 1919, with Soviet governments established in Bavaria and Hungary, with all of central Europe in turmoil, and with working class unrest prevalent throughout the world. By 1921 these hopes had faded. Soviet support was given to the Kuomintang or revolutionary Nationalist party in China, but the Kuomintang came to be dominated by bourgeois and militarist elements and expelled its Soviet advisers in 1927. The Communist movement in China was driven underground, but the seeds which had been sown flowered later in an

indigenous Communism among Chinese peasants and workers, who have secured control of large areas of the central and southern provinces and successfully resisted the Kuomintang dictatorship. The leaders of Communist Party of the Soviet Union, while the economic forces that will inevitably result in a capitalist cataclysm are developing throughout the world, bend all their energies to the building of Socialism. The Communist International and its national sections—the Communist parties of the various countries—continue to lay their plans and organize for the overthrow of Capitalism. But for the present, the greatest service to the international proletariat is the strengthening of Socialist economy in the U. S. S. R.

This task has dominated Soviet domestic and foreign policy in recent years. Economic restoration was substantially completed by 1927. In 1928 the first Five-Year Plan was launched, for the purpose of laying the foundations of Socialism by collectivizing agriculture and industrializing the Union on a vast scale. The new economic order, which has been created in this way and which will be further developed in the second Five Year Plan (1933-1937), rests upon the abolition of the remnants of private property and private profit in agriculture, industry and commerce and upon large-scale economic planning in the interests of the urban working masses and the collectivized peasantry. Success requires peace and trade with the outside world. Security against renewed intervention is the prime objective of Soviet foreign policy. The means thereto have been the maintenance of the Red Army on a high level of efficiency, the granting of a certain amount of diplomatic support to the "revisionist" States of Europe against the dominant *status quo* bloc, in accordance with balance of power considerations, and the promotion of general disarmament. Moscow has also supported all international projects for the maintenance of peace, short of entrance into the League of Nations, which is still regarded as an association of hostile bourgeois Powers, either useless or dangerous from the point of view of Soviet interests. The U. S. S. R. was the first Great Power to ratify the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928. It has urged upon other Powers complete and general disarmament or, barring that, as much disarmament as possible. It has consistently urged the conclusion of non-aggression agreements with its neighbors, and it has sought peace, commerce, and normal diplomatic relations with all States.

Up to the time of writing, this foreign policy has been largely successful in accomplishing its purposes. Peace has been preserved and new interventionist attacks have been prevented, despite acute diplomatic friction with Great Britain between 1927 and 1929, with France in 1929 and 1930, and with other Powers at various other times. But the peace is an armed truce, and no Communist expects that it can continue indefinitely. The Soviet Union remains on the defensive and views with alarm every threat of war or intervention. The Japanese seizure of Manchuria in 1931 aroused lively apprehension in Moscow. The U. S. S. R. will not fight to retain the Chinese Eastern Railway, to recover Bessarabia, or to further Soviet interests outside of its own frontiers. But it will resist to the death any invasion of its own territories and will call the Communist parties of the world to its defense in the event of war against it by the bourgeois governments. Time is doubtless on its side, for Soviet economy is self-contained and affected only indirectly by the crises of capitalism. The progress of industrialization, along with the rapid growth of population, promises to make the Soviet Union (already the greatest of the Powers in territory, population, and potential resources) the most powerful State of the world.

This article is a summary of a section of Dr. Schuman's forthcoming book, International Politics: An Introduction to the Western State System. Dr. Schuman is professor of political science in the University of Chicago.

EXHIBIT 12

[Soviet Russia Today, Sept. 1939]

TO ALL ACTIVE SUPPORTERS OF DEMOCRACY AND PEACE

The text of an Open Letter calling for greater unity of the anti-fascist forces and strengthening of the front against aggression through closer cooperation with the Soviet Union, released on August 14 by 400 leading Americans

One of the greatest problems confronting all those engaged in the struggle for democracy and peace, whether they be liberals, progressives, trade unionists, or

others, is how to unite their various forces so as to achieve victory for their common goals. The Fascists and their allies are well aware that democracy will win if its supporters are united. Accordingly, they are intent on destroying such unity at all costs.

On the international scene the Fascists and their friends have tried to prevent a united anti-aggression front by sowing suspicion between the Soviet Union and other nations interested in maintaining peace.

On the domestic scene the reactionaries are attempting to split the democratic front by similar tactics. Realizing that here in America they cannot get far with a definitely pro-fascist appeal, they strive to pervert American anti-fascist sentiment to their own ends. With the aim of turning anti-fascist feeling against the Soviet Union they have encouraged the fantastic falsehood that the USSR and the totalitarian states are basically alike. By this strategy they hope to create dissension among the progressive forces whose united strength is a first necessity for the defeat of fascism.

Some sincere American liberals have fallen into this trap and unwittingly aided a cause to which they are essentially opposed. Thus, a number of them have carelessly lent their signatures to the recent manifesto issued by the so-called Committee for Cultural Freedom. This manifesto denounces in vague, undefined terms all forms of "Dictatorship" and asserts that the Fascist states and Sôviet Russia equally menace American institutions and the democratic way of life.

While we prefer to dwell on facts rather than personalities, we feel it is necessary to point out that among the signers of this manifesto are individuals who have for years had as their chief political objective the maligning of the Soviet people and their government, and it is precisely these people who are the initiators and controllers of the committee.

A number of other committees have been formed which give lip service to democracy and peace while actually attacking the Soviet Union and aiding reaction. Honest persons approached by such committees should scrutinize their aims very carefully and support only those groups genuinely interested in preserving culture and freedom and refusing to serve as instruments for attacking the Soviet Union or aiding Fascism in any other way.

The undersigned do not represent any committee or organization, nor do they propose to form one. Our object is to point out the real purpose behind all these attempts to bracket the Soviet Union with the Fascist states, and to make it clear that Soviet and Fascist policies are diametrically opposed. To this end we should like to stress ten basic points in which Soviet socialism differs fundamentally from totalitarian fascism.

1. The Soviet Union continues as always to be a consistent bulwark against war and aggression, and works unceasingly for the goal of a peaceful international order.

2. It has eliminated racial and national prejudice within its borders, freed the minority peoples enslaved under the Tsars, stimulated the development of the culture and economic welfare of these peoples, and made the expression of anti-Semitism or any racial animosity a criminal offense.

3. It has socialized the means of production and distribution through the public ownership of industry and the collectivization of agriculture.

4. It has established nationwide socialist planning, resulting in increasingly higher living standards and the abolition of unemployment and depression.

5. It has built the trade union, in which almost 24,000,000 workers are organized, into the very fabric of its society.

6. The Soviet Union has emancipated woman and the family, and has developed an advanced system of child care.

7. From the viewpoint of cultural freedom, the difference between the Soviet Union and the Fascist countries is most striking. The Soviet Union has effected one of the most far-reaching cultural and educational advances in all history and among a population which at the start was almost three-fourths illiterate. Those writers and thinkers whose books have been burned by the Nazis are published in the Soviet Union. The best literature from Homer to Thomas Mann, the best thought from Aristotle to Lenin, is available to the masses of the Soviet people, who themselves actively participate in the creation of culture.

8. It has replaced the myths and superstitions of old Russia with the truths and techniques of experimental science, extending scientific procedures to every field, from economics to public health. And it has made science and scientific study available to the mass of the people.

9. The Soviet Union considers political dictatorship a transitional form and has shown a steadily expanding democracy in every sphere. Its epoch-making new

Constitution guarantees Soviet citizens universal suffrage, civil liberties, the right to employment, to leisure, to free education, to free medical care, to material security in sickness and old age, to equality of the sexes in all fields of activity, and to equality of all races and nationalities.

10. In relation to Russia's past, the country has been advancing rapidly along the road of material and cultural progress in ways that the American people can understand and appreciate.

The Soviet Union has an economic system different from our own. But Soviet aims and achievements make it clear that there exists a sound and permanent basis in mutual ideals for cooperation between the U.S.A. and the USSR on behalf of world peace and the security and freedom of all nations.

Accordingly, the signers of this letter urge Americans of whatever political persuasion to stand firmly for close cooperation in this sphere between the United States and Soviet Russia, and to be on guard against any and all attempts to prevent such cooperation in this critical period in the affairs of mankind.

AMONG THE 400 SIGNERS OF THE OPEN LETTERS ARE

- | | |
|---|---|
| Dr. Thomas Addis, Professor of Medicine, Leland Stanford University | Kyle Crichton, editorial staff of Collier's Weekly |
| Helen Alfred, Executive Director National Public Housing Conference | Miriam Allen de Ford, writer |
| Prof. Newton Arvin, Professor of English, Smith College | Paul de Kruif, writer |
| Dr. Charles S. Bacon, Honorary President, American Russian Institute, Chicago, Ill. | Pietro di Donato, writer |
| Frank C. Bancroft, Editor, "Social Work Today" | William E. Dodd, Jr., Chairman Anti-Nazi Literature Committee |
| Maurice Becker, artist | Stanley D. Dodge, University of Michigan |
| Louis P. Birk, Editor, Modern Age Books, Inc. | Prof. Dorothy Douglas, Department of Economics, Smith College |
| T. A. Bisson, Research Associate, Foreign Policy Association | Muriel Draper, writer |
| Alice Stone Blackwell, suffragist, writer | Prof. L. C. Dunn, Professor of Zoology, Columbia University |
| Marc Blitzstein, composer | Prof. Haakon Chevalier, Professor of French, University of California |
| Anita Block, Theatre Guild playreader | Prof. George B. Cressey, Chairman of the Department of Geology and Geography, Syracuse University |
| Stirling Bowen, poet | Harriet G. Eddy, library specialist |
| Richard Boyer, staff writer, "The New Yorker" | Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, Professor of Sociology, New York University |
| Millen Brand, writer | Kenneth Fearing, poet |
| Simon Breines, architect | Prof. Mildred Fairchild, Professor of Economics, Bryn Mawr College |
| Robert Briffault, writer | Alice Withrow Field, writer |
| Prof. Dorothy Brewster, Assistant Professor of English, Columbia University | Sara Bard Field, writer |
| Prof. Edwin Berry Burgum, Associate Professor of English, New York University | William O. Field, Jr., Chairman of the Board, American Russian Institute |
| Fielding Burke, writer | Irving Fineman, writer |
| Katherine Devereaux Blake, teacher | Marjorie Fischer, writer |
| Meta Berger, writer, widow of the first Socialist Congressman | Angel Flores, writer, critic |
| Prof. Robert A. Brady, Professor of Economics, University of California | Waldo Frank, writer |
| J. E. Bromberg, actor | Wanda Gag, artist |
| Bessie Beatty, writer | Hugo Gellert, artist |
| Vera Caspary, scenario writer | Robert Gessner, Department of English, New York University |
| Maria Cristina Chambers, of the Author's League | Prof. Willystine Goodsell, Associate Professor of Education (retired), Columbia University |
| Prof. Robert Chambers, Research Professor of Biology, New York University | Mortimer Graves, of the American Council of Learned Societies |
| Harold Clurman, producer | Dr. John H. Gray, economist, former President of the American Economics Association |
| Robert M. Coates, writer | William Gropper, artist |
| Lester Cohen, writer | Maurice Halperin, Associate Editor, "Books Abroad" |

- Earl P. Hanson, explorer, writer
 Prof. Samuel N. Harper, Professor of Russian Language and Institutions, Chicago University
 Rev. Thomas L. Harris, Nat'l Executive Secretary, American League for Peace and Democracy
 Dashiell Hammett, writer
 Ernest Hemingway
 Granville Hicks, writer
 Prof. Norman E. Himes, Department of Sociology, Colgate University
 Charles J. Hendley, President Teachers' Union of the City of New York
 Leo Huberman, writer
 Langston Hughes, poet
 Agatha Illes, writer
 Rev. Otis G. Jackson, Rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Flint, Michigan
 Sam Jaffe, actor
 Orrick Johns, poet
 Matthew Josephson, writer
 George Kauffman, playwright
 Prof. Alexander Kamm, Associate Professor of Slavic Languages, University of California
 Fred C. Kelly, writer
 Rockwell Kent, artist
 Dr. John A. Kingsbury, social worker, Administrative Consultant, W. P. A.
 Beatrice Kinkadee, writer
 Lincoln E. Kirstein, ballet producer
 Arthur Kober, playwright
 Alfred Kreymborg, poet
 Edward Lamb, lawyer
 Dr. Corliss Lamont, writer, lecturer
 Margaret I. Lamont, sociologist, writer
 J. J. Lankes, artist
 Jay Leyda, cinema critic
 John Howard Lawson, playwright
 Emil Lengyel, writer, critic
 Prof. Max Lerner, Professor of Government, Williams College
 Meridel LeSueur, writer
 Meyer Levin, writer
 Prof. Charles W. Lightbody, Department of Government and History, St. Lawrence University
 Robert Morss Lovett, Governor of the Virgin Islands, an Editor of "The New Republic"
 Prof. Halford E. Luccock, Yale University Divinity School
 Katherine DuPré Lumpkin, writer
 Klaus Mann, lecturer, writer, son of Thomas Mann
 Prof. F. O. Matthiessen, Associate Professor of History of Literature, Harvard University
 Dr. Anita Marburg, Department of English, Sarah Lawrence College
 Dr. George Marshall, economist
 Aline MacMahon, actress
 Clifford T. McAvoy, Instructor, Department of Romance Languages, College of the City of New York
 Prof. V. J. McGill, Professor of Philosophy, Hunter College
 Prof. Robert McGregor, Reed College
 Ruth McKenney, writer
 Darwin J. Meserole, lawyer
 Prof. Herbert A. Miller, Professor of Economics, Bryn Mawr College
 Harvey O'Connor, writer
 Clifford Odets, playwright
 Shaennus O'Sheel, writer, critic
 Mary White Ovington, social worker
 S. J. Perelman, writer
 Dr. John P. Peters, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale University Medical School
 Dr. Emily M. Pierson, physician
 Walter N. Polakov, engineer
 Prof. Alan Porter, Professor of German, Vassar College
 George D. Pratt, Jr., agriculturist
 John Hyde Preston, writer
 Samuel Putnam, writer
 Prof. Paul Radin, Professor of Anthropology, University of California
 Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, Professor of Industrial Engineering, Columbia University
 Bernard J. Reis, accountant
 Bertha C. Reynolds, social worker
 Lynn Riggs, playwright
 Col. Raymond Robins, former head of American Red Cross in Russia
 William Rollins, Jr., writer
 Harold J. Rome, composer
 Ralph Roeder, writer
 Dr. Joseph A. Rosen, former head Jewish Joint Distribution Board
 Eugene Schoen, architect
 Prof. Margaret Schlauch, Associate Professor of English, New York University
 Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Professor of Government, Williams College
 Prof. Vida D. Scudder, Professor Emeritus of English, Wellesley College
 George Seldes, writer
 Vincent Sheean, writer
 Viola Brothers Shore, scenario writer
 Herman Shumlin, producer
 Prof. Ernest J. Simmons, Assistant Professor of English Literature, Harvard University
 Irina Skariatina, writer
 Dr. F. Tredwell Smith, educator
 Dr. Stephenson Smith, President Oregon Commonwealth Federation
 Hester Sondergaard, actress
 Isobel Walker Soule, writer, editor
 Lionel Stander, actor
 Christina Stead, writer
 A. E. Steig, artist
 Alfred K. Stern, housing specialist
 Dr. Bernard J. Stern, Department of Sociology, Columbia University
 Donald Ogden Stewart, writer
 Maxwell S. Stewart, Associate Editor, "The Nation"

- Paul Strand, producer and photographer
 Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Professor of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 Robert Tasker, scenario writer
 C. Fayette Taylor, aeronautical engineer, head of Automotive Labs., Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 James Thurber, artist, writer
 Rebecca Janney Timbres, social worker, writer
 Jean Starr Untermeyer, poet
 Louis Untermeyer, poet
 Mary van Kleeck, economist, Associate Director International Industrial Relations Institute
 Stuyvesant Van Veen, artist
 J. Raymond Walsh, economist
 Dr. William Henry Walsh, physician
- Prof. Harry F. Ward, Professor of Christian Ethics, Union Theological Seminary
 Lynd Ward, artist
 Morris Watson, New York Newspaper Guild
 Clara Weatherwax, writer
 Max Weber, artist
 Dr. Gerald Wendt, Director of Science and Education, New York World's Fair
 Rev. Robert Whitaker, clergyman and lecturer
 Albert Rhys Williams, writer
 Dr. William Carlos Williams, writer
 Ella Winter, writer
 Richard Wright, writer
 Art Young, artist
 Leane Zugsmith, writer

EXHIBIT 13

SPONSORS

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Louis Adamic | Prof. Dorothy Douglas | Prof. Max Lerner | Ernest B. Price |
| Dr. Janet Rankin Aiken | Dr. Harl R. Douglass | Dr. William Ellery Leonard | Prof. Max Radin |
| Sherwood Anderson | Prof. Leslie C. Dunn | John Lesinski | Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch |
| Roger Baldwin | Prof. Mildred Fairchild | Dr. Eduard C. Lindeman | Rev. Herman F. Reissig |
| Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes | Dr. Ernest Feise | Robert Morss Lovett | Charles Edward Russell |
| George Gordon Battle | Donald S. Friede | Dr. Henry N. MacCracken | Monsignor John A. Ryan |
| Lewis Alan Berne | Dr. Frank P. Graham | Rev. Sidney Lovett | Rose Schneiderman |
| Mary McLeod Bethune | Ernest Hemingway | Dr. Malcolm S. MacLean | Adelaide Schulkind |
| Rabbi Philip Bernstein | Donald Henderson | Paul Manship | Prof. Frederick L. Schuman |
| Alice Stone Blackwell | Sidney Hillman | Hon. Vito Marcantonio | Prof. Vida D. Scudder |
| Dr. Franz Boas | Rev. John Haynes Holmes | Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn | George Seldes |
| Van Wyck Brooks | Charles H. Houston | Bishop Francis J. McConnell | Dr. Guy Emery Shipler |
| Heywood Brown | Fannie Hurst | Carey McWilliams | Viljalmur Stefansson |
| Prof. Edwin Berry Bergum | Rev. William Lloyd Imes | Dr. Paul Monroe | Prof. Bernhard J. Stern |
| Hon. Emanuel Celler | Inez Haynes Irwin | Dr. William Allan Neilson | Donald Ogden Stewart |
| Prof. Edward P. Cheyney | Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs | Dr. Rienhold Niebuhr | Maxwell S. Stewart |
| Sarah Cleghorn | Rabbi Edward L. Israel | Judge Patrick H. O'Brien | Prof. Harold C. Urey |
| Edward Corsi | Prof. Charles S. Johnson | Hon. Caroline O'Day | Oswald Garrison Villard |
| Howard Costigan | Rockwell Kent | Hon. Culbert L. Olson | Dr. J. Raymond Walsh |
| Prof. George S. Counts | Prof. William H. Kilpatrick | O. M. Orton | James Waterman Wise |
| Dr. Leonard Covelto | Carol King | William Pickens | L. Hollingsworth Wood |
| Jerome Davis | Prof. Otto Klineberg | | Dr. Mary E. Woolley |
| Prof. John Dewey | Prof. Oliver W. Larkin | | Dr. Max Yergan |
| Carl Van Doren | | | Charles S. Zimmerman |
| John Dos Passos | | | |

Pre-Conference Headquarters: Suite 1505—79 Fifth Avenue, New York City, ALgonquin 4-2334

ERNEST HEMINGWAY
 DR. WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON
Co-Chairman, Committee of Sponsors.

FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Hotel Annapolis, Eleventh and H. Streets, N. W.

Washington, D. C., March 2 and 3, 1940

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF FOREIGN BORN

DEAR FRIENDS: We are enclosing the Program and Call for the Fourth Annual Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, which is to be held at the Hotel Annapolis, Washington, D. C., on March 2 and 3.

The Hon. Marshall E. Dimock, Assistant Secretary of Labor, and Archibald MacLeish, will be among the speakers to address this important Conference. We urge that your organization consider immediately the possibility of your being represented at this Conference by a delegate or observer.

There is no registration fee for delegates or observers. Simply fill out the form provided with the Call and return it to this office. If your union cannot send a representative, we urge that you endorse this Conference and send a contribution to help us make it a success.

If you would care to reserve a room at the Hotel Annapolis for your representative, please let us know as soon as possible. A room for one is \$3.50 for one night, and a room for two is \$4.50 for one night. We are arranging also for representatives from New York City to go to Washington in a group by train at a special fare of \$6.75 each for the round trip.

We hope that you will let us know as to your decision in this matter at your earliest convenient opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST HEMINGWAY,
Co-Chairman, Committee of 100 Sponsors.

eh/ms
uopwa
no. 16

EXHIBIT 14

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

OUTSTANDING INTERPRETER OF CURRENT WORLD AFFAIRS

Dr. Schuman has received wide acclaim as a brilliant and provocative lecturer, teacher and writer on contemporary Europe and on the human problems of a war-racked world. He was born in Chicago and took his Ph. D. in 1927 at the University of Chicago where he taught until 1936. He has also taught at Harvard University and at the University of California. He is at present holder of the Wodrow Wilson Professorship of Government at Williams College.

Over a period of fifteen years he has travelled and studied widely in England, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Russia and the Balkans. He was a Fellow of the Social Science Research Council in 1929-30 and was awarded the James-Rowe Fellowship of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in 1933. He is a member of the Phi Beta Kappa, the American Political Science Association and the American Society of International Law. He observed on the scene the inauguration of the first "Five-Year Plan" in the Soviet Union and the Nazi Revolution in Germany.

Dr. Schuman has lectured extensively before all types of audiences and is a frequent contributor to popular and learned periodicals. He has appeared repeatedly on the University of Chicago Round Table, the Town Meeting of the Air and other nation-wide radio programs.

His published books include:

- American Policy Toward Russia Since 1917* (1928)
- War and Diplomacy in the French Republic* (1931)
- International Politics—An Introduction to the Western State System*
(1st edition, 1933; 2nd edition, 1937; 3rd edition, 1941)
- Rotary?—A Survey of the Rotary Club of Chicago* (1934)
- The Conduct of German Foreign Relations* (1934)
- The Nazi Dictatorship* (1935; 2nd edition, 1936)
- Germany Since 1918* (1937)
- Europe On the Eve* (1939)
- Night Over Europe* (1941)
- Design for Power* (Jan. 1942)

LECTURE SUBJECTS

DR. SCHUMAN is available for lectures, debates and panel discussions on all political and military aspects of the contemporary European and world scene. His special knowledge of Germany and Russia, of European diplomacy and of the past and present problems of American foreign policy make his analysis of current events particularly illuminating and stimulating. His familiarity with the work of the League of Nations and his interest in the cause of Inter-Democracy Federal Union enable him to speak authoritatively regarding the tasks of post-war reconstruction and the organization of international peace.

Many audiences have been impressed with Dr. Schuman's accurate predic-

tions of coming events. As early as 1933 he forecast the Second World War. In 1935 he prophesied a major European crisis on March 12, 1938—the day on which Nazi troops marched into Austria. In 1937 he predicted the partition of Czechoslovakia, the “peace” of Munich, and the coming of war between 1938 and 1940. Early in 1938 (Cf. the *New York Herald-Tribune*, April 10, 1938) he forecast the German-Italian-Japanese alliance, the fall of France within a year after the outbreak of hostilities, and grave danger of British defeat. On April 3, 1940 (Cf. the *Knoxville News-Sentinel*) he predicted the Nazi conquest of Rumania, the renomination and reelection of President Roosevelt, the rift between Berlin and Moscow in the event of major Nazi victories, the defeat of the Allies on the European Continent, and the coming American policy of all aid to Britain and China.

WHAT THEY SAY

Of International Politics: “Professor Schuman is a pioneer in breaking from the solemn formalities * * * I welcome this dynamic, ripping challenge to those who preside with feeble hopes over dust and ashes.” (Charles A. Beard in *The American Journal of Sociology*). “The most readable as well as the most competent survey of the immensely complex subject of international relations that has yet appeared.” (F. S. Dunn in the *Baltimore Sun*).

Of The Nazi Dictatorship: “Thorough * * * exhaustive * * * dramatic * * * written with remarkable insight and understanding.” (W. K. Frank in the *New York Times*). “The definitive work on Hitlerism, practically perfect of its kind. The origin, development, intentions, contradictions, personalities, comedy, horror, and probable future of German facism are here dissected with the mastery of the political surgeon.” (Edgar Ansel Mowrer in *The Nation*).

Of Europe on the Eve: “The combination of a thoroughgoing, exhaustive scholarship with a thoroughgoing, excoriating fury is rare enough to be exciting in itself. When Professor Schuman turns such a combination upon the last half-dozen years of European diplomacy, the result is at once historical drama in the grand style and a terrible tract for the times.” (Walter Millis in the *New York Herald-Tribune*). “Well-organized, accurate, well documented, and altogether the best history of the period * * * written with a vigor, a courage, and an honesty all too rare in books by academicians.” (W. H. Heicher in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*).

Of Night Over Europe: “It can be said without fear of contradiction that this is the most important and revealing book yet to come out of the smoke and carnage of World War II. As a political historian and a chronicler of international diplomacy, Professor Frederick L. Schuman remains peerless.” (Sydney Justin Harris in the *Chicago Daily News*). “Scholarly and extremely effective * * * A logically satisfying account of how the war broke out and how it was continued on the diplomatic front * * * Much more complete than anything on the subject that others have written.” (Malcolm Cowley in *The New Republic*). “One of the most thorough and readable accounts of the debacle which engulfed the democracies * * * The author analyzes the motives of European statesmen and the logic of the successive crises of 1939-40 with the cool, incisive pen of Machiavelli.” (Geoffrey Bruun in the *New York Herald-Tribune*). “Scholarly in a high degree without being, thank God, the least bit impartial * * * If you want this analysis very eloquently presented, here it is: it will not be done better.” (Vincent Sheean in *The Saturday Review of Literature*). “Professor Schuman’s powerful voice is waking the democracies, and especially America, to the realization of the mortal danger in which all civilization finds itself. His effort, buttressed by so much distinguished scholarship and a rare power of presentation, will help to erect a guide-post towards a brighter alternative for the future.” (Hans Kohn in *The Boston Evening Transcript*).

(At 3:50 p. m. the subcommittee adjourned until Wednesday, March 31, 1943, at 10 a. m.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1943

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met in room 1301, new House Office Building at 10 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman of the full committee) presiding.

Present: Hon. Martin Dies, Hon. Noah M. Mason, and Hon. J. Parnell Thomas; also present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator, and Dr. J. B. Matthews, research director for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The subcommittee will come to order. This subcommittee is presided over by Mr. Starnes. Mr. Starnes has to go on to another committee meeting, and asked me to preside.

'Will you stand and be sworn?

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

TESTIMONY OF EMIL JOHN LEVER, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, LABOR PRODUCTION DIVISION OF THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. LEVER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Have a seat, sir. Go ahead, Doctor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please state your full name?

Mr. LEVER. Emil John Lever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. LEVER. I was born in southern Russia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the name of the place where you were born?

Mr. LEVER. In a town, an agricultural town, about 80 miles from the capital of the province, the name of which is Cherson.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When were you born?

Mr. LEVER. I was born on January 21, 1894.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you come to the United States?

Mr. LEVER. I was brought here by my people in June or July 1906.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you a citizen of the United States?

Mr. LEVER. I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By what process did you become a citizen?

Mr. LEVER. The process of naturalization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When were you naturalized?

Mr. LEVER. In 1919, when I returned from service.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you naturalized?

Mr. LEVER. In Philadelphia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the exact date of the naturalization?

Mr. LEVER. I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was in 1919?

Mr. LEVER. 1919.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your service in the First World War?

Mr. LEVER. I served in Battery D, Third Field Artillery, which was attached to the Sixth Division in the A. E. F.

After the armistice, because I was a machinist, I was transferred from the Third Field Artillery to the Sixth Division Motor Transport Unit, at Arras, France, and worked in a machine shop until we then returned home about June 1919.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever been convicted of a crime?

Mr. LEVER. Never.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever been arrested?

Mr. LEVER. I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give an outline of your educational background?

Mr. LEVER. Not much. I went to grammar school, fifth grade, and I was brought to this country and went to serve my time as an apprentice in a machine shop in Philadelphia; took a 3-year night course at Spring Garden Institute in mechanical drawing and mathematics, with some studying in the International Correspondence Schools; was taken west in 1911 to Colorado by my older brother, where we operated a small garden; went to work for 2 years at the United States Naval Hospital at Fort Lyon, Colo., as a young machinist in a power plant, one of about 15 civilian mechanical employees on that reservation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you give a chronological account of your employment?

Mr. LEVER. Well, that is not so easy in terms of some twenty-seven or twenty-eight years of employment in a good many places throughout the country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Give it to the best of your recollection.

Mr. LEVER. I have worked in a good many foundries and machine shops, automotive plants, throughout the country—aircraft plants. The more recent ones, perhaps, come closer to mind.

I worked for Chance Vought in experimental work on military aircraft for the Army and Navy and for foreign governments in 1929 and '30. Prior to that I worked for a brief period for Crown Cap Corporation, Long Island City, New York, on die making, making tools and dies for closures.

I have worked with the Willys-Overland Corporation once upon a time as a young tool maker.

Mr. THOMAS. How long did you work for the Crown Cap Co.?

Mr. LEVER. Several months at the most.

Mr. THOMAS. Five months?

Mr. LEVER. Maybe; just off-hand.

Mr. THOMAS. In what year was that?

Mr. LEVER. That was in 1928, early in '28, probably January.

Mr. THOMAS. Who was your boss at that time?

Mr. LEVER. Offhand I can't give you his name. That wouldn't be very difficult to check.

Mr. THOMAS. How come you to get the job?

Mr. LEVER. I just asked for the job, like any other mechanic.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your present employment?

Mr. LEVER. My present employment is executive assistant to the Associate Director of the Labor Production Division of the War Production Board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long have you held that position?

Mr. LEVER. About since last July, I should say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your salary?

Mr. LEVER. My salary is sixty-five hundred.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had any previous employment in the Federal Government?

Mr. LEVER. I was employed by the Federal Government as I previously indicated at the United States Naval Hospital as a young machinist in 1911 to '13. I installed a machine shop for training purposes at Camp Dix in 1921, which took about 2 months' work, something like that—maybe 3—in the summer of '21. My next connection with the Government is the present job.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Since last July?

Mr. LEVER. Since April 28, 1941. The present job is a reclassification as of last October.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You haven't had the same title throughout this period?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please state what your first title and approximate duties were when you came with the Federal Government in 1941?

Mr. LEVER. I was brought in—let me see if I remember the exact title. You get so many in the course of time. I was senior field representative, I think. That will stand some correction; that is my recollection, in the original job, under Sidney Hillman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration in that position?

Mr. LEVER. Fifty-six hundred.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had one increase in salary since then?

Mr. LEVER. One increase.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you receive that increase?

Mr. LEVER. I think it was October 16, 1942.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever a member of the Industrial Workers of the World?

Mr. LEVER. I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When were you a member of the Industrial Workers of the World?

Mr. LEVER. From about 1914 to 1917.

Mr. STARNES. Just a moment, if I may interrupt. You have finished now with Mr. Lever's educational background and his employment?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You are coming now into his period of activity with the Federal Government?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Lever, did you apply for your position with Mr. Hillman when you first came in?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Or were you asked to come?

Mr. LEVER. I was asked to come.

Mr. STARNES. Who asked you to come in?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Hillman telephoned to the plant where I was employed, and that was the Pitcairn-Lawson Autogyro plant, and asked me to come. How that came about was brought out later.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Hillman was the one who asked you to come. You didn't apply for the place?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Did you furnish any reference or recommendation, or did he ask you for any?

Mr. LEVER. He had known me for about 20 years, but prior to that, in the course of the investigations and the application by the Civil Service, I was compelled to file the usual references.

Mr. STARNES. O. K.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Lever, why did you leave the Crown Cap Co.?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I have held a number of such jobs, particularly since 1919, when I returned from the service. I am one of the people who have gotten something the matter with their insides in France that the Veterans' Administration has never been able to determine, and so I have been in veterans' hospitals since 1929, been examined, usually once a year, and spent some time at the Mayo Clinic and all through there, trying to take care of it.

When you are working on precision work you are working under extreme strain quite often, and you can work for a few months and then you find that you can't work, and the question of your ability to work is largely one of physical strength. I was having quite a good time working in the tool room at Crown Cap.

Mr. THOMAS. You worked there in connection with dies, didn't you?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; making dies for closures, and so forth.

Mr. THOMAS. And did you resign voluntarily?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. You weren't discharged?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Was there any objection on the part of the management or your boss as to the dies that you were making?

Mr. LEVER. I don't think so. I thought that the man I was working for was one of the finest men I ever met. We never had any trouble.

Mr. THOMAS. What was his name?

Mr. LEVER. I can't recall the man's name. I could identify him if I saw him. That was in 1928.

Mr. MASON. Dr. Matthews, the gentleman stated that after he had been invited by Hillman to come and take this position, developments then told him why he had been invited, or something, and I would like to have that enlarged upon.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please tell us what you were told about the reasons for your employment?

Mr. LEVER. That is very brief. At that time there was a National Defense Advisory Committee working with Mr. Hillman, composed of representatives of organized labor, the railroad brotherhoods, A. F. of L. and C. I. O. Mr. Hillman asked the American Federation

of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations to designate one man each, if they had such people, or to nominate such people who had some experience in training. This was after Congress had voted a good many millions for developing a defense training program, and there were very few people, apparently, who had the practical experience end of it.

The American Federation of Labor nominated a man who was doing vocational training; the Congress of Industrial Organizations said, "Lever is working in an aircraft plant. If you want him, you will have to get him."

Mr. MASON. The Congress of Industrial Organizations recommended you to Hillman?

Mr. LEVER. Representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations on this Defense Advisory Committee working with Mr. Hillman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did William Green approve your appointment?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know whether he has or not, and it wasn't required that he should.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't know whether he objected or not?

Mr. LEVER. No; and I don't care much.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever have any uncomplimentary remarks or communications from William Green, of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. LEVER. I have. I have made some uncomplimentary ones, too, in the course of time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did William Green ever write you, "It was just such as you that we were afraid Brookwood would turn out"?

Mr. LEVER. Very much so, and I have a copy of that letter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you on occasion used that letter with pride?

Mr. LEVER. I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you, or where did you, join the I. W. W.?

Mr. LEVER. In Salt Lake City, I should say in the spring of 1914, probably March or April.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you employed at the time?

Mr. LEVER. I was working at the time in a railroad shop in Idaho.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited you to join the I. W. W.?

Mr. LEVER. I heard a soap-boxer, Mr. Matthews, in Salt Lake City on a Sunday afternoon, and a good Mormon friend and I took a walk and we heard somebody making a speech, and I thought it was a very exciting speech.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the nature of the speech that attracted you?

Mr. LEVER. He thought that labor ought to get organized.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you resign from the I. W. W. when you left the organization?

Mr. LEVER. I permitted my membership to run out.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say that was in the year 1917?

Mr. LEVER. 1917.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It couldn't have been 1918?

Mr. LEVER. 1918? Well, I went into the service in May 1918.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And did you have your membership in the I. W. W. up until the time you entered the service?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall now whether it was up to the time I entered the service or whether it ran out a few months earlier.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by "let your membership run out"? You just failed to pay dues?

Mr. LEVER. Failed to pay dues.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the bylaws of the organization, was that equivalent to withdrawal?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall the bylaws, but probably there was a clause. The normal clause in union bylaws is that if you don't pay dues for a period of 3 or 4 months you are dropped from membership. That was probably contained in those bylaws somewhere.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the I. W. W. a revolutionary organization?

Mr. LEVER. Some people said it was, and some people said it was a union, an industrial union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you claim it was a revolutionary organization?

Mr. LEVER. I claimed it was an industrial union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever claim it was a revolutionary organization?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I don't recall claiming it was a revolutionary organization. I have heard people who had.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Bill Haywood?

Mr. LEVER. I knew him casually, having heard him speak on a couple of occasions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever work with Bill Haywood?

Mr. LEVER. Naturally, since I was a member of that organization—more or less long distance, but I suppose you could call it that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you engage in organizing activities with Bill Haywood?

Mr. LEVER. More or less indirectly; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you organize the Marine Transport Workers Industrial Union together with Bill Haywood?

Mr. LEVER. I am one of a number of people who organized it; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And was Bill Haywood one of the others?

Mr. LEVER. No; Bill Haywood did not participate directly in it. There were about a dozen men who were interested in building an industrial union of marine transport workers at that time on this coast. That is where my activity took place.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not you ever stated that you organized the Marine Transport Workers Industrial Union with William D. Haywood?

Mr. LEVER. I may have stated it, because Will Haywood was secretary of the national organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You may have stated it? Was it a fact?

Mr. LEVER. It was a fact in the sense that I have just stated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know the history, in brief, of the arrest and conviction of Bill Haywood?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For what was he convicted?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I don't know what the legalities are. I didn't participate in that trial. I wasn't there. I got most of my information from newspapers, like anybody else.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not he fled the country after his conviction?

Mr. LEVER. No; he fled the country after he was let out on bail in the post-war period.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did he go?

Mr. LEVER. Well, he is supposed to have gone to Russia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever meet him in Russia?

Mr. LEVER. I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well then, there is no reason to say he is supposed to have gone there, is there?

Mr. LEVER. No; I don't know where else he went. I met him there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you met him in Russia, you know from your own personal knowledge that he went to Russia.

Mr. LEVER. O. K.; on that occasion I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you meet him in Russia? What was the year?

Mr. LEVER. In the winter of 1927, probably November or December. I think it was November.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he die in Russia?

Mr. LEVER. So the newspapers reported.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have read the newspaper accounts of his death in Russia and his burial in the walls of the Kremlin?

Mr. LEVER. I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who were some of the other leaders of the I. W. W. with whom you were associated in organizing activities?

Mr. LEVER. Walter Neff; E. F. Dore.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were they associated with you in the organization of the Marine Transport Workers Industrial Union?

Mr. LEVER. They were.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a paid organizer of the Marine Transport Workers Industrial Union?

Mr. LEVER. I worked nights, usually, as a tool and die maker, and spent what waking hours I could helping them organize. That was my usual method of compensation. I always depend on myself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever a paid organizer of the I. W. W.?

Mr. LEVER. Once upon a time I drew the enormous sum of \$18 a week and expenses.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As an organizer of the I. W. W.?

Mr. LEVER. That's right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you organize for the I. W. W.?

Mr. LEVER. In the port of Philadelphia and the port of Baltimore.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that before the World War?

Mr. LEVER. That was before the World War, before America got into the World War.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that immediately prior to your enlistment?

Mr. LEVER. That was up to about January or February or March 1917.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you enlist or were you drafted?

Mr. LEVER. I went ahead of my quota. The Army advertised for mechanics and I was a mechanic and I went.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you associated in any way whatever with the Centralia case, involving the I. W. W.?

Mr. LEVER. No; I have never been on the Pacific coast until November of a year ago, when I went out on an inspection trip of defense industries with several staff members.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you at any time active in the defense of the so-called Wobblies?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I have probably collected funds in their defense and participated in defense committees wherever I was, probably again in Philadelphia or Baltimore.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But not on the Pacific coast or in the West?

Mr. LEVER. No; I was never on the Pacific coast for them.

Mr. THOMAS. Before you go on, will you explain what the Wobblies were?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The members of the I. W. W., Industrial Workers of the World, were popularly called the Wobblies.

Mr. LEVER. A nickname.

Mr. MATTHEWS. An organization which, as the witness says, some people have described as the revolutionary organization of workers in this country prior to the First World War. The witness himself has declined to state that he called it a revolutionary organization, but he says that others have so described it.

Mr. MASON. If the gentleman from New Jersey were as old as the gentleman from Illinois he would remember back to that time and would know all about it.

Mr. THOMAS. Just getting back to the real purport of the testimony, what was this organization engaged in during the war, for instance?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you state what that was?

Mr. LEVER. The organization was established around 1905 by men like Eugene Debs.

Mr. THOMAS. Never mind 'way back there. I want to know what they did during the World War.

Mr. LEVER. They were organizing workers into industrial unions.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all?

Mr. LEVER. That was their purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. Weren't they engaged in sabotage also?

Mr. LEVER. They were charged with that, but I have noted in reading reports in the labor and public press during that period that apparently the only ports in which the I. W. W. had some semblance of organization where there wasn't any sabotage were those ports. I knew Baltimore intimately; I knew Philadelphia intimately, and there weren't even charges brought during that trial that they had any trouble in those ports.

Mr. THOMAS. Wasn't it proven in the courts that they were guilty of sabotage in certain places during the World War?

Mr. LEVER. I doubt it very much, in spite of the fact that they were convicted. We lived through a different psychological period than we did in this war.

Mr. THOMAS. Never mind this war. I am talking about World War I now.

Mr. LEVER. I am simply making a comparison. In this war we had a long period; we are still passing through a period of getting people excited about the defense of the country. In the last war, with the sinking of the *Lusitania* and something else, the American people just went wild about it.

Mr. THOMAS. That hasn't anything to do with my question. My question is, and if the witness doesn't know the answer I would like to have Dr. Matthews ask the witness some questions on this particular point or make a statement for the record; I want to know whether this particular organization that this man was a member

of wasn't guilty of sabotage and other crimes during World War No. 1?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall any cases of conviction involving sabotage of members of the I. W. W. during the First World War?

Mr. LEVER. I do not. That is a matter that the committee will have to go into the court records for.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what year was Bill Haywood convicted?

Mr. LEVER. Either 1917 or 1918.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Wasn't his conviction during the World War?

Mr. LEVER. That was the World War period, certainly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then you do recall that one case.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Bill Haywood the recognized leader of the I. W. W.?

Mr. LEVER. I think he was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I cannot from memory give you specific instances, but there were numerous convictions in various parts of the country.

Mr. THOMAS. I think, for the record, then, that they ought to be supplied right at this point, if that is all right with the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right.

(The material furnished for the record is as follows:)

On April 1, 1918, in Chicago, 166 defendants who were leaders of the I. W. W. were placed on trial. Their trials lasted approximately 5 months and resulted in 93 convictions with sentences ranging from 1 to 20 years in Leavenworth Penitentiary.

On January 25, 1919, in Sacramento, Calif., 46 leaders and members of the I. W. W. were convicted and received sentences ranging from 1 to 10 years.

In Wichita, Kans., 50 I. W. W. defendants were placed on trial; in Omaha, Nebr., 49; and in Spokane, Wash., 28. In most of these cases, convictions resulted.

In addition to the foregoing, there were during the period of World War I numerous individual trials and convictions of leaders of the I. W. W.

Among those convicted was Vincent St. John, general organizer of the I. W. W., who described the tactics and methods of the I. W. W. in one of his pamphlets, as follows: "As a revolutionary organization the Industrial Workers of the World aims to use any and all tactics that will get results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of 'right' and 'wrong' does not concern us. * * * 'Sabotage' is used to force the employers to concede the demands of the workers. * * * Interference by the Government is resented by open violation of Government orders, going to jail en masse, causing expense to the taxpayers, which is but another name for the employing class."

Mr. LEVER. May I, Mr. Chairman, elaborate on this question a little more?

The CHAIRMAN. On the question of what convictions?

Mr. MASON. I would like to make this observation, that so far as I remember, there were no cases of sabotage in the Baltimore yards or the Philadelphia yards, and most of it was out on the west coast, which you say you had nothing to do with. Then, if branches or units of the organization to which you belonged out on the west coast performed acts of sabotage, but the units to which you belonged here, Baltimore and Philadelphia, did not, it seems to me we are going far afield when we try to identify the witness with acts performed by this organization on the west coast.

Mr. THOMAS. I think Mr. Mason made a very good observation, but we will let the record speak for itself, and if there are any convictions, put them in the record.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, may I elaborate on this thing a little bit, in line with Mr. Mason's suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; go ahead.

Mr. LEVER. I think it would be informative to the committee to indicate what happened in such places as Philadelphia and Baltimore, where I was at the time.

There was a judge in Baltimore named J. Abner Saylor, who was then an attorney, and who did some legal work for us. My first experience with conviction was a statement in the Baltimore Sun of a Sunday morning that because members of the I. W. W. were being arrested in the West they were running to Baltimore and making a haven out of it, upon which I visited the chief of police and the United States District Attorney, in company with Judge Saylor, and asked them to indicate any I. W. W.'s who were hiding in Baltimore, and promised if there were any such people who were under charges or under indictment, all they needed to do was telephone, and if I knew where they were at I would be glad to bring them in. I also asked the United States District Attorney whether there were any charges against me. He said he had never heard of any. I gave him my card, and I have never heard from him since. That is proven.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, may I suggest that we proceed with the development of the testimony? We can ask questions later, unless it is in explanation of some point that is brought out. We will proceed with it, and then if the witness has explanations to make, we will accord him that right. Just proceed to develop it. You are now on the industrial organization. What we are primarily interested in, I think, is the nature of the organization, what it stood for.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was going to ask the witness if the Industrial Workers of the World advocated the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

Mr. LEVER. I can't answer that question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a member of the organization. Don't you know what its program was?

Mr. LEVER. I was a member of the organization many years ago, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Francis Biddle, held in the deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges that he was a member of an organization which advocated the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence, and named the I. W. W. as that organization, would you say from your recollection that the Attorney General was correct?

Mr. LEVER. No; I would say that was his opinion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever read any of the program of the I. W. W., the organization to which you belonged?

Mr. LEVER. I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you wish to state that you do not recollect whether it advocated the overthrow of the United States Government or not?

Mr. LEVER. That depends on who advocated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the I. W. W. advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force?

Mr. LEVER. When an individual who is connected in one form or another with an organization advocates his views, it doesn't necessarily represent the views of me or anybody else. Those are his views.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the organization itself, officially, advocate in its program the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, right at that point, Mr. Lever, you were a member and active in it, and one time the organizer. You heard the speakers, you were quite enthusiastic over it, were you not?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You felt very deeply that what they were trying to do was right; didn't you?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You certainly were acquainted with what the organization stood for.

Mr. LEVER. Except that I stood for my own convictions in the matter, which that organization gave me an opportunity to do.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not now asking you that question, because you stated in the beginning that some people considered it revolutionary; other people, including you, didn't consider it revolutionary. We are asking you about the organization itself. You were actively identified with it. It seems to me you certainly ought to know what the organization stood for.

What did you think it stood for from reading its literature and pamphlets?

Mr. LEVER. I think that the organization stood for the organization of labor on an industrial-union basis, and that was my interest in the organization, and where I participated, Mr. Chairman, we were building unions of workers on an industry basis.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you understand the organization stood for from its own statements?

Mr. LEVER. There is no doubt that that organization intended to be a revolutionary organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's be perfectly frank about it.

Mr. LEVER. We are perfectly frank about it.

The CHAIRMAN. We are familiar with what the organization is, and you are. We are now asking you about your own opinions. We are asking a very simple thing. You know as well as we do that the organization did stand for the overthrow of the Government by force and violence; don't you?

Mr. LEVER. I want to see it in print before I believe it. I haven't seen any I. W. W. literature for 25 years.

The CHAIRMAN. From your recollection you knew perfectly well that the organization was a revolutionary organization; didn't you?

Mr. LEVER. That depends on the meaning of the word "revolutionary."

The CHAIRMAN. The overthrow of the Government, the existing Government. Didn't you understand it stood for that?

Mr. LEVER. I wasn't interested in overthrowing the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not talking about what you were interested in; I am talking about what the organization was, from your acquaintance with it. You knew Haywood, you knew the leaders, you read the

literature. You certainly know whether the organization was in favor of the overthrow of our Government.

Mr. LEVER. I knew its outstanding leaders casually. I heard Haywood speak a couple of times. I have never been in a conference with Haywood in my life.

As a youngster, I was a sort of active youngster in the thing. The conception of what constitutes a revolutionary organization to a boy of about 18, 19, in comparison with my understanding of it now, is a lot different.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but, of course, you are playing on words. The thing that seems to me that you could answer is, from your acquaintance with the organization, whether or not the organization advocated the overthrow of this country, of our existing Government. Now, did you gain the impression during your association with it that that was the purpose of the organization?

Mr. LEVER. I have met people in it who thought so; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you read the official literature of it?

Mr. LEVER. At that time? Probably.

The CHAIRMAN. Did it advocate the overthrow of our Government?

Mr. LEVER. That depends on your interpretation of the words.

The CHAIRMAN. I am using simple words, regardless of their interpretation. Did it advocate the overthrow of the existing Government?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know. I can't testify to that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Harry Bridges at the time he was a member of the I. W. W.?

Mr. LEVER. I never saw Harry Bridges until about a year ago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you see him a year ago?

Mr. LEVER. I saw him in a conference, in a labor conference, here in Washington.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under what auspices was that labor conference?

Mr. LEVER. As a representative of his union from the Pacific coast.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under what auspices was that labor conference held here in Washington?

Mr. LEVER. The Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever associated with the National Metal Trades Association?

Mr. LEVER. The National Metal Trades Association is an employers' antiunion organization. I couldn't have been associated with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever associated with any union in that field?

Mr. LEVER. I was associated with the International Association of Machinists for twenty-three-odd years, in the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever contribute any articles to a publication know as the "Labor Herald"?

Mr. LEVER. I have. One article, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the title of that article?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall the title of it, but I think I recall the substance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the year in which you contributed the article?

Mr. LEVER. I think it was 1922.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it refresh your recollection if I told you it was April 1923?

Mr. LEVER. We will stand corrected on a minor issue.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is to make the record as accurate as possible. Under what auspices was the "Labor Herald" published?

Mr. LEVER. The "Labor Herald" was published by William Z. Foster.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it published under the auspices of the Trade Union Educational League?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; so it claimed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know at the time that you wrote for it that it was published under the auspices of the Trade Union Educational League?

Mr. LEVER. I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Trade Union Educational League subsequently change its name to the Trade Union Unity League?

Mr. LEVER. It is quite possible. Those organizations change names quite often.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, aren't you sure, as a student of labor questions, that it did change its name to the Trade Union Unity League?

Mr. LEVER. There was such a thing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean there was such a thing as the change of the name?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I don't know whether it was before or after.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know William Z. Foster?

Mr. LEVER. I have heard William Z. Foster speak on several occasions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever met him personally?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say you recall the substance of the article which you wrote 20 years ago?

Mr. LEVER. How many articles did I write?

Mr. MATTHEWS. William Z. Foster is only one man, and I am just asking if you ever met him personally.

Mr. LEVER. I can't recall conditions under which I may have met him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether Earl Browder contributed an article to the same issue of Labor Herald in which your article appeared?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know whether he had or not. It isn't beyond the range of possibility, though.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Earl Browder has an article in the same issue. William Z. Foster was the editor of the publication at the time Mr. Lever contributed his article.

Mr. LEVER. What was the article about, Dr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was going to ask you if you would please state the substance of the article.

Mr. LEVER. Well, I haven't seen it for—when was it, 1923? I haven't seen it since that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said a moment ago, as I understood you, that you did recall the substance of the article.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I probably advocated labor-management production committees.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall, if your memory is refreshed, that you were discussing the subject of amalgamation?

Mr. LEVER. That is quite possible.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At that particular period, in 1923, was the word "amalgamation" the definite slogan of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVER. The Communist Party borrowed the slogan from the International Association of Machinists of the A. F. of L., who coined it several years earlier.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it a particular slogan of the Communist Party in this period, 1923?

Mr. LEVER. I believe it was. But it was also a slogan of the A. F. of L. metal trades unions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it not a fact that the entire trade-union program of the Communist Party in that period was organized around the slogan "amalgamation"?

Mr. LEVER. It may have been. I couldn't very well follow all the machinations of the Communist Party, and therefore don't consider myself an authority.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was a Communist publication to which you contributed your article, was it not?

Mr. LEVER. It claimed to be a publication of the Trade Union Educational League.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you consider the Trade Union Educational League and the Trade Union Unity League Communist organizations?

Mr. LEVER. I think they were under Communist domination.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have no hesitation in saying they were Communist controlled?

Mr. LEVER. I am saying I think they were Communist dominated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a man who has had long years of experience in trade-union activities, it is your understanding that William Z. Foster and Earl Browder, who at that time were active in the—

Mr. LEVER. Are you trying to make a case that I ever had any connections with the Communist party, Mr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am asking a question, if you please.

Mr. LEVER. You are asking me what substance that article contained. I probably advocated the amalgamation of the metal trades.

The CHAIRMAN. He was asking you a question about Foster and Browder. State your question again.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir; Mr. Chairman.

We have already elicited the information that the article dealt with the subject of amalgamation. Now I am going on to the next step, to show that amalgamation was a particular slogan of the Communist party, and the Communist leaders, William Z. Foster and Earl Browder in this period, particularly in connection with their work in the Trade Union Educational League and the Trade Union Unity League; and that the witness wrote an article for the publication of those men and their organization dealing with the same subject.

Now, I should like to ask the witness if the viewpoint which he presented in this article was in line with the viewpoint of the Trade Union Educational League.

Mr. LEVER. I should think that the people who spoke for the Trade Union Educational League ought to be asked that question. I spoke the viewpoint of the International Association of Machinists, which worked for amalgamation several years earlier, beginning around 1913. I joined the Machinists in 1914, in Toledo.

May I finish?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Because the Communists at any one time pick up a slogan of the trade-union movement and proceed to make it their own doesn't make the advocates of the original idea in the labor-movement Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. No one has charged that.

Mr. LEVER. No; but that is the history of those things. When it becomes a popular issue, other people pick it up and carry it along for probably their own purposes, which wasn't our purpose at all. We were interested in unionism as such.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you associate yourself with the International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Industry?

Mr. LEVER. I don't think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wish to read you the last paragraph of your article as it appears on page 21 of the "Labor Herald" for April 1923:

To oppose a plan for unifying the workers in their fight against exploitation along constructive lines, based on sound trade union policy, as proposed by the International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Trades, is the greatest offense that any officer of any metal trades union can possibly commit against his fellow workers.

Does that refresh your recollection at all as to whether or not you were yourself affiliated with the organization?

Mr. LEVER. That doesn't prove affiliation at all. It proved that I believed in the amalgamation of the metal trades.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am asking you a question as to whether or not you were affiliated.

Mr. LEVER. I was not affiliated with it, and therefore answered your question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You endorsed the program of the International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Trades, however, did you not?

Mr. LEVER. I endorsed the program of amalgamation in the metal trades before there ever was such a thing as the Trade Union Educational League, or a Labor Herald as a publication, and I stood my ground then as I did previously.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now I repeat the question: You endorsed the program of the International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Trades, did you not?

Mr. LEVER. I advocated amalgamation of the metal trades.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the answer is not responsive.

The CHAIRMAN. Read the content again.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was a committee formally set up, known as the International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Industry. I am asking the witness if he endorsed that specific committee's program?

Mr. LEVER. Conceivably.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not you did?

Mr. LEVER. If you consider the statement that you read as an endorsement of it, I agree with you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did this International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Trades carry on factional activities inside the metal trades union of which you were a member?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you support the view of the International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Trades which was stated in its printed program as follows:

The International Association of Machinists must also affiliate in the only fighting international in the world, the Red International of Labor Unions, with headquarters in Moscow?

Mr. LEVER. I certainly did not. Are you reading from my article?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I stated that I was reading from the statement of the International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Trades.

Mr. LEVER. I never saw such statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Nevertheless you did say that to oppose the plans and program of the International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Industry was the greatest offense that any metal trades union officer could possibly commit against his fellow workers.

Mr. LEVER. As an amalgamation program of the metal trades.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever connected with the so-called Farmer-Labor Party of Pennsylvania?

Mr. LEVER. I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what capacity were you associated with the Farmer-Labor Party of Pennsylvania?

Mr. LEVER. Almost in no capacity, but I was probably a member of the State committee during a period of 1 or 2 years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you not a member of the State executive committee of the Farmer-Labor Party of Pennsylvania?

Mr. LEVER. I think I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For several years?

Mr. LEVER. For a year or two.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the years, approximately?

Mr. LEVER. Probably in 1925 or '26; maybe '24, through there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it not as early as 1923?

Mr. LEVER. It may have been.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From 1923 to 1927?

Mr. LEVER. Let's see—when was that? I think I was in New York State in 1927. I am sure I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Farmer-Labor Party of Pennsylvania have any national affiliations?

Mr. LEVER. The Farmer-Labor Party of Pennsylvania acted more or less as the State organization of the Conference for Progressive Political Action. It was then organized by the railroad brotherhoods and other unions, headed by William H. Johnston, who was then president of the International Association of Machinists. It was a political offshoot in Pennsylvania of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it put up candidates?

Mr. LEVER. It endorsed candidates which were endorsed by the Conference for Progressive Political Action.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When was the Conference for Progressive Political Action organized?

Mr. LEVER. I think it was established around 1921 or '22.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In Pennsylvania?

Mr. LEVER. Well, it wasn't called that in Pennsylvania. I think it was originally established through a trade-union conference in Washington.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you confident of your recollection there?

Mr. LEVER. As to when it was established?

Mr. MATTHEWS. As to when it was established.

Mr. LEVER. Yes, about that time. It participated in the LaFollette-Wheeler campaign, for instance, in 1924, which I distinctly remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Farmer-Labor Party of that period endorse Communist candidates for office?

Mr. LEVER. In Pennsylvania?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; or nationally.

Mr. LEVER. Well, I wasn't connected with any national organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Wasn't the Pennsylvania organization affiliated with the national group?

Mr. LEVER. With the Conference for Progressive Political Action, run by the railroad brotherhoods.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it affiliated with any national Farmer-Labor Party movement of that period?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall a national Farmer-Labor Party movement of that period.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make a trip to the Soviet Union in 1927?

Mr. LEVER. I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under what auspices did you make that trip?

Mr. LEVER. Under my own auspices.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a part of what was known as the trade-union delegation to the U. S. S. R.?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a part of what was known as the rank and file trade-union delegation to the U. S. S. R.?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you go in company with other persons?

Mr. LEVER. I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To the U. S. S. R.?

Mr. LEVER. I did; one of whom was former Representative Lundeen, of Minnesota, afterwards United States Senator.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recognize that as your handwriting? Is that your signature?

Mr. LEVER. I believe it is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recognize that as your own handwriting?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The witness identifies this as his own handwriting. In this document do you state that you were a member of the rank and file delegation to Russia in 1927?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you wish to alter your previous testimony?

Mr. LEVER. I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was this statement true?

Mr. LEVER. That is a rhetorical statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what that means. Were you or were you not a member of the rank and file delegation to Russia in 1927?

Mr. LEVER. Will you define the rank and file delegation?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You yourself have stated in writing here that you were. In your testimony a moment ago you stated that you were not.

Mr. LEVER. May I refer to my testimony, Mr. Chairman, before the Federal agencies who investigated me?

The CHAIRMAN. Later, if it is important; but it seems to me, Mr. Lever, that you stated that you were not a member of the rank and file committee. Your letter states that you were, and you say that your statement in the letter was rhetorical. What do you mean by "rhetorical"?

Mr. LEVER. Because that group became known as the rank and file delegation, but no one elected me or appointed me or designated me as a member of any delegation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He didn't ask you that question.

Mr. LEVER. Consequently I say that this is a rhetorical question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who paid your expenses to the Soviet Union on that occasion?

Mr. LEVER. I paid my own.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall any of the other persons who accompanied you or whom you went with on that occasion?

Mr. LEVER. Senator Lundeen, of Minnesota.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I said, "Do you recall any others?" You have named him.

Mr. LEVER. I suppose amongst the people who were on that boat were probably a dozen people. I remember an electrician from the Pacific coast, whose name I don't recall at the moment.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether Pauline Rogers was a member of the party?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall the name. There were two or three women in that group.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall Pauline Rogers?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know whether I do or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't recall her as one of the leading Communist women organizers?

Mr. LEVER. If I saw her I might recognize her.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As one of the leading women Communist organizers in New York?

Mr. LEVER. No, I don't. I wasn't active in the Communist movement in New York or anywhere else, and am not likely to know them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not the Communist Party was active in the organization of the rank and file delegation?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To the Soviet Union?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know that it was?

Mr. LEVER. No. I don't doubt, Mr. Chairman, that some of the people in that group were Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, you know they were from your conversations and association with them.

Mr. LEVER. I am saying I don't doubt it.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's put it a little differently, so as to be perfectly frank. You are quite certain in your own mind from your conversations and associations with them that some of the people were Communists.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, you are asking a legal question which I cannot prove. I can only state my convictions.

The CHAIRMAN. I am saying, from your conversations with them and your association with them you reached the opinion, let us say, that some of the people were Communists.

Mr. LEVER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What percentage of the 12? What percentage, in your opinion, were Communists?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say most of them were Communists?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know, frankly.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. LEVER. I would say some were.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know E. P. Cush?

Mr. LEVER. Pat Cush, of Pittsburgh?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Steel worker?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. Was he in the delegation?

Mr. LEVER. I think he was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know him as a Communist leader, don't you?

Mr. LEVER. I knew him as a Communist leader afterward.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know him to have Communist views at the time?

Mr. LEVER. He used to be a delegate, apparently, from one of the steel locals in the old Amalgamated to the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor Conventions, the annual conventions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you reached the Soviet Union did you make any speeches anywhere in the country?

Mr. LEVER. I have talked with I don't know how many people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I said, did you make any speeches?

The CHAIRMAN. When you were in the Soviet Union. That is what he is asking you.

Mr. LEVER. I have talked to several groups in Russia, if you call them speeches.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, you did make speeches.

Did you deliver a speech before the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union?

Mr. LEVER. Where?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In Moscow.

Mr. LEVER. I probably made a statement; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Don't you recall quite definitely that you did make a speech before the Friends of the Soviet Union Congress in Moscow?

Mr. LEVER. Of course, if you say a few sentences and you call it a speech, you can call it that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the substance of that speech?

Mr. LEVER. No, I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having said—

The Russian labor movement alone has shown the courage and the ability to take over the Government and industry?

Mr. LEVER. That is a quotation from what?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is a quotation from part of your speech before the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union in Moscow in November of 1927.

Mr. LEVER. Reported in what?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reported in the Daily Worker.

Mr. LEVER. I didn't read the Daily Worker and didn't know what the Daily Worker reported, and wasn't its agent.

The CHAIRMAN. He is not asking you that. He is simply asking you if you made that statement in Moscow.

Mr. THOMAS. Anybody that is on the pay roll of the Government and getting \$6,500 a year ought to be more willing to answer these questions freely. I don't think the witness is responsive enough. He is appearing before a very important committee of the House of Representatives, and he shouldn't be so reluctant to answer these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. At any rate, answer the questions. When you are asked a simple question, if you made a certain statement in Moscow, you either know or you don't know. If you made the statement, say "yes."

Mr. LEVER. I made no such statement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever held to that viewpoint as expressed in that statement?

Mr. LEVER. I don't think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Don't you know whether you have or not?

Mr. LEVER. I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And your answer is that you have not held to that viewpoint?

Mr. LEVER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The viewpoint that it is a matter of courage and ability to take over the Government and industry for the trade-union movement or the labor movement?

Mr. LEVER. Where?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Anywhere, in Russia or elsewhere.

Mr. LEVER. What is the difference what my opinion is about what people did in Russia? I should think that what counts most is what I believe in here.

The CHAIRMAN. He didn't ask you that question. He is just asking you if you ever held to the viewpoint expressed as reported in the purported speech that you made in Moscow.

Mr. LEVER. Well, gentlemen, I should say that I am not too sure of the subject.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think I can explain to the witness, Mr. Chairman.

You are alleged to have said, before the Friends of the Soviet Union Congress in Moscow, "The Russian labor movement alone has shown the courage and the ability to take over the Government and industry." Now, the word "alone" implies the labor movement in other countries, including the United States. Whether you did make the statement, or whether you didn't, is not the question that I am putting to you now. But the statement itself implies that it is a courageous and able thing for the labor movement in the United States, as well as in Russia, to take over government and industry.

Mr. LEVER. I made no such statement, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now I am asking you if you ever held to that viewpoint or advocated that viewpoint.

Mr. LEVER. No; and I state that any report in the Daily Worker of what I said is as unreliable as most of its other statements.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you treasurer of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. LEVER. I was the theoretical treasurer of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action during an early stage, or during some stage.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the national executive committee of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read you from the published purpose of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action as it appears on the organization's own letterhead:

It aims to inspire the workers to take control of industry and Government, abolish the present capitalist system and build a workers' republic.

Was that the announced objective of the organization?

Mr. LEVER. I think there was such a statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then your testimony was untrue?

Mr. LEVER. No; my testimony is true. It doesn't state how, and I know my convictions in the matter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course the testimony speaks for itself, but there was no question as to how. I asked him with reference to the statement he was alleged to have made in Moscow. The wording is practically identical with the wording of the statement of purposes of the Conference for Progressives Labor Action, as I have just read it.

Will you identify that as your signature? There, that is the signature. Is that your signature?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is my signature.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The witness identifies his signature to a letter which is typed on the stationery of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action. His letter is dated December 25, 1932. In the upper right-hand corner Louis Francis Budenz is listed as executive secretary, and E. J. Lever is listed as treasurer of the organization. On the left-hand side is a list of the members of the national executive committee and the chairman of the organization.

Mr. LEVER. What does the letter say, Mr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the letter itself is not pertinent to this inquiry; the letter itself is not relative to the question which has been put to the witness. The question concerns only whether or not the witness has identified himself with a viewpoint expressed in the purpose printed on the top of this letterhead.

What do you mean by the statement that you were the "theoretical" treasurer of the organization?

Mr. LEVER. Because, as you know very well, Mr. Matthews, I was a very close friend and admirer of a gentleman named A. J. Muste, who to me was the most Christ-like figure that I have ever seen in flesh and blood, and who for a period of about 2 years at a labor school established by the labor movement was my teacher in history, primarily, and when A. J. Muste organized the Conference for Progressive Labor Action I just assumed that he was doing the right thing, and he assumed that I was one of his friends, and my election, if you can call it that, as treasurer of that organization, was done on a basis of friendship. There was no compensation involved in the thing and my activity in that organization was just on about the same scale. To me anything that A. J. Muste was interested in was a great thing. The

fact that A. J. Muste became involved in a lot of politics afterwards with which I didn't sympathize did not change the viewpoint that I had toward A. J. Muste.

The CHAIRMAN. While you were designated as treasurer, you were not, as a matter of fact?

Mr. LEVER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever serve at all in the capacity of treasurer?

Mr. LEVER. No. They had a girl or somebody in the office who handled their funds.

The CHAIRMAN. You didn't sign any checks?

Mr. LEVER. I didn't handle the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. You didn't sign any of the checks? You are quite certain of that?

Mr. LEVER. I am pretty certain of that.

The CHAIRMAN. You know that, don't you?

Mr. LEVER. I am pretty certain I didn't sign checks.

The CHAIRMAN. You didn't carry on any of the work as treasurer?

Mr. LEVER. I would say that, sir. The only reason I qualify my statement, Mr. Chairman, is because these things are in the long past, you see, and it is a question of memory and so on. I am perfectly frank with the committee, because I don't intend to be anything else.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the national executive committee of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. LEVER. I may have been a member of the executive committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Can you make your testimony more explicit?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I was a member of it for some period.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were an actual member, not a theoretical member?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I was a member of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a photostatic copy of page 26 of the "Labor Age" for November 1931, which purports to contain the statement of purpose of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, and ask you to glance at that and say if you can identify that as a copy of the actual statement of purpose of the organization.

Mr. LEVER. It conceivably is. I haven't seen it in years, if I have ever seen it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you read the publication known as "Labor Age?"

Mr. LEVER. Sometimes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you active in the preparation of the publication known as "Labor Age?"

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not Tom Tippet was also a member of the national executive committee of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not David Saposs was a member of the national executive committee of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Tom Tippet and David Saposs?

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you associated with them in the work of this organization at all?

Mr. LEVER. I was associated with them at one time at Brookwood College, Katonah, N. Y., when both of them were teachers at that institution.

The CHAIRMAN. He didn't ask you that. He asked you if you were associated with them in this particular organization.

Mr. LEVER. The unqualified answer should be "No," Mr. Chairman, but when you answer the thing as a flat "Yes" or "No" on basis of memory, you have to recollect whether they were active participants in the thing, and I don't recall that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recall whether they were affiliated either actively or inactively with the organization?

Mr. LEVER. If they were, they were inactive members of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that is not answering my question. I am asking you if you recall of your own independent memory whether these two men were actively or inactively affiliated with the organization.

Mr. LEVER. Well, again, I have to depend on my memory.

The CHAIRMAN. That is exactly what I asked you. I said, "of your own independent recollection."

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall, for instance—

The CHAIRMAN. You either do recall or don't recall. There is a question anyone can answer.

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall.

The CHAIRMAN. Then that is the answer. Let's proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your statement that if they were members they were not active, do you imply that you were close enough and active enough in the organization to understand that?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then you didn't mean by your explanation of your treasurership in the organization to disclaim any responsibility for the program of the organization?

Mr. LEVER. I would disclaim responsibility for the formulation of its policies; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well now, right there. You were a member of the executive board? You have admitted you were active in the organization. You used the letterhead of the organization, which sets forth the objective and the purpose of the organization. Now, you certainly wouldn't undertake to disclaim responsibility for what the organization stood for. Why would you be on the executive board, an executive member of an organization, identified with it actively and the nominal treasurer of the organization, using the letterhead of the organization, which you have identified, which has its purpose? You sent out the letterhead with the purpose on it. Now, in view of all those things, you wouldn't undertake to tell the committee you disclaim responsibility for what the organization stood for?

Mr. LEVER. Well, Mr. Chairman, this particular letterhead that is quoted here has a letter in my handwriting asking or discussing some information that somebody wanted from Consumers' Research, if I recall correctly, which has nothing to do with the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of having you identify the letter is to show that you recognized the objective of an organization by using the

letterhead. Not only were you an executive member of it and treasurer of it, but that you actually had knowledge of what the organization stood for.

Mr. LEVER. Within those limitations; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you can't disclaim responsibility for something.

Mr. LEVER. I don't disclaim responsibility, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all I am asking you.

Mr. LEVER. I merely state the quotation of this kind of stuff, out of context, doesn't give the committee the information that it ought to have with respect to my activities.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say "out of context," the statement of the announced purpose is very plain. If it is read by almost anyone, he would reach the same conclusion, wouldn't he? There is nothing obscure about it. It simply says, very plainly, what the purpose of the organization is.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a democrat (with a small "d"), and I believe in changing things by voting. This story, out of context as published on the letterhead, doesn't tell my beliefs at all. That is the reason I am qualifying my statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, I read from the statement of purpose as published in Labor Age of November 1931, on page 26, setting forth in somewhat different language the objective of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, as follows:

Advance as swiftly and steadily as possible to its true goal, the complete abolition of planless, profiteering capitalism, and the building of a workers' republic.

Do you recall that that was a part of the official statement of purpose?

Mr. LEVER. That was probably a part of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall what the organization's position was with respect to American democracy?

Mr. LEVER. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't recall what the position was?

Mr. LEVER. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever read the organization's constitution?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know, at this late date, whether I have read it or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will read you what purports to be the preamble to the Conference for Progressive Labor Action's constitution as it was published in Labor Age for September 1932, on page 5:

Sham political democracy which has been the tool of capitalist business and finance must also go.

Do you recall that statement as a part of the preamble to your organization's constitution?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall it, but if it was published at the time I would have said that I didn't agree with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are listed immediately below that statement as an officer of the organization. The preamble begins with these words:

Planless profiteering, war-provoking, imperialistic capitalism must be abolished.

Mr. LEVER. That is a lot of shibboleth.

Mr. MATTHEWS. (continuing reading):

It cannot be reformed. Sham political democracy which has been the tool of capitalist business and finance also must go. We must have a workers' republic. * * *

We, the workers, must ourselves provide the revolutionary will, the courage, and the intelligence for the task.

To realize our aim we must achieve power. To gain power, we must organize.

Do you recall whether or not there was anything said anywhere in the program about voting?

Mr. LEVER. No; I don't recall the program.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Knowing the general nature and purposes of the organization as you engaged in its activities, doesn't your recollection tell you that there was nothing about voting in the official statements of the organization?

Mr. LEVER. My primary interest, Mr. Matthews, was amalgamation of the metal trades, even at that stage; labor education, but at that particular time, primarily the cooperative movement, as you well know and knew at the time. The people who prepared that stuff, whoever they were—I can pretty nearly guess who might have written a statement like this—were operating pretty much on their own. It was a loose organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Right at that point, Mr. Lever, let me tell you this. We have had a number of Nazi and Fascist organizations before this committee. We have had people who were identified with them, and when the true publisher of the organization was disclosed, they have an explanation very similar to yours, that while they served as officers and chairmen, or something else, and while the organization put out the literature, they seek to give an explanation that is the very opposite of what the organization stood for. How are people to know what you stand for? You are judged by your acts. It is one of two things. Either you were in this movement or you were ignorant of it and you were deceived and misrepresented and so forth; which, if you had been, you would have come before this committee and said, "Yes, gentlemen, this is all true. But I have changed my views. I was a young man and I had revolutionary ideas." But you come before the committee and undertake to do what is very difficult to convince people of, that you were affiliated, you didn't know anything about what it stood for, and so on and so forth; that you had some purpose entirely different.

Mr. LEVER. That is well, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. If, on your testimony, a man having such a record is to be exonerated, what will we do with the people who have been in the Nazi organization? Many of them have been convicted on much less testimony than this. That is the thing, where a frank statement would be much more impressive to people than this constant attempt to play at words and to deny what is obvious and so on and so forth.

Mr. LEVER. Well, Mr. Chairman, that deserves an answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I think so.

Mr. LEVER. I assume that photostatic copies or originals or whatever they were, now being read, were issued by that organization. In the absence of direct knowledge or memory of what happened at that particular time, on some of that stuff, at least, I would make a

poor witness on direct testimony. But as to my part in it, I am pretty clear.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but that, of course, is the argument that is used constantly. If that is to hold good, then what we ought to do is to exonerate all the thousands of people that were connected with the German-American Bund and all these Nazi organizations in America, because invariably you can bring them all before this committee and every one of them will disclaim responsibility for what the organization stood for and advocated.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have stated to the investigating agencies after my employment by the Government that without question, as a matter of my own conviction, this Government has every right, and Congress has every right, to protect this Government, without question. I think I used that phrase. That represents my conviction.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they ask you all these questions when you were employed?

Mr. LEVER. No; they asked me those questions during some period after I was put to work.

The CHAIRMAN. No one asked you any questions before you were put to work?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; they asked a lot of questions.

The CHAIRMAN. What agencies examined you?

Mr. LEVER. The Civil Service Commission, I should think. I don't know who the people are, but I assumed they represented the Civil Service Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they investigators?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they come to you?

Mr. LEVER. They called me into their office and asked me a number of questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was their office? Do you recall?

Mr. LEVER. In the Social Security Building, where I was employed.

The CHAIRMAN. And they asked you a number of questions?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I was afterward asked a number of questions during two evenings that I spent with a representative of the Treasury Department who went into considerable detail and pulled out a lot of material.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Lever, let's see if we can't get answers to some very direct questions here.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to ask some questions. This questioning of you by the Civil Service investigators, did that questioning include a reference to any of this material that has been covered?

Mr. LEVER. Not by Civil Service, I would say. They apparently asked the standard questions for their purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, you have never been asked these questions by any agency.

Mr. LEVER. I have been asked that by a representative of the Treasury Department, who spent two evenings with me.

Mr. THOMAS. When was that?

Mr. LEVER. That was in April, a year ago.

Mr. THOMAS. And did that representative of the Treasury Department ask you questions concerning this particular material?

Mr. LEVER. He had a good deal of material there, all of which—

Mr. THOMAS. I know, but that is not answering my question. Did the representative of the Treasury Department ask you questions concerning this particular material?

Mr. LEVER. He asked questions based on similar material which he had.

Mr. THOMAS. Did he or did he not ask questions on this particular material? Answer that "yes" or "no."

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I remember now, because I have answered it in writing.

Mr. THOMAS. To what material are you now referring?

Mr. LEVER. The Conference for Progressive Labor Action.

Mr. THOMAS. When you saw these statements which appeared over your name back some years ago, did you protest against those statements?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. You did protest?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. To whom did you protest?

Mr. LEVER. I protested to people who were active members or officers of that organization.

Mr. THOMAS. Name those people.

Mr. LEVER. Well, one gentleman whom Mr. Matthews knew at that time was Budenz.

The CHAIRMAN. He is a well-known Communist.

Mr. LEVER. He became affiliated with the Communists after our experience with him.

Mr. THOMAS. And in substance what was your protest?

Mr. LEVER. That I had grave doubts as to whether they represented the opinions of those who at that time were affiliated with that organization.

Mr. THOMAS. Who did you say that man was?

Mr. LEVER. Budenz.

The CHAIRMAN. Editor of the Daily Worker.

Mr. LEVER. He is now editor.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to see if we can get some very frank statements from you here. You made this trip to Russia. You went, you said, with 12 people. You have named only 2 of those people. You remember Lundeen was one.

Mr. LEVER. I said about a dozen people.

The CHAIRMAN. Now give us the names of some of these people.

Mr. LEVER. I don't know the names of them. I might recall some of them if they were all there.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have the list of the names of them?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of them were well-known Communists who went there? Do you have a record of that, Mr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would be a relative matter, as to how well known they were. I would be in position to answer only on the basis of whether or not they had actually publicly known affiliations with the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. How many would fall in that category?

Mr. MATTHEWS. There were more than a dozen in the delegation. I would judge, from 2 accounts of the return of the delegation from

Russia, that there were at least 19 members, and I base that on the fact that on December 15, 1927, in the *Daily Worker*, it is reported that 8 members returned, including the witness, whose picture appears here in the *Daily Worker* of that date; and on December 28 the *Daily Worker* announces that 11 more members of the rank and file trade-union delegation to Russia returned yesterday on the *Mauretania*. So I can only assume that there were at least 19, unless perhaps some others came back individually.

Mr. LEVER. What date was that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. December 28, 1927.

Mr. LEVER. I returned alone from London on January 4 or 5, 1928.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recall that there were about 19 who went with you there? Would you say it was that many?

Mr. LEVER. No; because I can't define what constituted that committee.

Mr. THOMAS. The thing I can't understand is that the witness can remember the exact day on which he returned, yet he can't recall who were the other people on this trip with him.

Mr. LEVER. I also remember that I returned alone, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; you remember that you returned alone, and you remember also that you went over with 11 or 12 others. If your memory is as good as that on one subject, it certainly ought to be just about as good on another subject on the same trip.

Now, who were the others on this trip?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I can probably identify some of the names if they are read to me. The reason this thing is a nebulous sort of a thing is because I had nothing to do with the organization of a committee composed of specific people.

Mr. THOMAS. You recalled two. I want you to try to recall the names of the others.

Mr. LEVER. I can't recall the names.

The CHAIRMAN. He said he wasn't able to.

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you a list of them?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; I have a list, and if someone will make a check on the names and count them—Harvey O'Connor.

Mr. LEVER. Harvey O'Connor was on that one.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, Harvey O'Connor has a very substantial record of Communist affiliations.

William McKenzie, of Stamford, Conn. Do you recall him?

Mr. LEVER. He was a molder. I recall him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Meyer Geizer?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. William G. Hearing?

Mr. LEVER. Now, we are crossed up on that. Hearing was the molder. I don't think there was any McKenzie in that group; at least I don't recall him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Jack Lever's name appears next.

Mr. LEVER. My name is E. J. Lever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't mean that this was not you?

Mr. LEVER. No; but I have a name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Ed Stock?

Mr. LEVER. Ed Stock was an electrical worker from somewhere in California.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Peter Jensen?

Mr. LEVER. Jensen was a railroad man, or something, from the Chicago area, some place.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Fred Siders?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. E. P. Cush?

Mr. LEVER. Cush I recalled previously.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Ernest Lundeen?

Mr. LEVER. Lundeen I knew, of course, because I met him on the trip and knew that he was a Congressman.

The CHAIRMAN. He was a what?

Mr. LEVER. A Congressman. He was not an officer at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Ben Thomas?

Mr. LEVER. Thomas I knew.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Clara Thomas. Did you know her?

Mr. LEVER. That is presumably his wife. I don't think she was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. William Sirokin?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. R. P. Forrest?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Robert Eling?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Harvey Watts?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Ellen Dawson?

Mr. LEVER. What is it—a man or a woman?

Mr. MATTHEWS. E-l-l-e-n.

Mr. LEVER. No; I don't know her.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Bill Codema, spelled elsewhere in accounts as "C-o-r-d-e-m-a."

Mr. LEVER. That is Codema.

Mr. MATTHEWS. C-o-d-e-m-a?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; a kid who is in the Army now.

Mr. MATTHEWS. His name here is given as "Bill."

Mr. LEVER. I think it is wrong.

Mr. MATTHEWS. George Velliver?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Samuel Arnstein?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. George Barret?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Frank Moser, from Philadelphia?

Mr. LEVER. There was a Moser in Philadelphia. I don't know whether he was on the trip or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Frank Moser, in Philadelphia, is a very active Communist leader in Philadelphia; is he not?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know. I knew there was a Moser there. He apparently happened probably during the 10 years I wasn't in Philadelphia.

That "Arnstein" thing is corrupted, apparently. It was "A-r-t-z-e-n," from Minnesota.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Harriet Silverman? You knew her as a very prominent Communist woman leader; did you not?

Mr. LEVER. No. There were, I thought, two, maybe three, women on that boat going over.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you recall that this particular one was on that boat?

Mr. LEVER. No; I knew afterwards who this girl was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Harriet Silverman?

Mr. LEVER. Afterwards. You were active in New York, Mr. Matthews, and I was not. Now, those people were new people to me.

Mr. THOMAS. You found out afterwards she was on the trip?

Mr. LEVER. I think we are referring to the same person.

Mr. THOMAS. You found out afterwards that she was on the trip?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think he means to say that he found out afterwards that she was a Communist.

Mr. LEVER. I think we agree that this is probably the woman.

Mr. THOMAS. On the trip?

Mr. LEVER. But that she was a Communist was something else.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There are two more names.

Pauline Rogers, whom I have already identified in my statement as an official organizer for the Communist Party in New York, also a candidate for office on the Communist Party ticket in New York; and the last name is Betty Yarris, or Yaris.

Mr. LEVER. It doesn't register with me. I don't know her.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many names were there all together?

Mr. STRIPLING. Twenty-five.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the list of the delegation that appeared in the Daily Worker of October 24, 1927, on page 5.

Now, according to the accounts of this delegation as they appeared in the Daily Worker, this delegation was to be entertained by the Workers' Republic as the Workers' Republic's guests. Did you pay your own expenses in the Soviet Union?

Mr. LEVER. I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were any facilities provided free of charge?

Mr. LEVER. I have eaten with people.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's get right down frankly on this.

Mr. LEVER. Transportation; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Your transportation to Russia was furnished?

Mr. LEVER. No; I paid the transportation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were any hotel facilities provided without charge?

Mr. LEVER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay for the hotels when you got there?

Mr. LEVER. There in Russia?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The trips were paid for by whoever—I presume the Russian Government, or somebody. The personal expenses were paid by me.

Mr. THOMAS. Who paid the hotel bills?

Mr. LEVER. I may recall in a moment; it may come to me.

Mr. THOMAS. How long were you over there all told?

Mr. LEVER. About 3 weeks.

Mr. THOMAS. What hotel did you stay at?

Mr. LEVER. I visited in a number of places. I traveled, oh, I suppose, altogether, about three or four thousand miles.

Mr. THOMAS. What hotel did you stay at in Moscow?

Mr. LEVER. The Hotel Europe, I suppose.

Mr. THOMAS. Who paid the bill there?

Mr. LEVER. That is what I am trying to remember. I may have paid it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I understood the witness to say he paid it himself.

Mr. THOMAS. No; he said he paid his transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. He said he paid the transportation, and he thought the Russian Government paid for the balance of the expenses.

Mr. LEVER. I have no way of proving who paid it.

Mr. THOMAS. You know that you didn't pay for it?

Mr. LEVER. For the transportation in Russia?

Mr. THOMAS. I am not only referring to the transportation. I am referring to hotel bills. Who paid those bills?

Mr. LEVER. I am trying to get this straight in my own mind. It will probably come.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did your trip over there and back cost you, out of your own pocket?

Mr. LEVER. Well, roughly speaking, I should judge about four to five hundred dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the amount of money you spent to go there and spend 3 weeks and come back?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The balance of the expense was paid by someone else. You don't know who paid it?

Mr. LEVER. That's right.

Mr. THOMAS. It is your recollection that someone else also paid that hotel bill?

Mr. LEVER. I wouldn't include it in that, because I can't get myself straight.

The CHAIRMAN. What work were you doing when you went to Russia?

Mr. LEVER. I was superintendent of buildings and grounds of a labor school called Brookwood College, at Katonah, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your salary on that job?

Mr. LEVER. My salary on that job was pretty small.

The CHAIRMAN. What was it? I am asking you.

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall at the moment. It wasn't much.

Mr. THOMAS. About what was it?

The CHAIRMAN. As much as \$100 a month?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; and keep, probably—board and room.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the best recollection you have?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. About \$100 a month?

Mr. LEVER. But the circumstances there, Mr. Chairman, were that that was one of the periods when I was ill, when I became ill, and some of my friends, whom I recollect very well, amongst themselves and unbeknownst to me, had collected amongst themselves several hundred dollars. They gave it to me on a certain occasion and suggested that I take a trip to Europe. At that time this is where it stood. This was around the end of October 1927. My connection with this trip as a person began when I bought the ticket to go to Europe. It was at that time that the agency where those trips were being arranged, this Russian trip—that I ran into the preparations for this trip. Now, I bought my own ticket, as I assume everybody else did.

Mr. THOMAS. Not with your own money. The money was given to you.

Mr. LEVER. This money that was given to me.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I see.

Mr. LEVER. Under the circumstances, obviously there were people there who either hadn't planned to go to Russia or, if they had planned to, did it on their own account. For instance, Senator Lundeen, who, in spite of what was said, I am still convinced had no connection with the Communist Party, either then or since. Consequently there were several other people, myself particularly, who went on that trip.

Now, most of those people I had never seen until we were on the boat. The propaganda part of it, Mr. Chairman, see, is obviously propaganda of the Communist Party—quotations from the Daily Worker and all the rest of it. As you well know, they do not hesitate, and I am not a reformed guy, I have always been a man who opposed the activities of the Communist Party in the labor movement. I can now see, in the face of this, that it was to their own advantage, their political advantage, to indicate that they had more allies than they really had.

Now, the fact that this stuff is reported in apparently some detail in the Daily Worker is an indication of the pattern that has become so well known in the trade-union movement of the kind of tactics that are used to drag other people in who don't want to go.

I am not denying that I didn't want to go to Russia. Sure, that was an adventure to go and see Europe and see Russia. Hundreds of people were over there; see? But going to Russia doesn't mean affiliation or endorsement of a Communist movement in America.

The CHAIRMAN. No one is contending that the mere trip to Russia would be any evidence that a man was in sympathy with communism. Do you know who got up this money?

Mr. LEVER. You mean the money—

The CHAIRMAN. That was given to you to make the trip.

Mr. LEVER. Men like Clinton S. Golden; men like A. J. Muste; a lady whose—

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think—

Mr. THOMAS. Let's see if he can recall.

Mr. LEVER. Those three people were primarily responsible.

Mr. THOMAS. You didn't name the woman.

Mr. LEVER. I will try to think of the woman's name now.

Mr. THOMAS. It wasn't a lady by the name of Flynn, was it?

Mr. LEVER. No. Mr. Matthews will recognize the name. I will supply the name for the record.

Mr. THOMAS. The witness will supply the name of this woman, the third person who supplied the money.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are alleged to have said in this speech, which you delivered at the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union in Moscow, "Ten years ago we used to talk about darkest Russia. Now the Russian workers have every right to point to darkest America." Did you make that statement?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make any statement similar to that in wording?

Mr. LEVER. Similar to this?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. No. I don't believe that America is a dark country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the substance, if you can state it briefly, of your speech before the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union?

Mr. LEVER. You are asking me to say what I said, say, 15 or 16 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. You can't remember it, can you?

Mr. LEVER. That is a very difficult thing to put down.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree with you. Anybody that would attempt to remember the contents of a speech made 15 years ago—I can't remember what I said a year ago.

Mr. LEVER. We all talk so much we can't remember what we said the day before. This thing is specific, really. I would remember if I had said it. This was a meeting of the Friends of Soviet Russia. It was a conglomeration of people that obviously none of us had ever seen before. There was an organization in this country at that time called the Friends of Soviet Russia, as Mr. Matthews will recall.

The CHAIRMAN. There is now.

Mr. LEVER. Maybe there is now. I was never a member of that organization. I think that indicates, you see, that this thing, you see, was not prearranged, because of my alleged affiliations, if any, with Communist organizations in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; let's proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said a moment ago that you protested to Budenz, possibly, some of the statements in the official program of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action. Did you ever publicly repudiate your connection with those statements?

Mr. LEVER. Probably not. I don't think that my name as a person was of sufficient importance to publicly repudiate such statements.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you resign from the Conference for Progressive Labor Action because of any disagreement with its stated program and principles?

Mr. LEVER. I just tapered out of the picture.

The CHAIRMAN. It wasn't on that account?

Mr. LEVER. Well, on account of disagreements.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean you tapered out of the picture of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. You will recall, Mr. Matthews, that my great interest at the time was in the cooperative movement, and that I was devoting all my time to it, and what went on there at the time was something that I was conscious of but not particularly interested in.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, as a matter of fact, instead of tapering off—

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of fact, that letter that you refer to with my signature deals with that kind of problem and has nothing to do with the conference.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a matter of fact, instead of tapering out of the picture as far as the Conference for Progressive Labor Action is concerned, isn't it a fact that the Conference for Progressive Labor Action went out of existence, and that A. J. Muste organized on the heels of the dissolution of that conference the American Workers Party, into which you went as one of the active leaders?

Mr. LEVER. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you the treasurer of the American Workers Party?

Mr. LEVER. I was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever listed on its stationery as the treasurer of the American Workers Party?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know. I don't see why I should be.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any connection or affiliation with the American Workers Party?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a letter on the stationery of the American Workers Party, which lists A. J. Muste as chairman, Louis Francis Budenz as executive secretary, and Jack Lever as treasurer.

Mr. LEVER. Well, it may have listed it, but without my consent.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is a letter dated September 6, 1934. Were you ever apprised of the fact that the organization was listing you as its treasurer?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you attend any conventions or conferences of the American Workers Party?

Mr. LEVER. I don't think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any recollection of the organization?

Mr. LEVER. I have a recollection of the organization of the American Workers Party pretty much as indicated by Mr. Matthews.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you know that Muste talked to you about it?

Mr. LEVER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this the first information you have had that they listed you as an officer?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the first time you have ever heard of it?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. This question was raised by somebody, I don't recall just who, outside this committee in the middle of last year. That was my first intimation that my name was on the letterhead.

The CHAIRMAN. Muste was a very close friend of yours?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You say he was Christlike, almost Christlike, in your opinion. Do you think that he would have, without any authority, put your name there as an officer, a man that is as good a man as you say?

Mr. LEVER. Well, he did it before, Mr. Chairman, in the case of the C. P. L. A. It wasn't of grave importance to me, because I believed in him and he apparently did it again in this case at a time when my interest in that movement—I am speaking of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action now—was practically nil. In other words, I left myself die out of the picture.

Now, some people got together and organized this American Workers Party. I knew some of the people who combined to form the American Workers Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Weren't some of them very close friends of yours, and associates?

Mr. LEVER. That is in the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, not the other people with whom they combined.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the old associates of yours.

Mr. LEVER. Well, that is how it comes to be in there.

The American Workers Party—

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever send out any letters over the letterhead of this organization? Do you have any independent recollection of that?

Mr. LEVER. No—possibly.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had sent out a letter over their letterhead you would certainly have known that you were listed as an officer.

Mr. LEVER. I knew that I was listed as an officer of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action. As to the American Workers Party, I doubt it very much. I was out of sympathy with that whole procedure.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to ask a couple of questions on this.

Have you ever visited 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York City?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. That is where Mr. Muste was located, wasn't he?

Mr. LEVER. At one time.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, we will say in the latter part of 1934.

Mr. LEVER. Possibly.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you visit there after September 6, 1934, or, shall we say, in the latter part of 1934?

Mr. LEVER. I can't answer that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. When you did visit there, about when was it that you visited there?

Mr. LEVER. What was it about? There were several organizations in that building. Eastern States Cooperative Wholesale was in that building. I have been in that office on a number of occasions.

Mr. THOMAS. You never visited Mr. Muste in that building?

Mr. LEVER. Conceivably.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you recall whether you did or not?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall the specific instance, but it is quite possible.

Mr. THOMAS. The address of this Workers Party is given as 112 East Nineteenth Street, and this is a letter from A. J. Muste to Tucker Smith.

Mr. LEVER. Tucker Smith was a friend of J. B. Matthews. He can tell you more about that than I can.

Mr. THOMAS. I am making the observation that the letter was sent by Muste to Tucker Smith, and the address of the American Workers Party at that time was 112 East Nineteenth Street.

Mr. LEVER. I don't doubt it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were your own headquarters at the date on which this letter was written?

Mr. LEVER. My own headquarters?

Mr. MATTHEWS. 112 East Nineteenth Street?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oh, yes.

Mr. LEVER. Not my headquarters.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What were you engaged in at the time?

Mr. LEVER. I was president of Cooperative Distributors, Inc. Our headquarters were on the corner of Sixteenth Street and Irving Place, on the eighth floor of an office building there. That was distinctly not my headquarters. I never had headquarters at 112 East Nineteenth Street.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever connected with a publication called Labor Action?

Mr. LEVER. In pretty much the same manner as I was with the Conference for Progressive Labor Action. It was a paper that they had got out for some period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. What was his connection with that organization?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were on the editorial board, were you not, of the paper Labor Action?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know. Am I listed as such?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I never claimed to be an editor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever affiliated with the Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners?

Mr. LEVER. In the early 1920's, probably, in Pennsylvania.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the dates a little more specifically than that?

Mr. LEVER. I should think probably '22, the summer of 1922.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you the secretary of the organization?

Mr. LEVER. In Pennsylvania?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. About perhaps a month or two in the summer of 1922, as nearly as I recall—some period through there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you call the Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners a Communist-front organization?

Mr. LEVER. I certainly would not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, for the record, the interdepartmental memorandum of the Attorney General as distributed to department heads has a chapter on that organization, tracing its history back to the early days of which the witness speaks, and it is there classified as a Communist-front organization.

Mr. LEVER. The Political Prisoners Defense Organization that I was a member of was not a Communist organization. It included trade-unionists in Philadelphia, none of whom were Communist. If I recall, their names were on the letterhead, getting back to letterheads, at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should like to offer as exhibits some of the material which has been discussed, or on the basis of which the witness has been questioned.

I offer as exhibit 1 a photostatic copy of page 135 of The American Labor Who's Who, which contains a brief biographical sketch of the witness.

(Document entitled "The American Labor Who's Who" was marked "Exhibit No. 1.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as exhibit No. 2 three photostatic copies of an application for employment by the witness, one page of which the witness has identified as being in his own handwriting.

(Photostatic copy of employment application of Emil John Lever was marked "Exhibit No. 2.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as exhibit 3 a photostatic copy of the article which the witness contributed to the Labor Herald of April 1923, the article entitled "Two Unions—The Bosses' and Ours."

(Pp. 20 and 21 of the Labor Herald for April 1923 were marked "Exhibit No. 3.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as exhibit 4 three photostatic copies of articles from the Daily Worker; first, that of October 24, 1927; the second, of December 15, 1927; the third, of December 28, 1927.

(Photostatic copies of excerpts from designated issues of the Daily Worker were marked "Exhibit No. 4.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as exhibit 5 a reproduction of page 3 of the Daily Worker of December 6, 1927, page 3, which also contains of an alleged speech made by the witness before the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union in Moscow.

(Photostatic copy of p. 3 of the Daily Worker for November 14, 1927, was marked "Exhibit No. 5.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as exhibit 6 a reproduction of an article from the Daily Worker of December 6, 1927, at page 3, which also contains what purports to be an account of a speech delivered by the witness in Moscow.

(Photostatic copy of p. 3 of the Daily Worker for December 6, 1927, was marked "Exhibit No. 6.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. And as exhibit 7, a reproduction of an article from the Daily Worker of December 7, 1927, page 3, which contains an additional account of the rank and file delegation to the Soviet Union, of which the witness was a member or with which he was associated.

(Photostatic copy of excerpt from p. 3 of the Daily Worker for December 7, 1927, was marked "Exhibit No. 7.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as exhibit 8 a photostatic copy of a letterhead of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, which has on it a letter in the witness' own handwriting, which he has already identified as authentic.

(Photostatic copy of letter on letterhead of Conference for Progressive Labor Action was marked "Exhibit No. 8.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. And as exhibit 9, a photostatic copy of a page from Labor Age for November 1931, containing the statement of purpose of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action.

(Photostatic copy of page from Labor Age, November 1931, was marked "Exhibit No. 9.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. And as exhibit 10, an article from Labor Age of December 1931, appearing on three pages, an article about A. J. Muste, dealing with the C. P. L. A., or the Conference for Progressive Labor Action.

(Photostatic copy of pp. 18, 19, and 20, from Labor Age for December 1931, were marked "Exhibit No. 10.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. And as exhibit 11, an article by A. J. Muste entitled "The Meaning of the Convention," which appeared in Labor Age for September 1932, on the third page of which there appears the preamble to the C. P. L. A. constitution and also a list of the national executive committee and officers of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action.

(Photostatic copy of article entitled "The Meaning of the Convention" from the September 1932 issue of Labor Age was marked "Exhibit No. 11.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. As No. 12, a photostatic copy of a page from Labor Action, dated January 21, 1933, on which the name of E. J. Lever appears as a member of the editorial board of the publication.

(Photostatic copy of p. 4 from Labor Action dated January 21, 1933, was marked "Exhibit No. 12.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you affiliated in any manner with the provisional committee of the Trade Union Conference for United Action, which met in Cleveland, Ohio, in August of 1934?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall anything about that gathering?

Mr. LEVER. No; I don't at the moment.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I have here as exhibit 13 photostatic reproduction of the Call to Action, a four-page leaflet of the Trade Union Conference which took place in Cleveland, Ohio, on August 26, 1927, which purports to have been signed, among others, by the witness, E. J. Lever.

(Photostatic copy of document entitled "A Call to Action" was marked "Exhibit No. 13.")

The CHAIRMAN. Do you deny having signed that, "A Call to Action"?

Mr. LEVER. I never took part, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't ask you if you ever took part. Do you deny that you ever signed or authorized anyone to sign your name to that?

Mr. LEVER. I deny that.

The CHAIRMAN. You have an independent recollection on that?

Mr. LEVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What do you recall about it?

Mr. LEVER. I don't recall anything.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you don't recall anything about the conference, how can you recall whether you signed that?

Mr. LEVER. Because I haven't participated in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Among the signers are William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, and at least a score of the top officials of the Communist Party in the United States, together with E. J. Lever, Tom Tippet, A. J. Muste. Does that refresh your recollection at all?

Mr. LEVER. It doesn't refresh my recollection, but if my name was used in connection with Earl Browder or any known Communist, it was done without my authority or knowledge.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you wish to look at the list?

Mr. LEVER. I don't need to look at it. I have had nothing to do with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever repudiate your connection with it?

Mr. LEVER. I didn't know I had any connection with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Edward Ryan, Jr.?

Mr. LEVER. I knew an Ed Ryan once who was a textile worker.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he located in Philadelphia when you knew him?

Mr. LEVER. He hails from Philadelphia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know him at Brookwood Labor College?

Mr. LEVER. I knew him at one time at Brookwood Labor College.

Mr. MATTHEWS. After he left Brookwood College he became an organizer in Philadelphia, did he not?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't recall Ryan's having invited you to be a part of this conference?

Mr. LEVER. Ryan?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; Ryan.

Mr. LEVER. No. I certainly do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Edward Ryan, Jr., is listed as president, and Louis Weinstock as secretary.

Mr. LEVER. Who is Louis Weinstock?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was offered as exhibit 13.

The CHAIRMAN. I might say that in permitting that to go in as an exhibit, it is solely for the purpose of setting forth what the organization stood for, and not as evidence that the witness signed it, because there isn't any evidence; if he denies it, and it is printed, there is no evidence that would be binding on him that it was his signature unless the original can be produced, or someone can testify that he signed it.

Mr. LEVER. I am confident this committee can't produce anybody to testify that I signed that.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, I may say in that connection, Mr. Lever, that there are so many of these documents and organizations that you were affiliated with that the fact that here is a document that was publicized rather extensively—in fact it was published, wasn't it?—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In some of the newspapers at the time, and this is the first information you had that they used your name.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; in connection with that conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On the same basis that you stated with reference to that previous exhibit, I offer the letterhead of the American Workers Party, which contains the name of Jack Lever as treasurer, as exhibit 14.

(Photostatic copy of letterhead of American Labor Party was marked "Exhibit No. 14.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you connected with Brookwood Labor College?

Mr. LEVER. I came there as a student in the fall of 1921 and spent 2 years the first time. I came back, I believe, in 1926.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what capacity?

Mr. LEVER. As an employee of the school. I think I was superintendent of buildings and grounds at the time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And how long did you remain?

Mr. LEVER. That was about a year. I am not too sure at the moment whether it was '26 or '27, that particular time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you remained for about a year?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I should think it was about a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any other or subsequent connection with the school?

Mr. LEVER. In 1929 I worked for the school for a period of, I don't remember, probably a year, maybe more.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was there any subsequent connection with the school?

Mr. LEVER. I left there either in '30 or '31.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then that was for a period of approximately 2 years, your last connection with the school?

Mr. LEVER. It may have been 2 years. I think it was '29 to '31, something like that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the circumstances under which the American Federation of Labor repudiated Brookwood Labor College?

Mr. LEVER. Yes, I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On what ground did the American Federation of Labor repudiate the school?

Mr. LEVER. The American Federation of Labor was engaged in its traditional fight with the Communists and needed some material, presumably, with which to carry on its fight. Some of the students who got to Brookwood were either members or affiliates of the Communist Party. The A. F. of L. used that as a means of fighting the school as a whole at the very time when that school was owned and operated by a trade-union committee of the American Federation of Labor, composed of the International Association of Machinists, its vice president, who was afterward the Director of the C. C. C. under President Roosevelt; Fred Hewitt, editor of the Machinists Journal; the editor of the Railway Clerk's Journal, another trade-union, and others of that type.

John Brophy at that time was, I think, a member of that committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, the American Federation of Labor repudiated the college on the grounds of its Communist character?

Mr. LEVER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you working at the school at that time?

Mr. LEVER. I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it at that time that William Green wrote you "It was just such as you that we were afraid Brookwood would turn out"?

Mr. LEVER. I wrote a letter to William Green, who was attending the meeting of the executive board of the American Federation of Labor in Miami at the time. It was a private communication, and Bill Green, in the heat of battle, said it was just such as me that he was afraid Brookwood would turn out, as though Green didn't know me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know anything about the proportion of Communist labor organizers that were turned out by Brookwood College?

Mr. LEVER. I don't believe the first year there were any. The second year there were probably one or two, as nearly as I can recollect. Remember, that is 1922. And, off and on, there was some percentage of those people, probably in some years none and in other years there were some. Who they were—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say that a majority of the students turned out of Brookwood who went into the labor organizing field were Communists?

Mr. LEVER. I should say not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If the official report of the school stated that there had been 43 graduates of the school who had become political labor organizers, and that of the 43, 31 were Communists, would you say that that was an untrue statement?

Mr. LEVER. Is that the statement of Brookwood School?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the statement of the Brookwood School.

Mr. LEVER. An official statement of the school?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is an official statement of the school, and the statement is closed by these words: "Be it said to Brookwood's credit that it has not manufactured any Republicans or Democrats!"

Mr. LEVER. When was that statement issued?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That statement was issued by Tom Tippet.

Mr. LEVER. When?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not prepared to give you the exact year. I think it is—I will have to be estimating—around 1931 or '32.

Mr. LEVER. I wasn't connected with Brookwood then.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But this covers the entire history of the school.

Mr. LEVER. If somebody writes a statement, over whom I have no control—

Mr. MATTHEWS. The report is in existence, and it happened to be placed in the folder of another witness.

The CHAIRMAN. We will incorporate that report at this point.

Do you know of anyone who would know any more about it than Tom Tippet?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I refer back to Mr. Muste. He would know more about it than anybody else. He was head of the school.

The CHAIRMAN. What about Tom Tippet? Wouldn't he know?

Mr. LEVER. I don't know whether he would or not.

The CHAIRMAN. You know him, don't you?

Mr. LEVER. I knew him.

The CHAIRMAN. You were associated in Brookwood School?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Don't you know him in Washington?

Mr. LEVER. I know he is in Washington somewhere. I don't see him.

The CHAIRMAN. He was actively identified with the school?

Mr. LEVER. Yes, I would say so; at one period.

The CHAIRMAN. He was certainly in a position to know, the same as you were.

Mr. LEVER. Well, frankly, I am surprised at that statement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Just that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I am not relying solely on my recollection. I am sure the chief investigator of the committee, who has read the statement a number of times, will verify it.

The CHAIRMAN. I have read the statement myself.

Mr. THOMAS. When you were at the school were you associated with a man by the name of Nunn?

Mr. LEVER. No; there was no one by the name of Nunn—you mean at Brookwood?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. No. I suppose you refer to William Nunn.

Mr. THOMAS. That's right.

Mr. LEVER. William Nunn taught at some school in New Jersey, and lived there.

Mr. THOMAS. You don't recall meeting him at Brookwood?

Mr. LEVER. I don't think so.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you recall the name of Spencer Miller?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. He was associated with you at the school?

Mr. LEVER. No. Spencer Miller was secretary of the Workers Education Bureau of the American Federation of Labor. The Workers Education Bureau was founded in 1921, at about the same time that Brookwood was. It was a separate bureau. Brookwood was an educational enterprise that was affiliated with it, as were other educational committees throughout the country. I knew very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will adjourn. The witness is dismissed. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 12:25 p. m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a. m. the following day, April 1, 1943.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee convened at 10 a. m., Hon. Joe Starnes (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Hon. Joe Starnes, Hon. Noah M. Mason, Hon. Herman P. Eberharter, Hon. Karl E. Mundt, Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, Hon. Wirt Courtney, and Hon. John M. Costello. Mr. Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator, and Dr. J. B. Matthews, director of research for the committee.

Also present: Hon. John H. Kerr and Hon. Frank B. Keefe, chairman and member of the special committee set up in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. STARNES. The committee will come to order. We are glad to have the General Counsel, Mr. Charles Denny, of the Federal Communications Commission, who has been given permission to sit in on the executive hearings, so that he may assist these witnesses in the future in preparing any defense they will make before any other committee or any other group.

Dr. Watson, the purpose of these sessions has been heretofore stated as giving the members or employees of the Federal Government who were charged by Mr. Dies personally as having been affiliated with or publicly associated with subversive groups or front organizations, using that terminology in its commonly accepted term, an opportunity to appear before this subcommittee. The testimony which we are taking here is in executive session, and it is the purpose of this committee to make available the official record to the Special Committee on Appropriations which was recently set up under a House resolution to pass upon and make a finding upon these cases and submit it to the House for whatever action the House deems appropriate. That is the purpose of the hearing.

I will state to you that Dr. Matthews has already been sworn at the beginning of these hearings and any statement he makes with reference to these documents or questions that he propounds are under oath just the same as yours will be.

Will you stand and be sworn?

(Dr. Goodwin B. Watson was sworn by Mr. Starnes.)

TESTIMONY OF GOODWIN B. WATSON, CHIEF ANALYST OF THE FOREIGN BROADCAST INTELLIGENCE SERVICE, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. STARNES. Doctor Watson, I will ask you a number of preliminary questions, for the benefit of the record and of the committee, prior to the time that Dr. Matthews will ask you in some detail about your alleged affiliations with these organizations.

Dr. WATSON. Mr. Starnes, as a protest I should like——

Mr. STARNES. Will you give us your full name and address?

Dr. WATSON. Goodwin B. Watson, 509 West One Hundred and Twenty-first Street, New York City.

Mr. STARNES. You are a native-born American citizen, of course?

Dr. WATSON. Native-born American citizen.

Mr. STARNES. When and where were you born?

Dr. WATSON. Whitewater, Wis., July 9, 1899.

Mr. STARNES. Would you be kind enough to give the committee your educational training and background?

Dr. WATSON. State Teachers College, Whitewater, Wis.; University of Wisconsin; Denver University; Union Theological Seminary; Columbia University.

Mr. STARNES. Do you hold any degrees? If so, give us the degrees you hold.

Dr. WATSON. Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Wisconsin, 1920; Master of Arts degree, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1923; Ph. D., Columbia University, 1925.

Mr. STARNES. Will you kindly relate to us in chronological order, then, your professional experience? As I recall it, you are a teacher. Give us your experience as a teacher or any other professional experience that you have had other than that with the Federal Government. We will reach that later.

Dr. WATSON. I began teaching in a little, two-room country school as principal of the school and teacher of the upper grades. I moved from there to the Randle Junior High School at Madison, Wis. The first school was at Albion, Wis. Then I entered the university.

I entered the Naval Training Corps; served as a member of the Navy during the last months of the World War; taught physics in the University of Wisconsin as a student assistant; as pastor of the Methodist Church at Hardyville, Wis.; director of religious education for the Washington Park Community Church at Denver, Colo.; director of religious education for the St. James Methodist Church in New York City; instructor in religious education at the Union Theological Seminary, New York City; director of research for the National Council of the Y. M. C. A.; and instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and now professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Mr. STARNES. Are you an ordained minister?

Dr. WATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. What denomination?

Dr. WATSON. In the Methodist Church.

Mr. STARNES. Have you been engaged in any other work than that of teacher and minister?

Dr. WATSON. Research director being included among these activities.

Mr. STARNES. You have written quite profusely on various, we will say, social, psychological, religious subjects?

Dr. WATSON. Educational and psychological primarily.

Mr. STARNES. You travelled quite extensively in the course of your research work and your other activities?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You traveled abroad quite a bit?

Dr. WATSON. I have.

Mr. STARNES. Of course, you have not been arrested or convicted of any crime?

Dr. WATSON. Never. May I make a statement, Mr. Starnes?

Mr. STARNES. Later on, Dr. Watson. I forgot to tell you a moment ago in my preliminary remarks in opening the committee session that after you have been examined fully and been apprised fully of the various documents, et cetera, that have been or will be exhibited, offered in the course of the hearings here, the committee will be delighted to have you make a full and complete statement in explanation of any matter that arises during the course of the examination and any other statement you care to make which is pertinent to the subject matter of inquiry.

Dr. WATSON. What I wanted to speak about was the procedure which is at present before us now.

Mr. STARNES. You want to ask some questions about the procedure? Of course, the committee determines the procedure. It is purely and simply an executive hearing, as I stated at the beginning, of a duly authorized committee of the Congress of the United States and is being held for the purposes which I stated. The procedures, of course, are the function of the committee, not open or subject to debate by anybody except members of the committee.

Dr. WATSON. Except, of course, that they should be in accord with procedures of the Constitution.

Mr. STARNES. We will hold them in that way, and there will be no violation of the guaranty of free speech. We are going to accord you the freest and fullest expression of speech, and we are just as jealous of seeing that here and more so of seeing that done here than the average citizen, because we have to act in a representative capacity, and there is not a member of this committee who is not jealous of that very fact.

I may say, for your benefit and for the benefit of the record, that individually we know already of your feelings toward the committee, what you think about it individually, and what you think about its procedures, and what you think about the whole situation, and you have that right. We do not criticize it, but frankly, we do not care. We are trying to do our duty as we see it, and we do not care about hearing any expression of that sort—any expression of criticism—because that is not pertinent to this inquiry at all. You are not brought here for that purpose.

When you do get on the other side you can issue any statement you care to make. You can issue a statement about any member of this committee or about the committee as a whole. You have that right. When we conduct these hearings we are going to do it

as the committee sees fit, which guarantees the constitutional rights of the witnesses.

You have here present the General Counsel of the Federal Communications Commission, who is a distinguished lawyer.

Dr. WATSON. Not as my attorney.

Mr. STARNES. I did not say as your attorney, but he is here, and if he thinks or if you think that any right you have as an American citizen is being violated you can note any exception, and after that you are under an obligation, of course, not to disclose the nature of the testimony here, because it is an executive session; and the gentleman back here, who represents or is an employee of the same organization you are, is fully aware of the situation.

Dr. WATSON. Should not I have had some statement of charges?

Mr. STARNES. You, of course, are apprised of them and they are a matter of public record. They are in the Congressional Record, which is a public record, and they were made by Mr. Dies on the floor of the House on a number of occasions, speaking in his capacity.

Mr. THOMAS. If I may intercede right there, the gentleman is not up for trial.

Mr. STARNES. Certainly not. There is no trial at all: It is just to ascertain the truth of the allegations and to give you an opportunity to say something. In other words, some criticism has been made by people who would not approve of the committee's work, regardless of what procedure has been adopted, that they had not been given an opportunity to be heard. The committee has made no formal charges against you at all, but allegations have been made and come to the attention of the committee—

Dr. WATSON. The committee has made no charges against me?

Mr. STARNES. May I complete the statement? Then I am going ahead with this examination.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to have the gentleman make a statement.

Mr. STARNES. May I complete my statement just a minute?

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. STARNES. The charges were made by a Member of Congress on the floor of the House of Representatives, and you are fully aware of that fact. Whether they are true or false, this committee has never determined. You had not been heard by the committee at that time. We are giving you an opportunity to deny the truth of those allegations and to make any statements, as I told you awhile ago, about the matter, and you will be asked questions now concerning it.

Proceed with the examination, Doctor.

Mr. THOMAS. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a good idea if we let the witness make a statement now at the beginning.

Mr. STARNES. That has never been our procedure heretofore, as the gentleman knows. We never have done that from the beginning, in 1938. We have always asked questions and let them submit—

Mr. THOMAS. I fully realize that, but this case is a little different, different from this standpoint: That he has been criticized greatly on the floor of the House and off the floor, and he knows just what that criticism has been and probably has very definite feelings on the matter, and as a result of that I think it would not do any harm even if we changed the procedure to let him make the statement.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I think that we should conduct this hearing in the manner in which we have been conducting the hearings and as you think best.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, surely, if he thinks best.

Mr. STARNES. The Doctor will be given every opportunity in the world, as I have repeatedly stated here, to make any statement he wishes to make before the hearings are concluded with reference to the allegations; but I propose, as chairman of the subcommittee, to hold the hearings in accordance with the established rules and procedures of the committee.

Proceed, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your present position?

Dr. WATSON. Chief analyst of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long have you held that position?

Dr. WATSON. Since the 15th of November 1941.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you state the exact title which you hold in connection with that work?

Dr. WATSON. I am not sure whether it is chief analyst or chief of the Analysis Division. It is sometimes used one way and sometimes the other.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has that been the title that you have held since the beginning of your employment in 1941?

Dr. WATSON. When I first came it was the Analysis Section. It was later changed to the Analysis Division.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your present salary in that position?

Dr. WATSON. \$6,500.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was your salary \$6,500 in the beginning?

Dr. WATSON. \$5,600 in the beginning.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has there been only one increase?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did that increase take place?

Dr. WATSON. I think it became effective in November of 1942.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any special sponsor in obtaining this position or in being invited to accept this position?

Dr. WATSON. I understand that I had been recommended by Professor Allport, of Harvard University.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is his first name Floyd?

Dr. WATSON. No; Gordon; and Prof. Hadley Cantril, Princeton University.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say you understand that they were the persons who recommended you for the position?

Dr. WATSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From whom did you receive that understanding?

Dr. WATSON. From Mr. Free, who was the director of the organization at the time and who came to me to see whether I would be interested in considering this position. It is not a position that I sought. It is a position which I first turned down and reluctantly finally accepted because I felt I could be of some service.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any special reason that you care to state which was the basis of your reluctance to accept the position?

Dr. WATSON. We were not at war at the time that I came here. I felt that we were going to be. It was a question in my mind as to

whether the function that I performed at the college in education and in my contacts with the public would do more good toward helping mobilize the country for what I thought I saw ahead than would the service that I could render down here. It was purely a question of service. There was a further point—the fact that it meant a substantial reduction in income for me to come down here.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give some details concerning your travels abroad as to the times and places of such trips?

Dr. WATSON. My first trip abroad was in 1923, a wedding trip, in which I visited England, Holland, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy.

My next was in 1931 and 1932, and I went on a traveling fellowship from Teachers College for study. I visited England; studied primarily in Germany and Austria. I spent a month in travel through the Soviet Union; another month in travel around the Mediterranean.

The next year I led a group in a study tour, visiting psychological laboratories in Germany—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that in 1933?

Dr. WATSON. 1933.

In 1934 I visited Mexico for a month during the summer, attending a congress with the Progressive Education Association.

In 1936 I led a group for the Open Road, which visited England, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Russia, Rumania, Hungary, Austria, Germany, and France.

In 1938 I led another travel study group which studied France, Switzerland, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Russia, Germany, and England.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that also under the auspices of the Open Road?

Dr. WATSON. Also under the auspices of the Open Road.

In 1939 I visited Mexico for a month in a study group under the Mexican Department of Education and the Council for Pan-American Democracy.

In 1941 I spent a month in Mexico under the auspices of the Rosenwald Fund, making a study of rural education.

In 1942—that is, last fall—I spent 2½ months in London, working at my present job.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give a summary of your present duties or the nature of your work?

Mr. WATSON. My duties are administrative, supervisory, and include the recommendation of personnel for the Analysis Division, assignment of duties within the Analysis Division, the making of suggestions for the improvement of the work of the Division, the editing of the publications of the Division.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many persons are subordinate to you or work under you in your position?

Dr. WATSON. There are 26 analysts and about a dozen clerical assistants.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Matthews, will you get what the Analyst Division does?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you elaborate on that?

Dr. WATSON. The Analysis Division receives records of the broadcasts from other countries of the world and summarizes, prepares digests, interpretations, studies, based on the material, to bring out changes taking place from previous periods relating to broadcasts, to the main propaganda lines of the countries concerned, to their

diplomatic and military objectives. Those reports are prepared for confidential use of officials in the State Department, in Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, Board of Economic Warfare, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, others Government agencies concerned with our foreign policy and with our military operations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What are the mechanical processes by which your Department receives the foreign broadcasts?

Dr. WATSON. The Engineering Division is responsible for the operation of the reception equipment near Washington and at several other points in the United States and in the world. Those records are listened to by translators or monitors, who record them and translate them. The verbatim report or portions of it come to us by wire or by air mail or are processed within the Translation and Transcription Division, and they come to us in this form [indicating]—reproduced materials.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are these receiving stations directly under the control and management of the Federal Communications Commission?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; except for the fact that we have a cooperative agreement with the British whereby the listening in in England is carried on by the British Broadcasting Corporation.

Mr. THOMAS. When was this Division set up, Mr. Watson?

Dr. WATSON. I organized it.

Mr. THOMAS. When was that?

Dr. WATSON. Beginning in November of 1941. There were, I should say, three or four, perhaps a half dozen, analysts engaged before I came. They had been employed for a period of several months, but no chief had been appointed, and the work of the Division had not yet been organized until publications had been issued.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do these receiving stations operate on a 24-hour-day basis?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are they able in their own judgment to record anything approximating all of the broadcasts from Nazi Germany, for example?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. They are able to record substantially all of the news programs, the political commentary, and the material that might have some importance for us. They do not attempt to record musical programs, dramatic productions, unless they have a political slant, or something of that sort.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Frederick Schuman testified that you were instrumental in having him come to your Division in the Federal Communications Division.

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He also read into the record a letter expressing some reluctance to accept your invitation to take a position in your Division. Would you care to tell the committee what your own response to Dr. Schuman's letter of reluctance was?

Dr. WATSON. I could probably find the letter that I wrote him. I do not have a copy of it here. I presume that I urged him to join the organization primarily because I felt he could make an important contribution to the work that we were doing and that he should be willing to make the same kind of financial sacrifice that other mem-

bers of the Division had made in coming into the Government service, in receiving lower salaries than they were receiving.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the substance of his letter to you?

Dr. WATSON. Not in any detail.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He discussed the matter of his possibly being under fire because of some of his former political associations and affiliations. Do you recall that?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any particular comment to make to him on that particular point?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I told him that it might be embarrassing, that it might be interfering with his work, as it did with mine. I immediately asked the Civil Service Commission and the F. B. I. to make an investigation of Dr. Schuman and to report back to us, so that we could be assured, before he joined our staff, that no substantial objection would be raised in his case.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you personally make that request to the F. B. I. and the Civil Service Commission?

Dr. WATSON. No. I think it was by Mr. Graves, who was assistant director.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you receive reports from the Civil Service Commission and the F. B. I.?

Dr. WATSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you as yet received such reports?

Dr. WATSON. I think such reports have been received.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not seen them?

Dr. WATSON. I have not seen them. I understand that they have been received.

Mr. MATTHEWS. About the time you came to Washington to take your present position Chairman Martin Dies, of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, addressed a letter to Chairman James Lawrence Fly, of the Federal Communications Commission, which letter dealt with some of your alleged affiliations. Have you at any time seen the text of that letter?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; I have seen it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, in order to make the record complete, I should like to ask that that letter be incorporated at this point in the record of the hearing this morning.

Mr. STARNES. The letter will be incorporated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That letter was dated November 18, 1941.

On November 19, 1941, Chairman James Lawrence Fly addressed a communication to Chairman Martin Dies, of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in reply to Chairman Dies' letter. I should also like to ask that Chairman Fly's letter be incorporated in full at this point in the hearing.

Mr. STARNES. The letter will be incorporated in full.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C., November 18, 1941.

HON. JAMES LAWRENCE FLY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention that one Goodwin Watson has just been appointed to a very important post in the Federal Communications Com-

mission. I understand that Mr. Watson's salary is \$5,600, and further that his title and duties are described as follows: Chief broadcast analyst, under general supervision of the Director of Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Service; is chief analyst of radio broadcast emanating from foreign countries to determine the probable trends of war, the internal morale and conditions of foreign nations, their objectives and their probable political, economic, or military action, applying to basic data secured from recordings and translations of broadcasts a knowledge of the political, sociology, cultural, and historical background, or social psychology of the peoples and governments of the foreign countries and correlating such data with current developments in other related fields; to assist in developing procedures and criteria for identifying, indexing, and refining pertinent material from the great mass of broadcast recordings; and further directs the work of five supervising analysts.

I am deeply concerned over this appointment as it clearly bears out an observation which I have had occasion to make to the President in recent weeks, namely, that there is a new influx of Communists and fellow travelers into official Washington.

Goodwin Watson has been a propagandist for communism and the Soviet Union for many years. His activity in this respect has been open and above-board. Mr. Watson is to be commended for not attempting to conceal his Communist sympathies, and I wish it clearly understood that I do not challenge his right to hold whatever sympathies he may choose to hold. My only concern is over the fact that one of such outspoken Communist views and sympathies should be named to the position of chief broadcast analyst with such important decisions entrusted to him as are set forth in the foregoing description of Mr. Watson's duties.

Over a period of years, Goodwin Watson wrote numerous articles in praise of the Soviet way of life. At the conclusion of one of these articles, he expressed his liking for the "socialism" of Russia in the following manner: "I wish I knew whether it will take longer for the Russians to develop efficiency or for America to develop socialism. Then I'd know where I want to live."

Goodwin Watson's frequent eulogies on the Soviet way of life have customarily been coupled with emphatic disparagement of the American way of life. If you desire a complete listing of Mr. Watson's writings which reveal his strong preference for the Soviet system over the American system, I shall be happy to provide them for you, Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Watson has expressed his Communist sympathies by an extraordinary amount of activity on behalf of the front organizations of the Communist Party. I offer you, Mr. Commissioner, a list of the party's organizations with which Mr. Watson has publicly associated himself. It is as follows: American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; American Congress for Peace and Democracy; American League for Peace and Democracy; American Student Union; Conference on Pan American Democracy; Consumers Union; Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo; International Workers Order; League of American Writers; National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights; North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy; Open Letter in Defense of the Communist Party; Social Work Today.

I am sure you will agree, Mr. Commissioner, that Watson's associations with Communist front organizations have been so numerous that it is impossible to account for them on the ground of his having been an innocent dupe of the Communist Party. If you desire to have one of your representatives study the evidence in our committee's files which bears upon the matter of Watson's connections with Communist front organizations, I shall be happy to offer you every facility for that purpose.

We are not concerned solely with the case of Watson as an individual. We are, I believe, compelled to search for the hidden influences which bring about the appointment and certification of such persons as Watson. The problem of ridding official Washington of the hundreds of Communists and fellow travelers who now occupy Government posts will not be solved until we get at the root of the matter, namely, this prevailing influence which continues to bring such men as Watson to important Government posts in the Nation's capital. When that sinister influence has been identified and exposed, then we may hope that some Americans of undoubted loyalty will be called to these newly created posts of such strategic importance in the defense of America.

Respectfully yours,

MARTIN DIES, *Chairman.*

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1941.

HON. MARTIN DIES,
Chairman, Special Committee on Un-American Activities,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DIES: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of yesterday regarding Dr. Goodwin Watson, who was recently appointed as chief analyst in our Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Service.

I need hardly tell you that I am wholly in sympathy with every effort to rid the Government of subversive influences, and I am confident that all the members of the Federal Communications Commission would join us in this position. I also agree with you where any question is raised as to the basic attitude of a Government employee we should concern ourselves with the record and with the influences which brought about the appointment.

I have taken pains to make a full inquiry into this subject. As a result I can state unequivocally that at no time has Dr. Watson been a member of the Communist party, or registered or voted as a member of the Communist party, or participated in any way in the activities of the Communist party, and at no time has Dr. Watson indorsed the Communist system.

It ought to be made clear that Dr. Watson did not seek the position which he now occupies. We sought him. Dr. Watson is widely recognized as one of the outstanding social psychologists of the country, and I cannot but believe that the Government is fortunate to have his services in this period of emergency. The recommendations which were most influential in bringing about the appointment were made in response to our inquiry by Professor Gordon Allport, head of the department of psychology at Harvard University, and Dr. Hadley Cantril, professor of psychology at Princeton University and director of the public opinion research project supported by the Rockefeller Foundation and a special consultant for the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. At their suggestion Mr. Lloyd Free, Director of our Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Service, made a full investigation of the qualifications of Dr. Watson, which confirmed the high opinions of him expressed by Professors Allport and Cantril. Thereupon Mr. Free went to see Dr. Watson. It was then, for the first time, that Dr. Watson learned he might be considered for the post. Only after 2 weeks of discussion and negotiations did Dr. Watson agree to having his name presented to the Commission. The entire motivating force was our own. I might add that the Civil Service Commission investigated and approved the professional qualifications of Dr. Watson for the position.

I might join in your apprehension were I to find that Dr. Watson is or has been connected with the 13 organizations listed in your letter. My inquiry has developed, however, that he has been a member of only one of the organizations, that is, the Consumers Union, in which he was a director. This is a well-known agency which conducts research into values and prices of commodities and advises its members thereon.

I am informed that Dr. Watson has neither been a member of or actively associated with any of the other organizations listed in your letter, nor has he ever indorsed such organizations. It is well known that in the course of educational work the professors of our leading universities quite frequently give attention to specific projects or activities with which various organizations, including some of these, may be concerned. I think you will agree that this, however, cannot be construed either as membership in or as a general endorsement of any such organization. Certainly the American people by expressing admiration for the fighting qualities of the Russians, and by lending the Russians a billion dollars, are not thereby endorsing the communistic system of government.

As a man with extensive travel and broad educational background and experience, Dr. Watson has written more than 200 articles, monographs, etc. Only two or three of his writings have been concerned with Soviet Russia, and I believe you will find them to be objective studies. In these you will of course find, in the relation of experiences and observations, comments both favorable and unfavorable as the particular situation may have impressed the writer. Neither directly nor indirectly was any form of remuneration received.

If there lingers in your mind any question as to Dr. Watson's basic attitudes, I believe you would be interested in some of the points in his education and religious work. He is of tenth generation American ancestry. He has received degrees from American universities, including the degree of doctor of philosophy from Columbia University. He has also studied substantially at the universities of Berlin and Vienna. He spent 3 years in the Union Theological Seminary, and

is an ordained minister of the Methodist Church. He has had a guiding hand in religious education for the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association and in the Union Theological Seminary. From the period of 1925 to date he has served at teachers college of Columbia University successively as instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor of education.

If I can be of further service to you, kindly instruct me.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES LAWRENCE FLY, *Chairman.*

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall that Chairman Dies in his letter stated that a list of the party organizations with which Mr. Watson has publicly associated himself was offered to Chairman Fly?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not Chairman Dies made reference to membership in these organizations or whether his language was that of having publicly associated yourself with these organizations?

Dr. WATSON. Mr. Starnes at a later point made it clear to me that the term "publicly associated himself" did not imply having joined or supported or endorsed the organizations. I did not so understand it when I read the letter, but that it did mean that one was a member, an active supporter, and a worker in the organization. I discovered later that it was being used in a much more limited sense to mean that some public document connected your name with that of the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever publicly associate yourself with an organization known as the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom?

Dr. WATSON. I never joined the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. I wrote a strong letter indicating why I would not join them. I did, on the other hand, endorse a rally for the protection of public education, along with a great many other people interested in public education and who had no record of any kind of Communist or Communist-front organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it be your recollection that the rally to which you referred, which was held under the auspices of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, was held on or about April 13, 1940?

Dr. WATSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did sponsor that meeting, I understand your testimony to be?

Dr. WATSON. I understand that among the other sponsors were Judge Dorothy Kenyon, Ned H. Dearborn, of New York University, Newbold Morris, president of the New York City Council, Marion Park, president of Bryn Mawr, Robert A. Milliken, of California Institute of Technology, Frank Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, and others whose record seems to me to be above reproach.

Mr. STARNES. Let me get this straight in my mind, Dr. Watson. Your answer is that you did sponsor the meeting, but other sponsors included the names you just gave. In other words, as I listened to the question and answer procedure between you and Mr. Matthews, you have not given an answer that satisfies me as a member of the committee as to whether or not you had even publicly associated with this organization on the one hand. That was not answered. The second proposition is that you have not answered him or for the

record as to whether or not you sponsored that meeting. You just merely said there were other sponsors. Of course, there is an implication there. You answered by implication, but we would like to have a direct answer.

Dr. WATSON. I am sorry. I thought I said quite clearly that I did join with other sponsors in a meeting for the support of public education.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who the head of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was at that time?

Dr. WATSON. I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it refresh your recollection if I told you that Prof. Franz Boas was the national organization's head?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You recall that now?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it a matter of your observation that Prof. Franz Boas, now deceased, had numerous affiliations with organizations which had been alleged to be Communist front organizations?

Dr. WATSON. I know that now, Mr. Matthews. Whether that was apparent at that time I cannot now say. I know that my association with Professor Boas had been primarily as an anthropologist and a scholar, and I had and do have a high respect for him and for his work.

As a social psychologist interested in studying propaganda organizations, I gradually became aware of the frequency with which his name appeared in connection with organizations that seemed to me to be likely to have a party background, and I became suspicious of it, and there was a point, which I cannot now date, at which I decided that organizations sponsored or led by Professor Boas were suspect. I do not think that was so at this time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall who it was that solicited you to become a member of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom?

Dr. WATSON. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated a moment ago that you wrote a strong letter declining to become a member. Would you care to state the basis on which you declined to become a member of the organization?

Dr. WATSON. In July of 1939 I received an invitation to sign a statement by the League for Cultural Freedom, which was an assertion that Germany, Italy, Russia, Japan, Spain all were of the same strait-jacket type and almost at the same time an invitation to join the American Committee for—what is it called?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

Dr. WATSON. Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, which was getting out a statement to all active supporters of democracy and peace.

At that time I issued a statement rejecting both organizations, saying I wanted to maintain my intellectual and social independence; that there was some truth in what one side said and some truth in what the other side said.

May I quote?

Those who signed the statement surely knew that universal suffrage in the Soviet Union does not mean what that phrase means here; that while "those writers and thinkers whose books have been burned by the Nazi are published in the Soviet Union," there are many other writers and thinkers whose works

are not allowed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It is still customary to take away from incoming travelers any stray copies of such dangerous sheets as the New York Times or the London Times. It is well known that official party sanction is given from time to time to one line of scientific theory or artistic creation while others are condemned on political grounds and their exponents subjected to humiliation, demotion, and exile. It is difficult to defend the Soviet's drastic methods of dealing with dissenters on the grounds of "democracy and peace." Doubtless the Soviet Union has seen "an unprecedented advance of culture," with enormous extension of participation in art, literature, drama, music, science, and scholarship, but shall we publish a letter which presents only that part of the picture?

Perhaps that makes it clear why—

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Watson, was that a letter that you addressed to some person or some organization?

Dr. WATSON. That was a letter which I prepared for circulation among my friends as an answer to this.

Mr. STARNES. To whom was it addressed, Doctor?

Dr. WATSON. It was not addressed. It was headed, "Please sign on the party line," and it was given to the Nation and the New Republic. It was announced for publication, but it did not appear.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall the approximate date?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. It was July 18, 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it written in response to the invitation which you received to join the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom?

Dr. WATSON. It was written, I think, in response to the request to sign their statement, addressed to all active supporters of democracy and peace. You are technically correct that it was not an invitation to join the organization. I never did join the organization. I do not remember that I specifically received invitations to join. I probably did and threw them in the wastebasket.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A moment ago you mentioned Dorothy Kenyon and two or three other persons as co-sponsors with you in this meeting which was held under the auspices of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In naming them did you mean to imply that the list was composed exclusively of such individuals?

Dr. WATSON. No. Mr. Chairman, I think it might help the committee if I stated the principles on which I join or do not join in support of an organization during my period of academic work.

Mr. MASON. Before that, may we clear up this letter or statement or whatever it is?

Mr. STARNES. Yes. I was going to do that. I was going to summarize that as it appears to me as a member of the subcommittee.

After you received an invitation to join the organization that is now under discussion you issued a statement or you prepared a statement from which you have just read an excerpt. It was not addressed to anyone in particular?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. You made it available, I believe you said, to the Nation and what other magazine?

Dr. WATSON. New Republic, and mailed it to friends and colleagues, perhaps 50.

Mr. STARNES. But it was never given any publication?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. And it was addressed to no one in particular, but to everyone in general?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I understood the witness' testimony to be that at one time he had written a strong letter declining to become a member of the organization. That is the reason I asked whether he cared to incorporate such a letter into the record or read from it. I believe that that is not the kind of letter that he described in the beginning.

Mr. STARNES. I was listening for that. I do not want to be technical, but at the same time I wanted to have the thing clear.

Mr. MASON. This was, then, a general statement—

Mr. STARNES. Of his policy.

Mr. MASON. Issued by Dr. Watson of his policy as a reaction to not a direct invitation, but a suggestion that you sign a certain thing which meant that.

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Morris Watson?

Dr. WATSON. Not personally.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know him by reputation somewhat?

Dr. WATSON. By reputation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Morris Watson is listed as one of the co-sponsors of this meeting. From what you know of the reputation of Morris Watson, would you class him with the persons whom you have named with respect to Communist affiliations?

Dr. WATSON. I would not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it not pretty generally known, I should say particularly in New York, that Morris Watson has been a leader of the so-called Communist faction in the American Labor Party?

Dr. WATSON. I understand so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would that also be true of Rosalie Manning, or do you know her by reputation?

Dr. WATSON. I do not know her.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, you are under oath. You can tell.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Rosalie Manning has come into the hearings of this committee particularly in connection with the American Peace Mobilization, of which she was a leader in New York.

Mr. STARNES. I think it would be quite well, if Dr. Watson cannot give from his personal knowledge the reputation of persons, when you ask the questions, in order to clarify the record, for you to give the benefit of whatever information you have on it and what the records in our possession disclose.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I shall be inclined to conclude the discussion of this particular organization by referring to Dr. Watson's own statement that he came to believe that any organization with which Franz Boaz was permanently associated was suspect, and that probably answers all that needs to be answered about this particular organization, of which Prof. Franz Boaz was the national chairman.

Dr. WATSON. It is not, however, implied that all people who were publicly associated with that organization at any time have been in reproach from having had such association, as I understand.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the decision of the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, in the deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges?

Dr. WATSON. No; not in detail.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you read the text of the decision?

Dr. WATSON. I have not read the text of the decision.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should like to read you one sentence from the Attorney General's decision in the deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges, from page 11 of the document dated May 28, 1942, as follows:

Testimony on front organizations showed that they were represented to the public for some legitimate reform objective, but actually used by the Communist Party to carry on its activities pending the time when the Communists believe they can seize power through revolution.

As a student and expert in social questions, would you be inclined to agree that the Attorney General's statement there is a fair statement regarding Communist front organizations?

Dr. WATSON. I think it is a matter in part of defining "Communist front organization." There are some organizations which are so used. I would not, however, accept the generalization that any organization in which Communists are active is necessarily something which they are planning to use for revolutionary purposes. I find that Communists have often worked for social objectives that seemed to me desirable and have worked along side of other people who are also working for those objectives and have continued that work even when there was no possibility of their using the organization for revolutionary purposes, as has here been implied.

If you limit the term "Communist front organizations" to those which they control, those which they manipulate, undoubtedly that has a very real relationship to their revolutionary program.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I did not ask you to attempt at this time, at least, to identify any particular Communist front organization; but assuming that there is agreement that any particular organization or any particular organizations are Communist front organizations, has the Attorney General correctly, according to your own observations and study, stated the tactics and objectives of such organizations? He says two things, if I may summarize: First, that the front organizations appear in public or represent themselves to the public for some objective which is legitimate.

Dr. WATSON. That is true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would say that they thereby attempt to beguile or deceive persons interested in those objectives into joining the organization or associating themselves publicly with the organization; and then the Attorney General says, but actually the Communist Party has an ulterior objective in those organizations. Underneath that legitimate reform objective there is the tactic of building up a sympathetic following looking toward the day of seizing power through revolution.

That would be your own general understanding of what the organizations are for?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever publicly associate yourself in any manner with the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Dr. WATSON. I believe that there is a record of my name being listed as a sponsor of a rally or a convention or a mass meeting or something to protest against fascism. I was never a member of the organization.

I never worked in the organization. I did attend the meeting in question. I had no other contact with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is a letterhead and there are various other forms of publicity indicating that you were an endorser of the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, which was held in Washington, D. C., January 6-8, 1939, called by the American League for Peace and Democracy, that gathering being the regular annual meeting of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Did you lend your name as an endorser for that particular gathering?

Dr. WATSON. I presume I did. May I see the record?

(Mr. Matthews handed a document to Dr. Watson.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your recollection that you did lend your name for that purpose?

Dr. WATSON. It seems quite clear, yes, that I did; and the reason for it, I think, is twofold, if the committee is interested.

Mr. STARNES. As chairman of the committee, I prefer—and I am assuming the members do—that you make your answer “yes” or “no,” and then explain it. We would prefer that to the verbal sparring. I believe the use of the term “verbal precision” has heretofore been employed by some of the witnesses and the examiner. Just say “yes” or “no,” and then give your explanation. That is what we are here for. We want to find out if you were publicly affiliated in any manner.

Dr. WATSON. Not affiliated in this case, but endorsed a meeting, and I endorsed this meeting, which was, as I understood it, a mobilization of all democratic, liberal, and other forces against fascism, the objective of which I was in wholehearted sympathy with. Secondly, I looked down the list of people who had endorsed it and were endorsing it with me. I find in the list Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of the Methodist Church, whom I respect more highly than any of the leaders of the church of which I am an ordained minister. I find Guy Emory Shipler, of The Churchman, the editor. I find Dorothy Canfield Fisher, whom I have respected as a novelist and educator. I find that sort of people joining the enterprise. I believe in the objective of the enterprise. I recognize other names in the list that seem to me definitely left wing, some probably Communist. I do not withdraw my endorsement under those circumstances. If I believe that the organization is a legitimate one, the objective is an important one, the people are not exclusively Communists or Communist dominated, I carry on.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, you have no doubt now, in the light of subsequent events, that the American League for Peace and Democracy was a Communist dominated and controlled organization?

Dr. WATSON. I understand that now. I did not in January of 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know who else was endorsing the Congress at the time you gave your name?

Dr. WATSON. Usually it is the procedure to send the list of names of those who have already endorsed it to the little fry like myself; to pick out the big names and send those along first; and they act, shall I say, as bait for the rest of us to come in.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you think that some of those whom you have named and have described as bait might have seen your name?

Dr. WATSON. No; not Bishop McConnell or Dorothy Canfield Fisher or any of the rest of them. I have no illusion of the potency of my name in that matter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not think it is necessary to go into the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. STARNES. I think Dr. Watson has been a little modest in recognizing the others as bigger fry than himself. I think he is a man of giant intellectual attainment. He can ride along with those whom he has modestly described as being great and near great in their respective fields.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You, of course, are personally acquainted with Prof. Harry F. Ward, who is the national chairman of the organization?

Dr. WATSON. I am.

Mr. STARNES. He was another Methodist minister, was he not?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; and he was my teacher at the Union Theological Seminary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you were also a teacher on the faculty of the Union Theological Seminary?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As Dr. Watson has himself pointed out, numerous other endorsers—

Mr. STARNES. List some of them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe he described them as left wing and possibly some of them as Communists. Donald Henderson is listed here and is, of course, a publicly avowed Communist Party member. There are such other persons as Joseph P. Lash and Joseph Cadden, who were, respectively, the heads of the American Student Union and the American Youth Congress at the time of this particular occasion.

Mr. STARNES. And which Mr. Lash later stated under oath before this committee were dominated by the Communist Party and they were Communist front organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; at the time he was associated with them.

Did you have any form of affiliation or public association with the American Student Union?

Dr. WATSON. It is my recollection that when the American Student Union was first organized or proposed or contemplated that they asked me to serve as a sponsor of the proposed organization and that I did so. The reason for that was that it was presented to me as a student organization. I as a college teacher was much interested in bringing together Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, Communists, and all other student groups, regardless of party affiliation, for the purpose of current problems and action on current issues.

I may state that, as far as I know, the American Student Union, at the time that it was contemplated and I was interested in working with it, included Norman Thomas, included Alexander Meiklejohn, former president of Amherst, and other sponsors who could not by any stretch of the imagination be thought to be under Communist control.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The American Student Union was founded in 1935, primarily by a merger of the National Student League and the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the one having a Communist orientation and the other a Socialist orientation. Is that your understanding of the inception of the organization?

Dr. WATSON. With this additional idea, as I remember it, Mr. Matthews: The abolition of those sectarian organizations and their merger in the American Student Union was supposed to make possible the cooperation of all students interested, rather than the little groups of

Socialists and Communists who had previously been active on campuses.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1937 the official literature of the American Student Union listed your name as a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union. Do you recall whether or not you gave your consent to be listed in that capacity?

Dr. WATSON. I presume that I did, although I must say that I was never called upon for any advice. I never went to any meetings. I had no contact with the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Joseph P. Lash, personally?

Dr. WATSON. I have never met Joseph P. Lash. I think I have heard him speak.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have any recollection as to who invited you to become a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union?

Dr. WATSON. As I remember it, it was a committee of students of New College, which was associated with Teachers College at the time that I was on the staff teaching there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As Chairman Starnes has pointed out, Joseph P. Lash himself appeared as a witness before this committee and stated that the American Student Union was under the effective control—I think I am using his exact language—of the Communists from its inception until the time he testified.

Dr. WATSON. I must disagree if he says "from its inception." That is not my understanding of the situation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied at the present time that the American Student Union was properly classified as a Communist front organization at any time?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. That it eventually became that I am quite clear. That it was in the beginning I would seriously challenge, because I do not think Norman Thomas, Meiklejohn, or any of the rest of us would have agreed to work on it if it had been. I think the evidence is conclusive on that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you publicly associate yourself in any way with the American Youth Congress?

Dr. WATSON. I presume you have reference to the endorsement of the American Youth Act, not to any endorsement of any congress or the membership of the congress. The Youth Act I would sharply differentiate from the congress, which is the reason I answered that way. I would say no relationship to the American Youth Congress. I would say I was a supporter of the American Youth Act, a bill introduced by Congress and supported by Representatives Amlie, Bensen, Dunn, Scott, Young, Voorhis; and it was further endorsed by Prof. Charles A. Beard; Warden Lawes, of Sing Sing; and George Counts, president of the American Federation of Teachers. So I think I was in very good company there, gentlemen.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the American Youth Congress or any of its officials solicit your endorsement of the American Youth Act?

Dr. WATSON. That I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As of the present time you do not recall?

Dr. WATSON. I do not recall how it came to me. I can see a perfectly good reason why I would have supported it. It was a bill to provide employment and educational opportunities for young people between the ages of 18 and 25, which eventually became the N. Y. A.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you sponsor a group known as the Conference on Pan American Democracy?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; I sponsored a group known as the Conference on Pan American Democracy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your present understanding that the Conference on Pan American Democracy is properly identified as a Communist front organization?

Dr. WATSON. I am not sure about the Conference on Pan American Democracy. I would say I think it is legitimately under suspicion at the present time. I do not know that it was at the time that I joined with, again, a group of much more distinguished people in its sponsorship—Charlotte Carr, director of Hull House; Prof. Paul Douglas, of the University of Chicago; Mr. Henry Fairchild, of New York University; Mr. Irving Fisher, of Yale University; Sidney Hillman—

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean Charlotte Carr was formerly of Hull House?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. She is now deceased.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Matthews, are you making exhibits of the various things from which you are asking questions?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congressman, it was my desire at the end of the testimony to offer them all in one place by naming them, so they are all listed together.

Mr. STARNES. That will leave the Doctor's story connected, without breaking it up with these various things.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Furthermore, I am reluctant to hand them all over to the stenographer at any particular time, because we may want to use them as we go along.

Mr. STARNES. I just wanted to be sure, in these various statements that are being made, if there are others known to this committee or to the Doctor that are members of the Communist Party, or other subversive groups, that they might properly go along with a connected story.

Mr. THOMAS. In regard to that last organization—I have forgotten the name—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Conference on Pan American Democracy.

Mr. THOMAS. When did you resign from that?

Dr. WATSON. I never joined the organization, Congressman. The organization was at the time the only one that I knew—that was in 1938—that was working on the program of Latin-American cooperation. It was in advance of the general interest in our work with Latin America. My first contact with it was when they invited me to be one of the groups studying education in Mexico. I had some background for that and accepted the invitation and spoke once under their auspices. That terminated my connection with the organization.

Mr. THOMAS. That was the only connection you had with the organization?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the exhibits before us the witness is listed as a sponsor of the Conference on Pan American Democracy on the letterhead of November 16, 1938.

Is it your testimony that that sponsorship referred to a single meeting?

Dr. WATSON. I do not know to what it referred. I had no further connection with the organization except as I say. On my return from Mexico I spoke once under their auspices.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you ever see this letterhead?

Dr. WATSON. Not until it was shown to me as one of the exhibits of this committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This organization became a permanent group under the name of Council on Pan American Democracy. Were you acquainted with the organization under that form?

Dr. WATSON. I heard of it occasionally through the newspapers, but I had no personal contact with it, and, as far as I know, my name was never associated with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When it became a permanent organization it was headed by Gardner Jackson, and at the present time it is headed by Clifford T. McAvoy, of New York City. Do you know Clifford T. McAvoy?

Dr. WATSON. No. I think I met Clifford McAvoy, but I do not know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you any expression to make on the reputation of Clifford T. McAvoy with respect to his affiliations?

Dr. WATSON. He has been active in many of these organizations. I would not want to presume on that basis that he is or is not a Communist front individual.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Reporter, let it be known that Judge Kerr, distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee group which is charged with the power, under House resolution, to pass upon these allegations, is present, and Mr. Keefe, a member of his committee, is present. We are glad to have these gentlemen.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, in line with your request that I make an occasional statement with respect to these organizations, I will say at this time that the Conference on Pan American Democracy and the Council for Pan American Democracy have been designated as Communist front organizations by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and some other official agencies' investigations which have gone into the subject.

The evidence in possession of the committee is to the effect that the Communist influence in the Council on Pan American Democracy is expressed primarily through a person named Marina Lopez, who is listed as a member of the executive council of the organization, and Marina Lopez is listed at the State Department as the wife of John Little, State secretary of the Communist Party—of the Young Communist League—of New York State. There are, of course, other individuals who have extensive Communist connections whose names appear as sponsors of the two organizations.

Dr. WATSON. May I ask a question? Did you say that this lady, whom I have not known or have not met, was connected with the Conference on Pan American Democracy at the time that I was?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I am not sure about your exact dates of connection.

Dr. WATSON. As I told you, the only connection that I had with them, as far as I know, was the speech that I made in the fall of 1938, and at that time the people who were associated with it were

clearly a very broad and respected sample of leaders of American social thought.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Marina Lopez is listed with you as a co-sponsor.

Mr. STARNES. On the same letterhead, Dr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. On the same letterhead.

Dr. WATSON. Well, I never heard of her or saw her, so far as I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Langston Hughes, the Negro poet, is also listed here. Langston Hughes has been a candidate for public office on the Communist Party ticket.

Mr. STARNES. Did you know Langston Hughes, Doctor?

Dr. WATSON. No; I do not know Langston Hughes. I have read some of his poetry, which I think is very good.

Mr. STARNES. Did you know he was a Communist or a candidate for public office on the Communist Party ticket?

Dr. WATSON. No. That was a surprise to me. I learned it now.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not followed the organization very closely.

Dr. WATSON. I am afraid not in recent years. I am back in my home work.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever publicly associate yourself with an organization which calls itself the Descendants of the American Revolution?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I came into the Descendants of the American Revolution partly because I am proud of 300 years of American ancestry and have participated—members of our family—in every struggle with which this country has been engaged; partly because the Sons of the American Revolution, for which I was eligible, seemed to me to be concerned largely with rather extensive social affairs. The Daughters of the American Revolution were at that time refusing Constitution Hall for a Negro singer of great prominence. It seemed to me that some organization that would more clearly express the American spirit was a legitimate and desirable organization.

Among others who I think were members of it at that time were John Chamberlain, who has been a very strong anti-Communist, I think, Stuart Chase, whom I knew as a writer and economist and was not certainly in any sense a Communist; Bishop Paddock, of the Episcopal church, and so on. I attended, I should say, two or three meetings of the Descendants of the American Revolution in New York City. Only a handful of persons appeared. In one or two instances the Communist connection of the individual was apparent to me. I dropped out of it and had no further connection with it.

Mr. THOMAS. Right at that point will the witness name all of the persons who were present at that meeting in New York?

Dr. WATSON. I am sorry I cannot. I do not know.

Mr. THOMAS. As many of them as you can.

Dr. WATSON. I cannot name a single one. It is purely that I do not remember.

Mr. THOMAS. Can you name the ones that you thought leaned toward the Communist line?

Dr. WATSON. If there is a letterhead or a list of members or sponsors, I would be glad to pick out those. I remember one little fellow

who wore a beard who was very active in Queens, in the organization of the thing, and I think was later a Communist candidate for an office in that region. I do not remember what his name was.

It was an oddly assorted group who actually came to the meeting. The list on the basis of which I became interested in the organization was a good list. The people who actually came to the meeting seemed to be a bunch of queer ducks, and I dropped it. I did not see them since and I had not seen them before.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I understand your testimony to be that they were queer ducks, but some of them expressed views which to you seemed to be those of Communists?

Dr. WATSON. That and the fact that, as in the case of this man from Queens Borough, I later heard of activities which seemed to me to be Communist activities. I thought it was a pity, because an organization that seemed to me to have a great deal of promise had gone to pot.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Julia Church Kolar?

Dr. WATSON. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The incorporation papers of the organization show that Julia Church Kolar was one of the leading founders, if not the founder, of the organization, and there is considerable evidence about her being a Communist.

Dr. WATSON. John Chamberlain and Stuart Chase and Bishop Paddock and others were members at the time I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. Did you connect yourself with the International Workers Order in any capacity?

Dr. WATSON. I am informed by the Dies committee representatives, although I have no recollection of this, that I once agreed to sponsor a contest in writing plays for children. I am assured by the Secretary of the I. W. O., through an unsolicited letter, that I never had any connection with the organization and had never been a member or participant in its activities. So far as I know, I never did anything about the plays-for-children contest except to agree to act as a judge, or something of that sort, when the plays were sent to me. I think it is an entirely appropriate activity for a professor of education to act as a judge in a contest of plays for children.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not any doubt about the International Workers Order being a Communist organization?

Dr. WATSON. Not the slightest.

Mr. MATTHEWS. An organization that could be classified not simply as a Communist front but an auxiliary or an adjunct of the party?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. I think, even though you intend to state later on that you wish to offer all these exhibits, that you should refer to the exhibits each time. I think that is entirely proper, and then I think we can put all the exhibits in at the conclusion of Dr. Watson's testimony, so it won't clutter his testimony.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The exhibit before us is an advertisement from the New Masses of August 27, 1940, page 21, which announces a plays-for-children contest, sponsored by the junior section of the International Workers Order, under a committee of sponsors of eight individuals, and lists the name of Prof. Goodwin Watson.

Mr. STARNES. Of course, the committee takes judicial notice of the fact, and so does the Doctor himself, that the New Masses is a magazine that has wide circulation in this country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The interdepartmental memoranda of the Attorney General describes the International Workers Order as one of the strongest Communist organizations, and, of course, this Special Committee on Un-American Activities has on several occasions found it to be a Communist organization.

Mr. STARNES. And, of course, we have had before us the officers of the organization who are the heads of the Communist Party in this country, who testified to the same general fact.

Dr. WATSON. There is no implication, I assume, in this that the Communist organization International Workers Order was sponsored or approved by me in any way?

Mr. STARNES. No. This is evidence of public affiliation or public association with it.

Dr. WATSON. Affiliation; no.

Mr. STARNES. Association with it.

Dr. WATSON. Association with a project which it sponsored, yes.

Mr. STARNES. And then each time, as I said, you can offer a full and complete explanation of what your purposes were.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with John W. Gassner?

Dr. WATSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will Geer?

Dr. WATSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Elizabeth Irwin?

Dr. WATSON. Elizabeth Irwin is a very distinguished principal of one of the public schools in New York City.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Albert Maltz.

Dr. WATSON. Albert Maltz is a young writer. I do not know him well at all, but he had written a play, as I remember it, produced on Broadway.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Sam Pevzner?

Dr. WATSON. I do not know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oscar Saul?

Dr. WATSON. I do not know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Lem Ward?

Dr. WATSON. I do not know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, in the case of Will Geer, Albert Maltz, Sam Pevzner, Oscar Saul, and Lem Ward, there are very substantial indications that they are either members of the Communist Party or very close to the Communist Party.

I do not know whether you are aware of that or not.

Dr. WATSON. I am not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever publicly associate yourself with the League of American Writers in any capacity?

Dr. WATSON. I did. I contributed a chapter opposing race prejudice to a volume to which I think Vice President Wallace, Justice Jackson, Harold Ickes, Dorothy Thompson, and Gov. Thomas Dewey all made contributions. I am proud to be associated with that list.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Even under the auspices of the League of American Writers?

Dr. WATSON. The League of American Writers, I think, was not particularly involved in the project, as I understood it. It was to get out a book called We Hold These Truths. It was a defense of racial minorities.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, would you care to answer my question?

Dr. WATSON. I am sorry.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said you were proud to be associated with these individuals, and I asked, Even under the auspices of the League of American Writers?

Dr. WATSON. I thought my answer was that I did not think the League of American Writers had very much to do with this.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The League of American Writers published the book, did it not?

Dr. WATSON. I presume so. I do not know. Did they?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited you to write the chapter?

Dr. WATSON. I do not remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it Franklin Folsom?

Dr. WATSON. I do not know. I do not recall his name. To me it does not mean anything. But I should suppose whoever solicited Mr. Wallace and Mr. Jackson and Mr. Ickes, and so on, probably also invited me.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the date of this publication?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was in 1938.

The Attorney General's interdepartmental memoranda gives the League of American Writers as a Communist front organization. In fact, the memoranda include a separate section on the League of American Writers, which is among the strongest from the standpoint of condemnation in the entire memoranda.

Dr. WATSON. Was this book actually published by the league, or simply sponsored?

Mr. STARNES. It is purported to be published by the League of American Writers, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York.

Mr. MUNDT. Do you know what these other people wrote about?

Dr. WATSON. I have a copy of the book. I have forgotten what they said. The book was devoted to an attack on race prejudice, anti-Semitism particularly, as I remember it. Just what the contributions of Vice President Wallace and Justice Jackson were I do not remember, but I do remember that they were on the list of people who were to make contributions at the time I was invited to make one. It seemed to me an enterprise with which one could associate one's self without having it reflect upon one's patriotism.

Mr. THOMAS. That was only a few years ago. Can you not recall who invited you, because your memory has been very good?

Dr. WATSON. I am sorry. It is possible if I went through my files at Teachers College that I would find the letter asking me to make a contribution and my answer to it. It is possible that someone came in to see me, but I have no recollection about that. I have had a very heavy correspondence. I have written hundreds of articles and chapters, of which this is one, and the particular occasion on which I wrote this one is not clear. I can give you a list of all those publications, and so on, and I would be willing to look it up, but there is no purposeful forgetting as far as I am concerned. I just do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to ask you a theoretical question or a hypothetical question. If the Communist Party were publishing a booklet under its own auspices on the question of race prejudice, would you consider it advisable for you as a public figure and educator to contribute a chapter under those auspices?

Dr. WATSON. I find it very difficult to answer a hypothetical question like that. As a public official, obviously not. As a professor of education, a great deal would depend on the auspices under which the book was being prepared, the other people working on it, the purpose to be served by it. I should think that the answer would be no, that I would not do so, but I would not want to make that absolute, because I would want to consider the case on its merit if it ever came to me.

Mr. STARNES. You, then, question the propriety of gentleman like Mr. Wallace and Mr. Ickes and Mr. Dewey, since they were public officials, in making such a statement or having statements published under such auspices?

Dr. WATSON. No, Congressman. The hypothetical question dealt with something which was to be put out by the Communist Party as such, and I am quite sure that those people as public officials would not have contributed, and I would not have contributed under those circumstances.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The point that I think is relevant, Mr. Chairman, is that there is really little distinction between the League of American Writers and the Communist Party if, for example, the language of the Attorney General's interdepartmental memoranda is to be accepted. I would like to quote a sentence or two:

The League of American Writers was founded at a congress of American revolutionary writers held in New York City April 26-27, 1935. The call for the congress was signed by members of the John Reed Club, including such well-known Communists as Earl Browder, Isidor Schneider, John L. Spivak, and Michael Gold. The congress greeted Gold as the best-loved American revolutionary writer, and Gold in turn told the gathering that "our writers must learn that the working class, which has created a great civilization in the Soviet Union, is capable of creating a similar civilization in this country." The leading speakers at the congress were all prominently identified with the Communist movement in the United States and featured such men as M. J. Olgin, editor of the Communist Yiddish Daily, Freihart, Alexander Trachtenberg, head of the party's publishing house, International Publishers, Inc., and Clarence Hathaway.

The actual matter of the control of the League of American Writers is in the evidence before this committee and in the Attorney General's memoranda.

Mr. STARNES. It leaves no question in the mind of anyone.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It would make it practically identical with the Communist Party. That is the point I had in mind.

Dr. WATSON. Due to the fact that that was so clear, the Vice President and William Green and Warden Lawes and Associate Justice Jackson and Secretary Ickes, and so on, must have realized that they were contributing to a Communist enterprise in making a statement on anti-Semitism? If that is the implication, I think it is a false one. I think it is quite clear that they did not and that none of us or few of us who made that contribution had that in mind—

Mr. STARNES. The only question here was whether or not you were publicly associated or affiliated with these public groups.

Dr. WATSON. I was never associated with the American League of Writers.

Mr. STARNES. And it does not make any difference whether privately you were or not.

Dr. WATSON. You mean it does not make any difference whether you were affiliated—

Mr. STARNES. All I have to say as an individual member of the committee is that a person ought to know to what he is contributing or he ought not to contribute.

Dr. WATSON. I think it would be hard to press the charge of gullibility against the people I have mentioned.

Mr. STARNES. I do not agree with you. I think all of you have been carried away.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you been associated with the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy?

Dr. WATSON. I sponsored the psychologists committee for aid to Spanish democracy, or medical aid, or something of that sort.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is, of this organization that I named?

Dr. WATSON. For two reasons.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it yes or no?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The answer is yes?

Dr. WATSON. The answer is yes, for two reasons: That I believed then and I believe now that we should have given all possible aid to democracy in Spain. We are suffering today because we failed to do it. Secondly, that bureau included Bishop McConnell, Dr. Haven Emerson, Dr. T. Wingate Todd, a most distinguished anatomist at Western Reserve University; Dr. C. A. Winslow, of Yale University Medical School. In other words, it was a group whose professional connections were very high and whose political record is above reproach, and I think I was neither gullible nor subversive in joining with them for these purposes.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, when in all their checkered and varied career has the Spanish people been a democratic people?

Dr. WATSON. I think Spain has never achieved democracy.

Mr. STARNES. I do not think there was any democracy in Spain at that time. There was a lot of fascism, communism, and nazi-ism.

Mr. THOMAS. I think if one is named—

Dr. WATSON. I understand that all the names are to be included; is that not correct?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Dr. WATSON. I am referring to those who appealed to me.

Mr. STARNES. It would simplify it if the names are read. We know they will be in the exhibits, but we do not know whether the members will read the exhibits.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities unanimously found, in its 1940 report to the House, that the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy was a Communist front organization. It numbered among its leaders the individuals named by the witness and also numerous others of very pronounced Communist affiliations and even party members.

Mr. THOMAS. Who were some of them?

Mr. MATTHEWS. These exhibits will, of course, all be included in the record, but, as you say, it depends on how far you read the exhibits. The copy I have here carries the medical sponsors, and I am afraid that I cannot discern the names clearly on the copies I have. This is a photostatic copy, and we have the original, which is a better copy, but I can pick out some of them: Carol Weiss King, New York Communist attorney—

Mr. STARNES. Harry Bridges' attorney?

Dr. WATSON. Is Carol King a Communist? Do you state for the record that she is a Communist?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. That is my understanding.

Dr. WATSON. She is a daughter of Rabbi Wise, I believe. Am I thinking of the same person?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. That is an entirely different person you are thinking of. That is Justine Wise. This is Carol Weiss King.

Dr. WATSON. No. I am sorry. I was mistaken on that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Theodore Dreiser, Malcolm Cowley, Langston Hughes, Rockwell Kent—

Dr. WATSON. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that those people were associated with a different committee. I think the psychologists committee, in which I was included, or the medical bureau, did not include those people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. These were all persons who sponsored it.

Dr. WATSON. They were in some way related to aid to Spain.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under the auspices of this particular organization?

Dr. WATSON. But not with the part of it with which I was particularly concerned, although my connection was rather limited.

Mr. STARNES. Is this the same general organization—I am speaking of the parent organization—in which he seemed to have been a member of or associated with a psychologist group, about which the committee received voluminous testimony as to the fact that the Communist Party actually paid for the recruits of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and other recruits for one of the warring factions in Spain and helped to obtain passports, et cetera, and financed crossing the Atlantic?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Communist Party had numerous Spanish-aid organizations which it controlled, and they were all interlocking to some extent in personnel. The Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade is the one to which you referred. The Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, the United American Spanish Aid Committee, the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy were all part of the solar system, with an interlocking directorate, which has been identified as Communist.

William Gropper's name, for instance, is on this list. He is a Daily Worker cartoonist.

Mr. STARNES. Proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And numerous other Communist publications.

In the Daily Worker of March 5, 1941, there appeared a list of names with a heading, "List of signers of statement defending the Communist Party." In the left-hand column of this page the text of the statement is given. Your name is among those listed in the Daily Worker. Did you sign such a statement?

Dr. WATSON. I did, and the statement, if you had read the whole of it, says, "We who are not Communists, whose concern goes beyond the preservation of their constitutional rights to the maintenance of the democratic way of life."

It includes Professor Hocking, professor at Harvard, and a number of other distinguished people, who were defending purely the matter of civil liberties. The Department of Justice was urged against vigilante groups which have tried to keep Communists off

the ballot. As long as the Communist Party is a legal party, I believe we were correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I have read the entire text. It is quite true that the text says, "We who are not Communists." We made a check in the office and in the list are 23 publicly avowed leaders of the Communist Party's organizations in the list of signers, which led naturally to the conclusion that "We who are not Communists" was not true. It must have slipped in by mistake. David Bentall's name was on the list. Since that point has been raised by the witness, I can include the list of those who are publicly avowed Communists and Communist leaders in this country.

Mr. STARNES. I think that should be done.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your connection with the organization known as New America?

Dr. WATSON. I was one of the founders and originally a member of the National Policy Council, I believe it was called, of the organization called New America.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who were some of the co-founders, if there were co-founders, of the organization?

Dr. WATSON. New America came about as a merger of two little discussion groups which had been working independently in New York City, one under the general name Forward America and the other under the general name of Young America. Mr. Rodman, I believe, was most active in the Young America group. I was active in the Forward America group. My associates were largely persons at New College, where I was teaching, and some from Teachers College. We were later joined by Thomas Wright, Harry F. Ward, and the school principal in Cleveland.

The purpose of New America was to try to promote the study and action in the direction of the application of scientific planning in the operation under democratic control. The point of the thing was this. At that time, 1933-34, there was no W. P. A. program. There was no Social Security program. Unemployment was very high. Some of us felt something had to be done. We felt the Communists did not have the right answer. We felt the Socialists did not have the right answer. We felt there had to be an American answer. It could not be brought in from abroad. We felt the New Deal was beginning in a hopeful direction, but stumbling and fumbling and contradicting itself, because it had not thought through any consistent program.

The program of New America as it was launched at that time was to try to bring about the possibility of full utilization of our productive capacity rather than the half utilization which was carried on at that time. I worked with New America off and on for about 2 years. The influence of certain people in the organization, notably Prof. Harry F. Ward, increased. Professor Ward and I did not agree on our attitude toward Marxism generally and the tactics and attitudes of Socialist and Communist groups. Some of us within the policy committee fought for the original conceptions. Some of us fought for a more socialistic view of the picture. Eventually I resigned.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you resign?

Dr. WATSON. I think it was in the summer of 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you happen to have a copy of your letter of resignation?

Dr. WATSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever send a letter of resignation or did you resign by word of mouth?

Dr. WATSON. No; I sent a letter of resignation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To whom did you address it?

Dr. WATSON. To the executive director or organization secretary, Thomas Wright.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say the organization was launched in 1933?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; I think so. Well, I am not sure that New America was. I think that the Forward America activities were begun in 1933. The merger that produced New America may have begun in 1934.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you lecture under the auspices or on behalf of the organization New America?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where? Can you recall some of the places where you lectured?

Dr. WATSON. The principal recollection that I have is that it was one of the Methodist churches in New York City, 99 steps from Broadway. I have forgotten just what it is called now—Union Methodist Church, I think it is. A series of lectures was held for people in New York and training of leaders in group discussion was undertaken, and I gave a series of talks on New America and worked with leaders on developing techniques for discussion leadership.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where else did you lecture under the auspices of or on behalf of the organization?

Dr. WATSON. Probably at other places, but that is the only one that I remember as distinctly connected with New America. Are you informed of other occasions and places?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you not lecture at a point considerably distant from New York on behalf of or under the auspices of the organization, definitely?

Dr. WATSON. I do not recall that I did, although I have done a rather heavy program of speaking, and I was very much interested in New America and would have undoubtedly brought it into discussion at various points, but I do not remember any other meeting on behalf of New America at which I spoke.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was there such a meeting at Waukegan?

Dr. WATSON. Waukegan, Ill.?

Mr. MASON. Waukegan is in Illinois.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then the name of the city is not Waukegan. It is akin to it.

Dr. WATSON. Muskegon?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Muskegon.

Dr. WATSON. Muskegon, Mich.?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Muskegon, Mich.

Dr. WATSON. I remember that I spoke in Muskegon, Mich. I am not sure now whether it was in a New America organization or a school organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As I recall it, that was in the spring of 1935.

Dr. WATSON. I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not recall that?

Dr. WATSON. I remember being in Muskegon, Mich. I do not remember whether the meeting was a New America meeting or a public school teachers' meeting.

Mr. STARNES. Is New America the organization in which those rather strong statements of an anti-democratic policy were adopted? I think it would be worth while to insert the program of New America in the record at this point.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was going to ask the witness to identify that program of the organization, a photostatic copy of which I have here. Have you ever seen the original of that program [handing a document to Dr. Watson]?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, this is a 12-page exhibit titled "New America—Its Goal and Program." The national headquarters of the organization are given as Chicago, Ill., and the eastern division headquarters on Fourth Avenue in New York.

Would you like at this time for me to read some of the excerpts from the program?

Mr. STARNES. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 3 of the program of New America we find:

The attempt to change capitalism into a social economy by gradual steps is economically impossible because of the increasing break-down involved and the increasing opposition generated. The recent history of England and Germany also shows that such a policy is politically futile. The change to a new order must be adequately prepared for, but it must then be speedy and thorough.

On page 5, under the heading "Goal," the section opens with the statement:

The abolition of the profit system; the elimination of its incentives and habits, the legal forms and concepts by which it supports and the ideas by which it justifies capitalistic society.

That is listed as a goal. Therefore, you do not have a sentence with a verb in it.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, before you proceed any further, may we have also the meaning of the words contained therein? Do you recall the data we had which showed what the term "gradual" meant? There should not be a gradual change.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; I have those.

Mr. STARNES. It will have to be read in the light of those meanings before you can establish what was actually meant here, because those words, while strong, are mild when contrasted with their actual meaning.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Furthermore, under "Goal":

Eliminate private ownership in the means of production and distribution wherever such private ownership interferes with the success of a planned social economy; make profit, rent, and interest both unnecessary and impossible.

On page 7:

To win the masses to this goal and program by persuasive propaganda, aimed at uniting the farmers, the industrial and distributive workers, and the professionals in a common hate of their common enemy, the profit system, and a unified determination to achieve the new order in which alone can any of them find security.

On page 8:

In a world in which capitalism increasingly finds foreign trade impossible and socialism is being built on a national base in the Soviet Union as the quickest way to world revolution by the force of its example, no other tactic is practicable.

On page 9 there appears the statement:

New America will direct the force of hate and the destruction that removes obstacles in order to build. In behalf of the new order it will enlist and develop the creative force of sympathy for human need and the love of the ideal.

Among the tactics to be employed, discussed under a paragraph entitled "Coercion," it is stated that—

It will be the endeavor of New America to leave them in the position of bearing this disgrace alone, and it will seek to prevent them in this country from using this evil weapon effectively or destructively, by preparing the masses to use sufficient coercive restraint at the proper time.

That paragraph is under "Coercion."

Dr. WATSON. It is not quite clear from your reading. The point was that violence was to be left to the opposition, not to be used by us.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was going to explain that. Well, I would not agree with the latter statement of the witness. The point, as I understand it, is that the violence is to be initiated by the so-called ruling class, and then the masses are to be prepared to use sufficient coercive restraint at the proper time against those who begin the use of violence. That is a typical Communist view, without implying that this is a Communist Party document. Of course, the witness, I am sure, knows that that is the usual Communist doctrine on violence—that the other side begins it.

Mr. STARNES. And then they use a sufficient amount of coercive restraint to overcome it.

Dr. WATSON. I am talking about the kind of coercive restraint that operates in a democracy and only that kind. That is all that New America talks about.

Mr. STARNES. I was under the impression, from reading that, that there is very little democracy in America under the concepts of the founders there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was going to ask the witness if his understanding of the democratic procedures of which he speaks were to be used.

Dr. WATSON. Entirely; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By the use of the ballot?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Quoting from page 10:

New America will cooperate in genuine united front movements designed to weaken capitalist society.

Then on page 11:

New America does not follow the traditional political pattern. It subordinates and directs political action to the conquest of economic power by the masses in order that they may build a new society. Therefore it reserves its political drive until it appears probable that a mandate for a new economic order can be secured, or the resort to direct action by the reactionaries make other tactics necessary. It will not take office to reform the profit system, only to abolish it. Meantime, if and when it participates in the elective system, it will do so in order to expose, protest against, and weaken the profit system and the power of those who control it.

Dr. WATSON. Would the committee care to hear my interpretation of what the organization is trying to do?

Mr. STARNES. Yes; if you have any statement you wish to make in connection with it.

Doctor, I ask you again, for the benefit of Judge Kerr's committee, that you insert somewhere in the record or make available to them the description of this term "gradual" and what it means.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was coming to that next.

Dr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I object to the insertion in the record of publications of an organization after I resign from the organi-

zation in protest against that line of development and thought. I did not accept the definitions which it is proposed to insert, and I did not cooperate in the program which they seem to imply.

Mr. STARNES. All right. Go ahead and make your statement, Doctor.

Dr. WATSON. It is a difficult statement to make, because the view that I had in 1933 and 1934, when I began work with New America about our economic system, is not the same view which I hold today and which I have held in recent years—that is, I believe in our competitive private enterprise economy very much more wholeheartedly at the present time than I did at that time, when it looked to me as though the thing could not be made to work. I felt that we were heading downhill pretty fast through those depression years, and the measures that were being taken were not adequate to deal with it, and I wanted to do my part in setting up an organization which would deal with it within the framework of our political democracy.

There never was, so far as I know, a shadow of a doubt about the desirability of democratic political control and about loyalty—complete loyalty—to our form of democratic government. The only thing in question was what economic organization should operate within that political control, and the proposition of New America was that if we could study this planning process out and see a way in which goods, raw materials waiting to be produced, men waiting to go to work, and thousands of people in need of what could be produced by their work could be brought together, we would make a fundamental contribution to realizing the American dream and the American ideal.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Watson, at that point you will concede, of course, that when the American Government was set up, when its founding fathers wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and adopted it and put into operation our system of government, it was put in under a capitalist system of economics, with the profit motive and with the interest motive, if you want to call that a motive. All of those things were in there.

Dr. WATSON. That was our economic set-up, you mean, in the eighteenth century? There are many changes.

Mr. STARNES. You will readily admit that constitutional safeguards with reference to the right to own and operate private property and to be free in the operation and use and enjoyment of private property were written into the Constitution. You in this group were trying to write a new concept rather than to adhere to the traditional democratic action of government that we had enjoyed from the beginning of this country.

Dr. WATSON. No, Congressman—to alter one provision of the Constitution does not mean to reject the form of government.

Mr. STARNES. I read that article quite carefully. You and I went over it quite carefully together in my office one day when you came to see me last year. I find no single word in there that refers to a change in the Constitution of the United States of America so that by constitutional methods you would adopt the capitalistic system, the profit motive, and the system of economics on which the Government was founded.

Dr. WATSON. There is a great deal in the publications of New America which says just that, Congressman. The aim of the organ-

ization was always stated in terms of preserving democratic control and introducing scientific planning within it, which is the thing which I think we are moving toward in this country very effectively at the present time. As we saw it then, we saw it as a thing that had to be complete wholesale, for all kinds of businesses and enterprises. It all had to be planned together. I do believe that there is a much larger place for private enterprise, but, so far as method is concerned, the constitutional, legal method, in accordance with our laws and practices and form of Government, was always emphasized in every talk that I gave that described it and every piece of literature, so far as I know, that we put out on it.

Mr. STARNES. Doctor, in connection with the statement you are making at present, when you joined in setting up New America and formulating its policies and its programs, you believed in the abolition of the profit motive?

Dr. WATSON. No; I am sorry.

Mr. STARNES. You did not believe in it at all?

Dr. WATSON. May I explain the situation?

Mr. STARNES. I am just asking you. I cannot reconcile your present statement with the statements contained in that document, which expresses your views and the views that they set up several years ago. I cannot reconcile it except that you have had a change of heart.

Dr. WATSON. That is true, of course, but I am talking now about 1933 and 1934, assuming that my views at that time have any bearing on my capability for filling an office at the present time. In so thinking we distinguish pretty sharply between two things that you use synonymously, the profit system and the profit motive. Now, men are going to work for profit. I am a psychologist. I am a realist. I know that is true.

When we talk about abolishing the profit system and hating the profit system that stood between things as they were and the fulfillment they wanted in life, just what do we mean? We meant this. Whenever anything is abundant, plentiful, it is hard to distribute it on a profit basis. You cannot make profit out of air. Not that it is not important, not that people do not want to make profits, but there is too much of it. You cannot very effectively provide highways and drinking water, and so on, for people on a profit basis when there is plenty of it. You can sell water at a profit, for example, if you are in a desert and all there is is a barrelful. You can take it around and sell it at a pretty high profit.

The point of the situation was this. We will approach a time when we could produce all the food and the clothing that people wanted and needed, houses for them to live in, schools for them to go to, and so on, and it looked to us as though the idea of distributing them only by profit was a fallacious idea, a bad system, because here were people who needed shoes, here were shoemakers who wanted to make them, here were the hides all piled up, and why couldn't you do that? Because somebody said there is not any profit, they cannot afford to pay for them, I cannot afford to make them and sell at a profit.

We do not run a war by a profit system; only by saying to individuals, "What do you want to do in the interest of your private profits?" We set certain social goals ahead of that and then private profits make it subordinate to it. When we talked about getting rid

of a profit system that stood between us, I think we were wrong in large measure, but I want to make clear what we thought. We thought it would be necessary to get rid of the economic structure which made it impossible to produce the things that people wanted, when they wanted them, in spite of the fact that everything that was necessary was there. The only thing that stopped them was the system.

If you notice carefully in what Mr. Matthews read, it did not say the abolition of all private property or private enterprise. It said the abolition of private enterprise wherever it interferes with and makes impossible the production of the necessary goods and services for people.

Mr. STARNES. Then again it comes to this term used yesterday or the day before by Dr. Matthews and Dr. Schuman, your subordinate down there—verbal precision. Have you ever written any books or dissertations since the formulation of the New America movement in which you repudiated and rejected the theories that you held at that time?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I have written statements in rejection of any concept which involves the use of monopoly by the state as an economically desirable end and insists on the desirability of the preservation of competition and the value of private initiative in economic organization. That was a speech, a copy of which is available, if you wish, before a group of personnel managers in New York City.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the date of that?

Dr. WATSON. November 17, 1938.

Mr. MASON. Doctor, I am rather intrigued with your discussion of this subject and your use of illustration. You say here is a group of people that wants shoes. Here is a plentiful supply. The problem you want to solve is how to get those wants supplied in the best and most efficient way. Doctor, I would like to have that word "wants," as expressing a desire on the part of this group that wants and needs shoes, to be clarified. I want to know whether you mean that they deserve shoes that they need and want by their own efforts to deserve them or whether you propose to supply wants whether they have legitimately made efforts to supply those wants on their own part. There is a distinction there.

Dr. WATSON. Certainly there is.

Mr. MASON. I would like to have it cleared up.

Dr. WATSON. I am very glad that you asked the question, Congressman, because I am entirely in accord with the idea that everyone should supply those needs through his own efforts and his own work. I have no sympathy with theories which say that people must be given these things as hand-outs in some way or other or charity. I would expect, of course, people who are sick and too old to be taken care of. There are exceptions of that sort, but, by and large, the problems of New America's planning were to see how they could put these men to work so they could buy the shoes and so they could be produced.

Mr. MASON. That is a much better expression of it. I think we all agree that that is the best way, to place these people in a position so they can earn and deserve what they need and want.

Dr. WATSON. Right, but the point was that through their own efforts they did not seem to be able to do it. They tried to find work and earn it.

Mr. MASON. A great many of them, you will have to agree, from your own observation, have not even tried to provide them by their own efforts.

Dr. WATSON. That was true in many cases. I do not think it was the majority of the cases during the depression.

Mr. MASON. That is all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever active in any way whatever in the distribution of the New America program, which you have identified as an exhibit?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This particular program was in force as an official statement of the organization during your connection with it?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the program, as you recall it, describe your objective as a revolutionary change in our form of society?

Dr. WATSON. Again, verbal precision is necessarily involved. In the sense of an industrial revolution, yes, in the sense in which the New Deal has revolutionized our way of doing things. In the sense in which you set up machine guns in the square, no. Not a revolution by force and violence, but a change so fundamental that it is properly called a revolutionary change.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What did the program mean by mobilizing the force of hate against the common enemy?

Dr. WATSON. The profit system.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It does not describe the profit system in that particular connection.

Dr. WATSON. Doesn't it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The statement reads,

New America will direct the force of hate and the destruction that removes obstacles, in order to build, against the system that is now destroying humanity.

Dr. WATSON. That is right. Our feeling was, and is psychologically sound, that when people experience a great deal of frustration, hatred develops. Now, what are you going to do with that hatred? Hitler turned it against the Jews. The Communists turned it against people in high positions of wealth and against businessmen, and so on. Our hope was that the hate which was there could be turned against the system which prevented men from fulfilling their ideals and getting jobs, rather than against individuals, persons, groups. I do not know whether people can hate a system or hate an abstraction. Some people can. They were in a pretty desperate way—many people—and they had to have something that they could make a target for their feeling, and we tried to make it a system rather than persons or groups.

Mr. MASON. Do you not think that hatreds and emotions of that kind cannot be developed against an impersonal thing? Our emotions are personal.

Dr. WATSON. I think that tends to be true, Congressman Mason. I do not think it is always true. I think we can hate fascism, for instance, but for most of us it gets personalized in terms of Mussolini and Hitler sooner or later. I think one can hate war without per-

sonalizing it too much. One can hate ignorance without personalizing it.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Watson, that raises this interesting question. You hate certain forms of state socialism, but there are other forms of state socialism you do not hate?

Dr. WATSON. No. I am sorry. I think I would say I hate any form of state socialism.

Mr. THOMAS. Doctor, have you made any analysis of public opinion lately, as you made it back in those years?

Dr. WATSON. I read regularly the analysis of public opinion that is made by our Office of War Information.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you learned that there is a growing feeling of hate, perhaps due to many things, say the hardships as a result of war, among the people at the present time?

Dr. WATSON. I do not think, as I know it, it has developed to the point of hate. I think it is restlessness. Certain resentments are pretty strong. I think they focus about Washington pretty strongly at present. In some cases it is hate, but I would not say that the public generally is on the movement of hate, on the basis of what I know.

Mr. STARNES. How do you describe fascism? What is your definition of fascism?

Dr. WATSON. I would regard fascism as the control by the centralized power of the state, represented by a few individuals, of the economic, political, and cultural life of the people.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you think that there is any growing power of the state to the extent that we are entering a Fascist state in this country now?

Dr. WATSON. I am deeply concerned about the growing power of the state. I think it would be wrong to say that we are Fascist now. I think it is moving in a direction in which it could become fascism. One of the things that impressed me in London a few weeks ago was this: I heard Members of the House of Parliament—the House of Commons—discussing why the esteem for power had fallen as much as it had in recent years. I have heard similar discussions, not in the Congress, about the question of what has happened to the Congress in this country. I think that is a question of the salvaging and rehabilitation of our representative bodies.

Mr. THOMAS. Why do you include just the Congress? Why do you not include the bureaucracies that have made the centralized growth? Why do you not include them?

Dr. WATSON. I think that is part of the problem.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you not think it is the main part of the problem?

Dr. WATSON. I think neither Congress nor the executive organizations of the Government—bureaucracies, if you want to call them that—intended that this situation should develop. I think it has been a consequence of technical difficulties which we tried to administer as best we could, and the executive agencies have acquired more power and often have gone on their own and developed a good deal of resentment. Congress has dealt with them. Some of them have not been wise. I would not judge them now. I think we are working toward a solution of it. I have every faith that the solution is going to a democratic one, but I think there are very real dangers.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you not think there is more chance for the bureaucratic agencies and the tremendous growth of bureaucratic agencies in the last few years to turn us into a Fascist state than there would be from the representatives of the people who meet here in Congress?

Dr. WATSON. Oh, yes. I do not think the representatives of the people are Fascists at all. I meant that they are in a situation in which they are not able, in the nature of the case, to do many of the things that are expected of them.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Watson, what would you call a democratic solution? Just what do you mean by a "democratic solution"?

Dr. WATSON. I think I mean two things, essentially. One is that it shall be within the framework of our Constitution and representative government, under the control of representatives elected by the people. Secondly, I mean a kind of smaller democracy that comes down to the particular office or factory or school or home in which each person is given consideration as a person and is not simply regarded as a cog in a machine to be run by somebody else. I think democracy has both of those links. There is one more—the respect of the person in social relations, and, the other, the form of government which best implements that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wanted to ask another question about New America.

Mr. STARNES. When you reach a good place to stop we will recess for lunch.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mentioned at one point the fact that New America considered that the Communists did not have the answer and the Socialists did not have the answer, but there must be an American answer. Was a part of that feeling on the part of New America expressed in an attempt to change the language used in agitation for social change?

Dr. WATSON. I think, Mr. Matthews, you have expressed the issue between Dr. Ward and myself. I think Dr. Ward wanted to change the language and adopt the new ideals, and I wanted the fundamental American ideals throughout the country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you seen the memorandum that Dr. Ward sent to members of New America?

Dr. WATSON. I did not see it at the time I was with New America. I saw it for the first time when Congressman Starnes showed it to me for the first time. I was not surprised, because I had seen the tendency in New America toward that direction, by Dr. Ward and Dr. Wright.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the chairman of New America in the beginning?

Dr. WATSON. I think Ward was the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did he continue as chairman? Through-out your connection with the organization?

Dr. WATSON. I think so; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was Thomas Wright's connection with the organization?

Dr. WATSON. He was the executive organizer. He was the only paid official of the organization and was running the office.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, it is your testimony that Dr. Ward and Dr. Wright, on the one hand, held the view as expressed in this memorandum, and you were opposed to it?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you seen Thomas Wright recently?

Dr. WATSON. I saw him briefly when I first came to Washington about a year ago. I have not seen him since.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what his connections are at the present time? Where is he employed?

Dr. WATSON. The last I knew he was working with the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this particular exhibit, inasmuch as the witness states that he did not see it at the time and that it expressed the viewpoint of Harry F. Ward and Thomas Wright rather than his own, I should like to ask for its inclusion in the record, simply to have a picture of New America.

Mr. STARNES. That is right, to bring about what Dr. Watson says is the contrast between his views and those of Dr. Ward and Mr. Wright on the other hand.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And when I ask for its inclusion, that will be the understanding—that it is introduced for that purpose.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you contribute an article to a publication known as the Social Frontier in February 1937?

Dr. WATSON. Probably. I wrote several things for the Social Frontier.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The title of the article here is, "We Study the Soviet Union."

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You recall that article, do you not?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write in the article in question, expressing your personal sentiments by the use of the following language, "I wish I knew whether it will take longer for the Russians to develop efficiency or for America to develop socialism. Then I'd know where I want to live"?

Dr. WATSON. That quotation—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you answer it first and then explain it, if you will?

Dr. WATSON. You asked a double-barreled question, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May I state the question with all the precision of which I may be able. Did you write in the article in question expressing your personal sentiment?

Dr. WATSON. You are making it double-barreled there. That was in the article, but it did not express my personal sentiment. Will you let me separate those two?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You wrote the article?

Dr. WATSON. The words are in the article; yes. I wrote them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you express your personal sentiment by the use of those words?

Dr. WATSON. I did not. That was the distinction I wanted to get clear. If you read the rest of the article you will see it emphasizes many of the hardships that one suffers in the Soviet Union, that it is a pretty objective report, plus and minus, and this thing which you have quoted was stated as a question which stood out in our minds

largely because it was about the most dramatic thing said by someone. It was said by Anna Louise Strong. She said:

I wish I knew whether it will take longer for the Russians to develop efficiency than for the Americans to develop socialism. Then I would know where I'd want to live.

That stood out for us as giving a sentiment—one of the most memorable experiences we had—this talk from her on her background in America and in the Soviet Union and how she felt about it. It was not an expression of my personal sentiment.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May I read the entire paragraph, which has only two sentences in it?

One question lingers in our minds. Anna Louise Strong had stated it for us.

You will pardon me if I underscore for emphasis certain words.

Dr. WATSON. You mean before us, in a talk to us?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I do not so understand the English. I understand that it—

Dr. WATSON. That is what it was meant to say. It is bad writing if it does not say it.

Mr. STARNES. I am inclined to disagree with Dr. Watson, when I can see what a master of verbal precision he is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will read it again.

One question lingered in our minds. Anna Louise Strong had stated it for us. "I wish I knew," she said, "whether it will take longer for the Russians to develop efficiency or for America to develop socialism. Then I'd know where I want to live."

If I understand the English there, the question there was where you wanted to live.

Dr. WATSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the question where you wanted to live was to be determined on the basis of these alternatives: If Russia with socialism added efficiency to its system, the implication, as I see it, is that you would want Russia as the place to live.

Dr. WATSON. No. Anna Louise Strong would choose Russia as the place to live.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just a minute. On the other hand, the alternative is that if America, with its efficiency, should add socialism to it, then you would choose to live in America. That is the way I understand it. The English, in my mind, by the use of the word "for" would make it, as written, an expression of your own personal sentiment.

Dr. WATSON. Then it was badly written.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your testimony is that the sentence was badly written and therefore it does not express what it should mean?

Dr. WATSON. If that is what it seems to you to mean, it must have been badly written, because it seemed to me at the time, although I can see your reason for this interpretation, to say pretty clearly that Anna Louise Strong stated a question which was in her mind which had impressed us very much.

Mr. STARNES. I want to be a little precise, if a Congressman and a layman can be. When you say "for" that usually means you are participating. If she stated "to us," then I would know definitely

it was her viewpoint rather than ours. But when I say she stated for us or you stated for us, then I know you are speaking for me. That is the plain intent of it to an ordinary layman who is not skilled in semantics and verbal precision. To an ordinary layman I think that is what that means.

Dr. WATSON. I think if you will read the article—

Mr. STARNES. I read it most carefully and went over it with you.

Dr. WATSON. I do not know about that.

Mr. STARNES. I went over it with you, did I not?

Dr. WATSON. There is a great deal of the description of the condition in Soviet Russia—

Mr. STARNES. You agree that I went over that with you, at any rate?

Dr. WATSON. I do not know whether we went over all the criticism of the Soviet Union there. I rather object to the implication that a fellow who writes a hasty article is using words with the precision of a lawmaker or a lawyer. I am afraid that often I convey an impression which I do not mean to, and I may have in this case. I was not writing a creed which had been thought out carefully. I was trying to make an article readable. I put in a dramatic sentence. Apparently I put it in a sentence which is subject to the interpretation—

Mr. STARNES. You try to make words express the normal intent?

Dr. WATSON. I was not writing for cross-examination, however.

Mr. MASON. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I interject my interpretation of it from the standpoint of thirty-some-odd years in the schoolroom? When I listened to Dr. Matthews read that, the impression I got was that the question in our minds had been all along this question and that this lady, whoever she is, clarified that question in our minds by making the statement or the assertion that she made, but that was a question that had been in our minds previous to that statement, and when she clarified it, it just brought it out so that it was clear in our minds. That is another interpretation, I grant, but that is exactly what I grabbed when Dr. Matthews made that statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May I make a statement which is in line with what the Congressman has just said? The issue, as I see it, does not hinge on any fine interpretation of the word "for" as being misused, but hangs primarily on that first sentence. As you pointed out, "One question lingered in our minds." Then you might have said, looking through the dictionary we found words for it. Instead, you found words for it in Anna Louise Strong. You might have found them in Shakespeare or anywhere else. It is quite irrelevant to the main point at issue whether Anna Louise Strong said it, whether the dictionary gave it, or whether you culled it out of Shakespeare. The issue is whether it was in your mind. As I see it, there is no other question.

Dr. WATSON. It was not in our minds before she raised it. At least, it was not in mine. I cannot speak for all the group. It was a statement which I think lingered in our minds, and I think it will linger in your mind after you read it. I think that is the reason you picked it out. It was dramatic.

Mr. STARNES. We will recess until 2 o'clock.

(At 12:35 p. m. a recess was taken until 2 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The subcommittee reconvened at 2 p. m., upon the expiration of the recess.

Mr. COSTELLO (presiding). Proceed.

TESTIMONY OF GOODWIN B. WATSON—Resumed

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write an article for a magazine called *Common Sense* for its August 1934 issue, the article being entitled "The Great Choice—Reformation or Transformation"?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the substance of that article?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How would you yourself, if called upon to give the theme of the article, state the theme?

Dr. WATSON. It was a consideration of piecemeal reform as contrasted with trying to see the thing as a whole. I used the words "reform," "gradualism," and "opportunism" to describe the business of fixing up this and creating some more problems, and fixing up that and creating some more problems, and I used the term "transformation." I do not recall at the moment whether I used the term "revolutionary change" or "complete change," or something of that sort, to describe the process in which you try to put the whole thing together and get the fundamental change approach, the changed system, in other words, as contrasted with a step-by-step modification. It was part of the new America proposition that I described this morning.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will read you a paragraph from the text of the article as I have it before me:

Both gradual improvement and revolutionary transformations have played an important part in the evolution of nature, of culture, and of national institutions. Neither type of change can be assumed as more "natural," more "reasonable," more "humane," or more "American." Each case must be decided on its own merits. How is it with the present necessity to replace the broken-down profit system with one designed to produce and distribute all the goods and services the public can use? Shall we work for an all-or-none change, leaving the old order definitely behind us and building the new on a different foundation, or shall we work for gradual modification and improvement of the old, trusting that the net effect of many lesser changes will equal the greater one?

That is the end of the first paragraph. Do you have a text of the article before you?

Dr. WATSON. I think so; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that a correct reading of the text?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the next paragraph the article states:

There are four major lines of argument: Humanitarian, psychological, economic, and political. Each of them leads to the conclusion that the apparent attractiveness of gradualism is fallacious; that only the sharp break brings promise of success.

That is also a paragraph from the article?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it your understanding at the time you wrote the article, and is it your understanding now, that for many years there was a debate among so-called left-wingers that centered around the word "gradualism"?

Dr. WATSON. I think there were many such debates. I do not think of any outstanding single one.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has that not, let us say, from the beginning of the Marxist movement, been a stereotyped word indicating an issue or debate as to tactics?

Dr. WATSON. I think so. I was using it in a somewhat different sense than the sense which you have in mind.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it not true that by and large the Communists attacked the Socialists on the ground that the Socialists were committed to what was known as a gradualist program or a gradualist philosophy?

Dr. WATSON. I did not understand that that was the basis of attack as between Communists and Socialists. I thought that the essential difference that led to the Communist Party and separation from the Socialists is not the issue which you stated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you care to express what you think was the issue which led to the separation?

Dr. WATSON. I thought the separation took place over the issue of international war and the support of the country in time of war.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No doubt there were many differences of opinion on which debates were held between the Socialists and the Communists. Rather than describe this particular debate as the debate or the point of differentiation between the two groups, I will ask you if it was not your understanding that this was one of the points at issue between Communists in general and Socialists in general.

Dr. WATSON. I do not think that the point of my article was an issue as between Communists and Socialists. There probably were some Communists, and there certainly were some Socialists, who believed in a comprehensive social planning pretty well thought through in advance, and there may have been some in both camps who believed that you could get there by handling the broad issue as it was. I was coinciding with the latter point, but not coinciding with either a Socialist position or a Communist position.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the article you did attack the view of the gradualists; is that correct?

Dr. WATSON. That is correct. May I add there that that does not represent my present view. The progress that we have made in the last half dozen years has convinced me that we can deal with those problems, taking them up as they come and without the necessity for the over-all view; but as it looked to me at that time, we were taking one step this way and another step that way, we were plowing under cotton here and stimulating the planting over there, and there did not seem to be any connected way. I was aiming for the comprehensive outlook as contrasted with opportunism and drifting.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I might say at this time, Mr. Chairman, that I am not trying to prove that the witness was or is a Communist or was or is sympathetic to communism, but to bring out the point that this particular issue which he discussed in this article was an issue which might very well have inclined persons to think that the author of the article was taking a Communist view, inasmuch as the Communists

also were attacking gradualism, particularly in their debates with the Socialists. I would like for the witness to understand that also. I am not trying to prove what his viewpoint was, but to indicate a possible basis for this understanding. That is the conclusion that some of us reached on the basis of the article.

Did you consider that the program of New America was an American version of communism at any time?

Dr. WATSON. No. It was an American solution to the problem which communism is trying to solve, but it was not communism.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you think of the program, New America, as an American version of socialism?

Dr. WATSON. That would have been closer to the view, I think, that I held at that time. However, I would say again that socialism almost always implies a Marxist premise, and in working on New America and in New America I was trying to find a basis for social progress that was different from that of the class struggle and the organized activity of one class against another. In that sense, then, New America was distinct both from communism and socialism.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say that the doctrine of the class struggle is absent from the program of New America?

Dr. WATSON. As a basic doctrine of social change; yes. It seems to me that we were as much interested in getting the cooperation of businessmen as we were of getting the so-called proletarians. We recognized that the engineers, managers, and the skilled workers are even more important for this planning process than the people that had been organized under the Marxist programs.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not mean to imply, do you, that the Communists have rejected the assistance of engineers?

Dr. WATSON. No. It is a matter of emphasis in considerable measure, and viewpoint.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a matter of fact, in certain periods of the Communist Party they have been quite active themselves in organizing so-called professional men, have they not?

Dr. WATSON. I think they have tried to organize them. My understanding is that they have always regarded them as pretty weak material, perhaps at best to remain neutral, but never really to be relied upon for strength in their program.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the American Federation of Teachers?

Dr. WATSON. I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the local number of your branch?

Dr. WATSON. First it was local 5 and then I think it was 37. First all the teachers of New York were in a single local, and I was a member of that, and then they separated into the college teachers, as contrasted with the elementary and high-school teachers, and I became a member of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you still a member of the American Federation of Teachers?

Dr. WATSON. No; I am not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you resign?

Dr. WATSON. I resigned in the spring of 1940 or 1941. It was at the time before the decision was made as to whether those locals were to be expelled or to be kept in the organization, before the referendum was taken, because I know I did not vote in the referendum.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was going to lead up to that question. There was a referendum taken of the entire membership of the American Federation of Teachers on the subject of expelling Locals 5 and 37?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the decision was to expel, was it not?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you retain membership in either of those locals, if you did, after the expulsion?

Dr. WATSON. I resigned before.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You resigned before?

Dr. WATSON. Before the decision was made as to whether they would be expelled.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At a Buffalo convention of the American Federation of Teachers in a year that has slipped my mind, but I am sure you can tell me what the year was—

Dr. WATSON. It was the only one I ever attended.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What year was that?

Dr. WATSON. I think it was 1940. I am not sure about that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There was a resolution adopted which, broadly speaking, condemned communism; is that right?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you vote on that resolution?

Dr. WATSON. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you discuss the resolution on the floor of the convention?

Dr. WATSON. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you present during the discussion?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you present during the vote on the resolution?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any special reason for refraining from voting?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. Our situation in the Federation of Teachers in New York City, in the college teachers' union, was that we had a handful of Communists, maybe a dozen. We had several hundred members of the federation. That handful, a dozen or so, were very active in the organization, did more work than the rest of us put together, got themselves into a position of committee influence, and were in the process of destroying the effectiveness of the organization by making it a Communist-controlled local.

Watching that process develop, there were two viewpoints as to what ought to be done. One was that we ought to expel the Communists. That was the position taken by my colleague Counts, and the position that eventually prevailed. There was another position, represented by myself and others, which was that those of us who were non-Communists in the organization, outnumbering the others at least 10 to 1, ought to be able to control an organization through the ordinary democratic procedures without expulsion. I opposed the expulsion on the ground that the constitution of the American Federation of Teachers provides that no political requirement for membership was to be made. It seemed to me that this was a violation of our constitution and that we ought to be able to take over control without going through the process of expulsion. I could not vote with the Communists. I did not be-

lieve in the policy of expulsion, which was the alternative, so I did not vote.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did this resolution which was before the Buffalo convention call for expulsion?

Dr. WATSON. No. I think that was accomplished by a resolution later.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have the two things confused here, as I understand it.

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I was stating my general position through this struggle.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am talking now specifically about the Buffalo resolution, whose wording appears to me simply broadly condemnatory of Communism and did not involve the issue of expulsion. Those who introduced it and adopted it may have been looking toward expulsion, but the expulsion issue was not involved.

Dr. WATSON. No. I remember now. That particular issue was one of these verbal-petition arguments that Congressman Starnes was talking about earlier. There were two resolutions, as I remember it, both of them condemning communism, one of them condemning all totalitarianism—Communists, Fascists, or whatever—and the other condemning communism distinctly. That may have been the distinction. I am not sure.

I remember that I was quite willing to support the general and all-inclusive resolution, but for some reason was not willing to accept the form which the resolution finally took. On the other hand, I did not want to appear to be in opposition to an attempt to state condemnation of communistic totalitarianism.

I am afraid I would have to have the minutes of the convention to know just what the form of those resolutions was. It was a mess. I was disgusted with the whole business, because it did not seem to me to be advancing the cause of education at all, which was the reason for my being there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The form in which the resolution passed included all forms of totalitarianism, but specifically named communism, fascism, and nazi-ism. I asked you to explain your reason for your refraining from voting, and then you got confused and explained that your reason for not voting was because of the expulsion question.

Dr. WATSON. I remember I did vote in the Buffalo convention for a resolution stating opposition to all totalitarian forms. I remember also a great deal of wrangling about resolutions and substitute resolutions, which disgusted me immensely, and I left.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recollect now that you did vote for the final resolution as it was passed by the convention or the contrary?

Dr. WATSON. I think I did not, but I cannot remember now just what the difference between that and the resolution that I did vote for was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not the vote was by ballot, roll call, or voice?

Dr. WATSON. It was a standing vote, as I remember it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A standing vote?

Dr. WATSON. I remember we had one vote and I was standing with the people in favor of it. Then there were a couple of amendments. By that time I got disgusted and decided I would not have anything to do with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who were some of the Communist leaders in the American Federation of Teachers, Locals 5 and 37?

Dr. WATSON. The most active one was the legislative representative, a woman who teaches at New York University. I do not recall her name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Bella V. Dodd?

Dr. WATSON. Bella Dodd; yes. She seemed to be the active director of the thing and I understood was acting as a Communist Party representative, although I do not know of my own knowledge that that is true. In the college teachers' union there was a fellow named Neff, as I recall it, who taught at Hunter College.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Mr. Morris Schappes?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. Morris Schappes was a very vocal person in meetings of the council. It was my understanding that the heads of the two organizations, Bob Speer for the college teachers' union, and Hendley for the local 5, were not Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether Speer and Hendley sided with or against the referendum as it came up in the American Federation of Teachers?

Dr. WATSON. They were opposed to the referendum very strongly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Whether or not they themselves were Communists or Communist sympathizers, they took a position which in effect supported communism?

Dr. WATSON. Supported the right of the locals to remain in it, even though they were Communist-influenced.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Howard Selsam one of the Communist leaders?

Dr. WATSON. I never knew Howard Selsam. I never met him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was in the college teachers' union and was from Brooklyn, was he not?

Dr. WATSON. The name is vaguely familiar, but I never knew him. If he was present, he was never identified.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is true, is it not, that the Communists made a very determined drive in those two locals, particularly, in the American Federation of Teachers, to control a group of professional people?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; very true, but they were a small number, and I think it was a poor testimony to the ability of the rest of us that we let them get away with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The question came up in our discussion of the attempt of the Communists to enlist professionals. In this article which appeared in Common Sense in August 1934, you discussed what happened in Austria?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If I am correct, your conclusion about the eventual outcome of things in Austria was as follows:

Again a people learned in tragedy that there is no safe compromise with capitalism.

Was that your general conclusion as to the wisdom of the policies followed by the Socialists in Austria?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; that they failed rather dismally.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And they failed because they were attempting to compromise with capitalism?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; well—

Mr. MATTHEWS. And was not that compromise a question of gradualism such as you were discussing in your article?

Dr. WATSON. It was a planless kind of affair in which they tried to do public housing projects, but let themselves in for heavy international debts and made a situation that they simply could not handle, I think because they failed to think it through in advance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was not the general conclusion of your entire article here something as follows: That the Austrian Socialists, for example, had attempted a gradualist program, housing, general welfare, social security of various types; in other words, they had compromised with capitalism, they had not attempted to destroy the thing root and branch, they had left enough of it for capitalism to fight back successfully, and the Socialists were the ones who were destroyed? That was one illustration.

On the other hand, there was the Russian example, which you discussed at the very end of the article, as follows:

Only Soviet Russia has gone up to the left, in an oxcart that was nearly wrecked before the trip started, but they report now that the road is growing better. Our machines are more powerful but more delicate than oxcarts. Can't we stand the rough beginning if we prepare the road, the cars, the drivers, and the passengers?

I have read those two sentences correctly, have I not? Now, having read those, I would like to make this observation and ask you to comment on it. It seems rather clear to me that you were discussing the issue which essentially, in your own writing at the time, divided Socialists from Communists. Here you cited the failure of the Socialists in Austria because they were gradualists, and then pointed with some commendatory wording to the Russian Communists because they had gone all the way to the left. In other words, they had not tried gradualism, but a sweeping revolution.

Would it not be a fair assumption on the part of anyone reading this article and not knowing you or your work or anything else about you to think that you were fundamentally presenting a Communist viewpoint?

Dr. WATSON. On the basis of the sentence as you quoted, it would. On the basis of the total article, Mr. Matthews, I think it would not, because the emphasis is on the impossibility of our following the road of any other people; and also the statement, I believe, is in there that the transformation we want, while complete, can be peaceful and legal, which is an emphasis on comprehensiveness. That is the thing I liked in this passage, of course, about the Soviet Union. It is that they did go the whole way at one time. The Austrians failed because they tried to do things a piece at a time.

You are right in saying that it could be a natural presumption that one was arguing for the Communists against the Socialists. It also fits, however, my thesis, which was a different one—that there is an advantage, when you must make a great change like this in getting the total plan in, as contrasted with dealing with it in bits and pieces.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not denying that you have references in this article to a peaceful and wholly legal change. My eye does not happen to fall on those. Do you have them?

Dr. WATSON. I think I can find them. There is one paragraph which says—

Mr. MASON. On what page?

Dr. WATSON. It is on page 2 of my manuscript. I imagine it is near the beginning of your article.

Can we pass better laws, elect progressive officials, gradually socialize industry, and so create the new society? Or must we decide for swift and fundamental (hoping that it may also be peaceful and legal) transformation?

Again I think you will find the same viewpoint expressed later in the article, on page 9 of my manuscript.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would that be toward the end of the article?

Dr. WATSON. That would be very near the end, about the third paragraph.

Mass support must be rallied behind plans and leaders. Granted these prerequisites, the transition in a democracy may conceivably be complete and sudden, but peaceful.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, in both of those passages which you have read, is there not also the suggestion of some uncertainty?

Dr. WATSON. That is true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were not wholeheartedly in this article committed to—

Dr. WATSON. As far as my own efforts, I was wholeheartedly trying to make it a legal and peaceful affair. As far as predicting whether it would be under the circumstances in this country or any other, I think that would be precarious.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What I was about to ask you was, at the time you wrote this you had no certainty in your own mind that the change which you deemed desirable would be accomplished by peaceful means?

Dr. WATSON. I would have supposed the chances were at least 70-30 that it would be—something like that—but I think there are always possibilities that, you will fail in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have another article here from Social Frontier. The article is entitled "Across Fascist Frontiers," from Social Frontier of March 1937. You wrote that article, did you not?

Dr. WATSON. I think so. I do not seem to have a copy of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will be glad to have you look at this one, if you wish.

Toward the end of the article I find the following:

The Socialists, one-time leaders of the city, have now been killed, driven into exile, or are hopelessly beaten in spirit. What a stirring New Deal they had once begun! Roosevelt must go far before he achieves a program like theirs. The Austrian Socialists actually did the things F. D. R. makes speeches about. They provided real social security, built cooperative houses, set up health insurance, and enriched life generally for the forgotten man. The Socialists were sure that they had chosen the peaceful, gradual, practical way. They wanted to avoid bloodshed, even at the last, when they were disarmed by ruthless reactionaries and shot down in the 5-day battle in Vienna streets. I thought of the great pageant I had seen one May day in the Prater, when the youth of Red Vienna dramatized the story of mankind from slave societies to the brave new cooperative world of health and song and creative work. All gone now. Just a flicker of it I saw in an underground hall, where cynical actors satirized the present Catholic-Fascist regime in skits which could get by only a stupid or carelessly confident censor. Nothing in all this study tour has cut me so deeply as renewed acquaintance with brilliant and socially-minded Austrian young people, once flaming with zeal to realize humanity's dream of a cooperative commonwealth, now cowed, disillusioned, sunk beyond hope or despair, living only for the wearying routine of day by day existence in miserable poverty. Only emptiness ahead. Is that what my children will experience in America, after the failure of gradualism and the apparently inevitable rise of American fascism?

Now, again I ask you, Dr. Watson, if the ordinary reader reading that would not gather this impression—that you were attacking the gradualist philosophy of the Austrian Socialists and showing what an absolutely dire pass they had come to from following of a gradualist program as opposed to a more sweeping revolutionary change such as the Communists had instituted in the Soviet Union?

Dr. WATSON. If you thought the only alternative to Austrian socialism was communism, you certainly would draw that conclusion. As I tried to outline, I reject both the social programs, which it seems to me I have described in the words you read so effectively that no one could believe that I had faith in that method of procedure. I had not, up to that point in the article, set out my constructive hopes, as I did in other articles, for the development of Americanism as a constructive attack on these problems where the Austrian Socialist gradualism had failed.

Mr. MASON. Would you not say, Dr. Watson, from listening to the reading of that, it is perfectly proper for a person to get the idea that, at least at that stage of the game, having witnessed the failure of the Socialists in Austria in their approach to their problems by gradualism, and seeing the same approach here under F. D. R., you at least had forebodings that they might land about in the same spot that the Austrians had landed?

Dr. WATSON. That is pretty much what I had in mind, Congressman.

Mr. MASON. You have asserted, I believe, however, that you have changed your opinion since then about the possibility of this particular program, which we now term the New Deal, shall we say, avoiding that ending?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I think it depends upon what we do about the post-war demobilization situation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you wish to further identify this article?

Dr. WATSON. I recognize it. I am satisfied that is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was written in 1937.

Dr. WATSON. The date that I had was somewhat different, but perhaps you are right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. March 1937 seems to be the date of the magazine.

I have here an article purporting to be written by you in the October 1938 issue of Social Frontier. The article is entitled "Six Capitals." Do you recall that article?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have a copy of it before you?

Dr. WATSON. I am not sure. That is what I thought the other one that you just quoted came from. There may have been some mix-up on that. However, go ahead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In discussing Paris, which is the last of the six cities with which you deal in this article, you have the following to say:

Paris. The most significant city in Europe today.

Here may be found Socialist construction which far outshines the famous Karl Marx Hof and other workers' apartments of Vienna. A pity so few American visitors get out to Suresnes, to see how 28,000 people live in a planned new garden city, with some of the world's most attractive schools, nurseries, community halls, and other public buildings.

Here may be found the most effective experiment with the popular front government. "What you call a brain trust in America, we call left wing parties,"

says André Philip. Will this movement, like the Social Democrats of Germany and Austria, and the New Deal in America, fall between two stools? Will it hamper capitalism without building socialism?"

Would it not be a fair assumption on the part of anybody who read this article and came down to this conclusion on Paris to think that you were lumping the Social Democrats of Germany and Austria and New Dealers in America together in the category of those who advocated a gradualist change to socialism and expressed the fear that because they were gradualists they would fall between two stools?

If I were reading it, without hearing you elaborate on it, I would think that by the "two stools" you meant the retention of the status quo, which was capitalism, or a complete and sweeping change such as communism introduces. I may be wrong about what you had in mind about the two stools, but would that not be the way in which the ordinary person would read the article?

Dr. WATSON. If there is anything gratuitous in your interpretation, it is adding the Communist as the necessary alternative. As I pointed out before, I think there are other possibilities; but you are quite right in saying that the reader of that article would reach the conclusion that it was meant to let him think that the kind of experimentation with socialism that went on in Austria, and led to its fall, and went on in Paris, and had not yet led to the fall of France, but did later, was going on here in the New Deal and was likely to come out the same way. It just would not work. It was not the old capitalism or it was not anything new or better that was going to work. That was my view at the time. I think there was some justification for it. It was not meant to lead the reader to conclude that therefore we should become Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was using the word "communism" there with a little "c." I did not mean any political party; something completely transformed.

Dr. WATSON. I mean something that had been thought through.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it not be a fair deduction that you were advocating socialism in some form when you said, "Will it hamper capitalism without building socialism?"

Dr. WATSON. I do not think so. I think that was purely a description of what their objectives were and of their probable failure to obtain them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You include the New Deal in that particular reference.

Dr. WATSON. Well, insofar as it was trying to make them in a Socialist direction. I did not think it was likely to get there. I think that is quite true. I think that is all it says.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In this article the six cities which you discussed were London, Rome, Berlin, Isbanbul, Moscow, and Paris. Without taking the time of the committee to read what is a rather lengthy article—and I know you recall the substance of it—is it not true that the ordinary reader of this article would conclude that you found more that was favorable, more that was encouraging, in Moscow than in any of the other five cities?

Dr. WATSON. I do not think so. I would have to look the article over to see, but I am sure it was not an unmixed report on any of the places. We went into Russia at that time after the trials. I had expected to find a good deal of evidence of tension, fear of apprehen-

sion, people looking over their shoulders to see who was looking for them. I did not find it. I was much surprised at that.

I was much disappointed in their public schools. It did not seem to me they were doing as good a job as they were earlier. I was impressed with the development of paved streets, and so on. I was distressed, as always, by the lack of sanitation and by the very intense custom inspection through which we were put, newspapers taken away, and all that sort of thing. I tried to make a very balanced report on the thing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think maybe you must be thinking about some of your other writings, Dr. Watson, because in this particular article it certainly is true that with reference to the other five cities you do not give any unmixed account.

Dr. WATSON. Paris was a mixed account.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I say, you do not give any unmixed account. I am using a double negative.

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But, with respect to Moscow, I can give you what you say. One paragraph begins with, "Impressed by the new trucks and tractors." The next one begins, "Impressed by the new construction—broad new streets—finished canals." The next paragraph begins, "Much impressed by the rising standards of education and the extension of genuine higher education." The next paragraph begins, "Tremendously impressed by the continuous rise in Soviet production, despite political difficulties."

I do not find anywhere in here anything which you could describe, as far as I can read it, as a mixed account of what was impressing you in Moscow at that time.

Dr. WATSON. Let us read some more of it. I have found it now [reading]:

Naturally one looks for tension and suspicion—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is virtually at war on two fronts, and there has been a purge within which surpassed even the impression given by our none-too-friendly newspapers. (War today doesn't begin with the declaration or the march of troops. Propaganda and industrial sabotage lead the way.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; but just a minute. While you say there that "Naturally one looks for tension and suspicion," you went on to say that one did not find it.

Dr. WATSON. That is true. I said the purge, however, had been worse even than the description given by our newspapers. May I read another sentence?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Certainly.

Dr. WATSON. Describing the second session of the Supreme Soviet [reading]:

So far as we can gather all public "debate" consists of carefully prepared eulogies, and all votes are unanimous.

That was supposed to be a sarcastic condemnation of their democratic procedures. Maybe I did not make the point clearly enough.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would agree with you that that point is implied.

Dr. WATSON [reading]:

Shortage of teachers continues.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of course, the article would have to speak for itself, in the last analysis, when it comes before the committee.

Dr. WATSON. There is a point there also that military expenditures were taking 30 percent of their budget, but I think now they were wiser than I thought they were.

Mr. MASON. Wiser than we were.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On June 28, 1938, you delivered an address at a session of the National Education Association, did you not, Dr. Watson?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That address was published in the bulletin of the department of secondary school principals, National Education Association, in its December 1938 issue?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you supply the text of this address to the publication which printed it?

Dr. WATSON. I think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you seen the text as it was printed in this bulletin of the department of secondary school principals?

Dr. WATSON. I do not think so. I think I do not have the printed form of that, but I have a typewritten manuscript of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not any reason to believe that there were any alterations made in the text? On page 11 of the publication, where part of your article appears, I read as follows:

So long as power to control business and government rests with our present small, reactionary ruling class, we must expect enormous discrepancy between ideals of world peace and actions taken far more with a view to profits.

Was it your view then that the Government of the United States was controlled by a small reactionary ruling class?

Dr. WATSON. Not controlled wholly, but that, unfortunately, people with money and position do have a voice in government that outweighs that of the little man. I think we are moving to correct it. I think, perhaps, I was mistaken in that. It was thought wars had been in part a product, because you did have that democratic control of a particular foreign policy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At the time you delivered this speech you did use the word "control" with reference to the relationship between the United States Government and this small reactionary ruling class, did you not?

Dr. WATSON. I probably did. I always have an impulse to want to see more of the total point I was making, although I can't take the time of the committee to go over all the things a man has written and said over a period of 20 years. I do not doubt that the point was being made that some pretty powerful people do have a lot to say with government.

Mr. COSTELLO. You used the expression, however, "We are moving to correct it."

Dr. WATSON. That is correct.

Mr. COSTELLO. What do you mean by that?

Dr. WATSON. I mean to say that over the last century there has been a very great growth in this country of channels by which the person without property and great influence can have a voice in government. Initially the franchise did not extend to all citizens, but only to propertied citizens. Gradually we have gotten away from that in most sections. In some places there is still the poll tax.

Mr. COSTELLO. That would be true at the time you made the statement?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. The growth of farm organizations, cooperatives, unions, and so on, helps give more voice to the individual. I think Gallup polls, although they have their limitations, help us to know what people think, a person who has not any pipe line to high places.

Mr. COSTELLO. You do not think that the Gallup poll has a voice in government directly, do you?

Dr. WATSON. It is indirect, but it helps us to know what people think. Sometimes it misleads us, but not intentionally.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you wish to leave the impression in this address that the United States Government was in fact a plutocracy when it pretended to be a democracy?

Dr. WATSON. Well, that is putting it pretty strongly. That is one of those exaggerations which may be permissible in a speech in comparison with a situation like this, but I think if you read the total paragraph in which that appeared you will see what I was saying [reading]:

We cannot save democracy in the world unless we can save it at home. We cannot make our foreign policy express our desire for peace, unless we can make government more responsive to the will of the great majority of our people who have no great wealth or political pull. We cannot make government more democratic so long as economic power, and the power to pay for propaganda which molds public opinion, are concentrated in the hands of the few. Our Government, and that of France and England, may pretend to be democracies, but they are in truth plutocracies. It is no hyperbole of the radical demagog to assert that "Mr. Millionbucks" has at present an influence on legislative, executive, and judicial action which the man in the street, of equal or higher ability, cannot hope to have.

Mr. MASON. Would you not say that that figure of speech and those illustrations are pretty far-fetched as a clear-cut description of the situation here in the United States either today or in that period?

Dr. WATSON. I do not think so, in this sense. I think most people are not in the position to know the facts on a controversial issue except as they are given them through newspapers and over radio stations, and those are controlled by persons of very great wealth, necessarily so. When an issue arises, when there is a real issue, between the interests of the little fellow and the interests of some big powerful minority, the chances of affecting public opinion are with the latter.

Mr. MASON. This country is filled with little weekly country newspapers. Every little community of four or five hundred people has one. The proprietor or owner of that newspaper is one of the poorer people of that community. He probably owns his home and that is about all. You certainly would not say that he represents only the millionaire point of view?

Dr. WATSON. No.

Mr. MASON. Because the usual editorial in all of these country newspapers—we have a great many of them—takes the stand of the ordinary chap on the street in that little village and reflects his views to a very large extent.

Dr. WATSON, I just thought that this was an extreme description or illustration of the situation, because I personally am an object that refutes that entirely. I landed on these shores 50 years ago from Europe. I was the twelfth child in a family of 13. My father

and brothers worked in a mine. I had to go to work when I was 14. Yet, in spite of the control of these wealthy people, I have managed to get along pretty well and to earn a place in the community life and respect and have arrived at a place of a little influence in our American way of life; and I say that as long as there is that possibility for any chap to capitalize on his personal ability—what little he has—you cannot say that this country is controlled and dominated by “Mr. Millionbucks,” or whatever you want to call it.

Dr. WATSON. I very much honor you. I think your history is the kind of thing that America is justly proud of.

Mr. MASON. That has been true ever since the country started, and it is true today.

Dr. WATSON. That has been true ever since the country started and it is true today. I also have the respect that you have for the little country newspapers and weekly newspapers. I would come back, however, to my point, at least to ask this question, if I may. My understanding is that to run for Congress, for example, involves costs that are out beyond the pocketbook of an individual who does not have wealthy friends.

Mr. MASON. There again I will use myself as a horrid example. I was superintendent of a small system of schools, earning \$3,000 a year. Because I did a little work for the community, I was urged to run for the State senate. I did not put up a penny. I probably spent a hundred dollars in campaigning around. I was elected to the State senate. When there was a vacancy in Congress, after being in the State senate for 6 years, I was urged—I did not want to—to run for Congress, and I have spent approximately five or six hundred dollars in my campaigns in running for Congress.

Dr. WATSON. You mean your personal expenditures or the total expenditures?

Mr. MASON. The total expenditures, and that, I think is available to any person.

Dr. WATSON. Do you think that represents anything like the average of elected Congressmen, of campaign expenditures?

Mr. MASON. I am quite sure that it represents the average who runs in, shall we say, a country district outside of the large cities. In large cities there are machines and other things we have to contend with, but out in the country they judge you by your appearance on the platform and your past experiences and past records, and so forth, and they say, “That is the man we want to represent us.” I have been around. I have traveled all over the country. I have made political speeches and others in many States, and, judging from the crowds that I have seen, it does not require money.

Mr. COSTELLO. It is only in an unusual case that you have a large expenditure of money.

Mr. MASON. I would say that the average Congressman spends less than \$2,000 or so on his campaign.

Dr. WATSON. Is that so?

Mr. MASON. Every 2 years. There might be other occasions where some of them in cities spend ten, fifteen, or twenty thousand dollars. I do not know anything about that, but certainly no one has ever contributed to my campaign, and I could not afford to spend more, because I did not have it.

That is the viewpoint with which I look at all of these things that are coming to me. I cannot help but have that viewpoint, because that has been my experience for over fifty-odd years.

Dr. WATSON. I think that is very sound.

Mr. MASON. I am sorry, Dr. Matthews. I did not want to interject this, but I did want to give you my reaction to these statements—

Dr. WATSON. It is pretty much my reaction, although I think there is a grain of truth in what I was trying to say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In this same speech which you delivered to the National Education Association you made, according to the public accounts I have before me, the following statement [reading]:

Only when some of our great newspapers and radios, like our schools, are under the control of the public and not under the control of private owners and large advertisers, may we expect consistent support in efforts for democratic cooperation with all peoples of the world.

Did you mean to be advocating any form of public ownership of newspapers and radios in that statement?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I believe in a yardstick principle there. I would like to see public stations, like WNYC in New York City, in competition with private stations, and I think it would be a wholesome influence in other places. The University of Wisconsin has a good one under private auspices. I would not weigh the dice for or against one or the other, but I believe there is a place for public education and private education in the schools, and I think the same principle holds in the education of the adult population, by newspapers, radio, press.

Mr. COSTELLO. The inference to be drawn from your remarks would lead one to believe that you meant total ownership.

Dr. WATSON. It says "some."

Mr. COSTELLO. How is that worded?

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading):

Only when some of our great newspapers and radios, like our schools, are under the control of the public and not under the control of private owners.

The word is "some" in this particular article.

Toward the end of the article, in discussing the question of taking profits out of war as a measure against war, you wrote or said [reading]:

We might propose a bill to take the profits out of war, but a congressional committee would promptly eviscerate it in obedience to those who live by and for profits.

Would you want to modify that statement?

Dr. WATSON. That was sort of unfair to Congress, I think, but I would say that I hoped that the cost-plus contract had disappeared from the last war, and it seems to be back in again, which might be cited as evidence of the thing that I was objecting to.

Mr. COSTELLO. The difference between the present contract and the one that they had in the last war, in the cost-plus, is that the fee is determined in advance and fixed, regardless of what the cost may be, whereas in the last war it was based on the size of the cost.

Dr. WATSON. I am told that there are contracts which provide an incentive for the increasing of costs by producers so that they hire unnecessary labor and put it in as cost, and their profit is a percentage of that cost.

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not think that is true. I think you may find that by showing a large cost on one contract they may be led to get a higher fee on the next contract. That may be true, but the basis, as I understand it, on which all the contracts are being let is that the fee is predetermined. I think there is a decided difference between the fixed-fee contract in this war and the contracts given out in the last war, where the fee was dependent upon the cost.

Dr. WATSON. I thought that was still true.

Mr. COSTELLO. No; it is a different arrangement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the interdepartmental memoranda which were distributed by the Attorney General to the departmental heads to guide those departments in dealing with persons alleged to be affiliated with subversive organizations, the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder was designated as a Communist front organization. I say that for your benefit. The Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder was set up in the fall of 1941 as a result of a conference which was held on November 1, 1941, at the Riverside Plaza Hotel in New York City.

A letter inviting persons to support that conference, which was held on November 1, was dated October 18, 1941, and purports to have been signed by you, along with 15 or 16 other individuals.

Now, I have made quite a lengthy, descriptive statement. I do not ask you to concur in anything I have said about the organizations, but I will ask you if you signed a letter dated October 18, 1941, which did invite persons to support this conference which was held on November 1, 1941.

Dr. WATSON. Yes; I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you attend the conference yourself?

Dr. WATSON. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited your signature for this letter?

Dr. WATSON. It came through the mail, as I remember it, but I do not remember who signed the letter of inquiry.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have seen a copy of this letter, have you not, or a photostatic copy of it?

Dr. WATSON. I have seen a photostatic copy of the letter; yes. The issue, I suppose, at stake is not whether this was a policy in which non-Communists could concur? As I remember, Mr. Willkie took the same stand, and eventually the President acted in the same direction. I think that is the highest support for the position I took at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of course, it is not my function to decide what the issue involved is. I would like to establish whether or not you were publicly associated with an organization which has been designated as a Communist front organization.

Dr. WATSON. I do not know anything about the organization. My supporting matter was wholly based on the feeling that Mr. Earl Browder had not been treated as certain other citizens would have been under the same circumstances.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall, at the time you consented to the use of your name on this letter, whether you knew who the other signers would be?

Dr. WATSON. No. I remember now one interesting detail of that that may help your records. Someone telephoned and asked me whether I would be willing to support such an enterprise, and I said

I would, and he read me over the telephone, as I remember it, the content of the statement that was to be issued. He then called around later and asked me to sign the thing. I was not there. Then he asked me if I would leave a signed card with his secretary, which I did, and the photostat signature that was appended to this came from the card that I had signed.

That was a very dangerous practice. At this time it was not appended to anything I did not know about, but it was a dangerous practice. I just wanted to append to the record how it was done.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall who it was that telephoned you?

Dr. WATSON. No; I do not. Would the composition of the letter indicate who was primarily responsible? I think it was Arthur Upham Pope. He was the head of the Committee for National Morale, with which I had been working for the last couple of years. He was a very famous Egyptologist and Assyrian archeological student. I remember he called me. I would not ordinarily sign a thing on a telephone conversation. That is what this was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you learned since who the other signers of the letter were?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You recognize that a substantial number of them are either Communist Party members or Communist sympathizers?

Dr. WATSON. I think I am in very bad company there in that particular letter. I think on the issue I am in good company, and I think my invitation was one in which I had a right to trust, but I think Mr. Pope got me into a bad set-up, because the members were few and were more limited to radical circles than I had any idea they would be.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There are 17 names appended to this letter. One of them is Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. She subsequently became the head of the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder, which the Attorney General has described as a Communist-front organization. I am sure the Attorney General made his decision as to that wholly apart from the issue of freeing Earl Browder. The memorandum indicates that.

You know that Elizabeth Gurley Flynn is a Communist woman leader?

Dr. WATSON. I did not know who the other signers would be before I signed, but I presumed that there must be others along with Mr. Pope who would have been reassuring to me if I had known.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How about Ben Gold?

Dr. WATSON. No. You can have him. I don't want him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What about Max Yergan?

Dr. WATSON. That is one of the front cases.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is president of an organization which has also been described as a Communist organization.

Dr. WATSON. He used to be a Y. M. C. A. director.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Art Young. You know him as a cartoonist?

Dr. WATSON. Cartoonist for New Masses, or something like that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For the Daily Worker and numerous Communist publications, as well as some non-Communist publications.

Richard Wright, the novelist, who has been publicly avowed as a member of the Communist Party.

Representative Vito Marcantonio.

Did you want me to read these to you?

Dr. WATSON. I just wondered if there were any of those who were particularly reassuring. I do not think you have been looking for those.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Osmond K. Fraenkel.

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I worked with him in the American Civil Liberties unit and had every reason to suppose that he was an honest liberal.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Aline Davis Hays.

Dr. WATSON. I do not know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Aline Davis Hays has supported a good many Communist-front organizations.

Rockwell Kent.

Dr. WATSON. I think he is pretty well lined up with Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was the head of the campaign committee for Browder and Ford in the 1936 elections.

William B. Spofford.

Dr. WATSON. Isn't he an Episcopal minister?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was the acting chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy when Dr. Ward was in Mexico. He is one of the editors of the Episcopalian paper.

Dr. WATSON. The Churchman?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Churchman.

Lewis Merrill. He is the head of the United Office-Professional Workers Union, which the Special Committee on Un-American Activities—

Dr. WATSON. It is not as well weighted with other liberals as I would want an organization to be before I consented to cooperate with them, even in a move like that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Harry Reich. You do not know him?

Dr. WATSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Darwin J. Messerole.

Dr. WATSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The only other name is Prof. Dorothy Brewster.

Dr. WATSON. Smith College?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. As a matter of fact, about the only name that would have been reassuring would have been the name of the one who solicited you, Arthur Upham Pope.

Dr. WATSON. Fraenkel, perhaps—well, I guess not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you care to name some other names, I did not wish to interrupt you.

Dr. WATSON. Well, I guess not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you publicly associated in any capacity with Consumers Union?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I was on the board of directors.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you acquainted with Arthur Kallet in that?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever have any reason to believe that Kallet was a Communist?

Dr. WATSON. I was told by Dewey Palmer, who worked under Kallet for a long time in the organization, at the time that Kallet and Palmer were quarreling, and when Palmer left he said that Kallet and a

number of other people in the organization were Communists and that the party control went through the activities of the organization. I had been on the board of directors for some time and attended probably three meetings in a year. I could not be very active in it. I had not seen any evidence of party activity or party control in those board meetings.

When Dewey raised the question I made some further attempts at an investigation, which led me to no conclusive finding, and I had no reason other than Dewey Palmer's statement—I mustn't say that.

I had one other reason for saying there might have been some truth in it, but I was not convinced that from—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Kallet was the head of the organization, was he not?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know whether the witness knows it or not, but I may say that the committee has evidence, which Mr. Kallet has not offered to dispute, that he was editor of a publication known as Health and Hygiene, and used his Communist Party name, Edward Adams, in that editorial capacity at the time he was initially setting up Consumers Union. Were you aware of any of those facts?

Dr. WATSON. Not in the least.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to say this for the record, Mr. Chairman. I have no desire to enter into an argument with the witness on Consumers Union. I was very much involved in a dispute with that organization a good many years ago, and my sole purpose in asking the witness any questions at all about Consumers Union was that the organization was mentioned in the letter which Chairman Dies wrote to Chairman Fly, and an omission of that might just as easily have been misunderstood as my having brought it in.

That is all I have to ask the witness.

Mr. MASON. At the beginning of this session Chairman Starnes told the witness that after the questioning was over, if he wanted to make any statement that he cared to make, he could do so. We will be glad to listen to it as a concluding summary of the situation from his standpoint.

Mr. COSTELLO. We will be very glad to do that, Dr. Watson, if you have any statement you care to make.

Dr. WATSON. I hope there has been an opportunity to make my position clear. Perhaps if you will permit me a word or two of personal background and attitude in this matter: I come from 10 generations of Americans, who have been mostly little people, farmers and small businessmen, ministers, and school teachers. I grew up in Wisconsin, in a Christian home. I was educated in our public schools and taught in them. I always supposed that I represented the ideals of America in a very genuine fashion.

I have inserted in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, United States Senate, some selections from articles of the kind that would not, in the nature of the case, appear to us here, indicating my faith in democracy, my faith fundamentally that our one big problem is to extend democracy more effectively than it has been in the past.

In my little career as teacher and religious educator and my longer work as a teacher, particularly in the field of social psychology, I have been doing everything I could to try to advance that. When

the time came that war seemed inevitable with powerful nations that were determined to substitute for our democratic freedom a dictatorship, I saw it coming. I may say that I was pro our military intervention at a time when Communists and fellow travelers were standing by the Soviet Union. I joined the Committee for National Morale in the fall of 1940. The turn of Communists did not occur until about June of 1941.

I came to Washington, as you have heard, in response to an invitation to serve here. In the previous war I had served as best I could as a young fellow in naval training. I considered whether to go in the military service, whether to continue my work in education, whether to come down here and accept this job, and finally decided that there were relatively few people in the United States trained as I had been in the study of propaganda, experienced as I had been in visiting abroad and other countries, knowing a bit of their language and their politics, who could do this particular job that needed to be done.

I took it, as I told you, at a reduction of salary, meaning separation from my wife and three children, because I felt I could contribute something to the war. I was here before Pearl Harbor.

On the day after Pearl Harbor I received a telegram from my 75-year-old mother quoting a Biblical passage which runs, as you may know, "Who knows but that you have come into the world for just such a time as this?" Just about that time I found my reputation attacked on the floor of Congress and spread over the press—subversive, un-American, and so forth.

As I told you, I spent 7 days of my time, when I should have been on the job, answering these questions. I have a feeling that a very deep injustice has been done. I hope that if it is in your power in any way to rectify it that you will take whatever steps may be taken in that direction.

At the beginning I told Congressman Starnes that I would have to answer under protest and wish to indicate the grounds of that protest. For the record I think I had better indicate what that protest would have been, although I recognize and appreciate the courtesy with which I have been heard.

In the first place, I am unable to understand why an investigation is made a year or a year and a half after the verdict was reached and the attacks on me were publicized in such a way as to damage my reputation.

In the second place, I wanted to ask whether it has been true that in all cases of this kind, a class involving fitness of a public official, the hearing has been arranged with charges submitted to the individual in advance, with opportunity to be represented by counsel, and, if necessary, to subpoena witnesses. I should suppose that when the charge is one of subversion, which is a felony, those safeguards would be especially important; and if it should prove, as I suspect, that this is the first occasion on which those rights have not been accorded, then it seems to me that I had some ground for asking for an examination of the procedure.

Finally, Mr. Starnes referred to the fact that my opinion about the work of the Dies committee had not been flattering, and I think I should say that the principal reason for that is that I felt that procedural safeguards had not been followed, that verdicts were rendered before an investigation was made, and that cases were tried in the

newspaper rather than as we have worked this afternoon, in executive session.

Last night at 8 o'clock a broadcaster from Berlin in the Spanish language to Latin America made a major point of the work of this committee. It has been done before, as you know.

The Dies committee reestablished by the North American House of Representatives to examine all Anglo-Yankee activities has just presented the Senate with a memorandum in which reports that Stalin's agents already occupy the highest positions in the Government life of the United States. This memorandum, moreover, states that in some cases in which several public officials were dismissed for spreading propaganda in favor of the Bolsheviks, these were placed in posts of even greater responsibility by President Roosevelt himself, these are the * * * in the United States itself—we should not be surprised that good neighbor also wants to place the Latin American republics in dangerous contact with the Bolshevik danger, forcing them to reenter into politic relations with the Soviet Union.

At present there are in the world only two groups: One that is fighting in favor of Bolshevism and another one which fights against it. On what side are you?

I should suppose that if this committee's methods of work have commended themselves so highly to Goebbels and his propagandists, some mistake has been made. I do not think that mistake has been in the motives of any of you gentlemen protecting the American form of government and getting rid of forces that in any way would tend to undermine it.

I submit that as a statement that would have led me to say in the beginning that I cooperate only with these reservations and this protest.

Thank you very much.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, it is your statement now that you have been accorded the fullest, the fairest, and the freest of expressions before this subcommittee throughout the hearings today?

Dr. WATSON. Except, perhaps, Congressman Starnes, for the fact that there has been a prosecuting attorney and no attorney for the defense.

Mr. STARNES. Well, that statement is incorrect, either because of your incapacity to appreciate the facts or your willful desire to distort the facts. There is no attorney present for this committee. It does not have a paid attorney at all. All we have is a small investigating staff and not a single attorney on the staff that I recall at the present time, and we have not had for several years. We have given you the fullest, the freest, and the widest latitude to express yourself and to make any explanation about any incident that has arisen before the committee, and I think you are perfectly willing to admit that you have been accorded that latitude without any form of restriction.

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. I want to ask you now if, in the light of your sworn testimony, it is not a fact that in the past you have publicly associated with or affiliated with known front organizations which are subversive in character and have been so denominated by the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Biddle, as well as this committee?

Dr. WATSON. I have been publicly associated in the sense in which you use the term with certain of these organizations for what seemed to be very good reasons.

Mr. STARNES. The committee is perfectly willing to accept your statement that you went in there with the best of reasons, but at the same time what we are asking you is, is it not a fact that, according

to your own sworn testimony, with the reasons that you have assigned yourself, you have been publicly associated or affiliated in the past with what are commonly denominated Communist fronts or subversive organizations and organizations that have been so denominated by the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Biddle, as well as the full committee? That is true, is it not, Dr. Watson?

Dr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And throughout the proceedings today in the committee room has been present the very distinguished and learned General Counsel of the Federal Communications Commission at all times?

Dr. WATSON. With no responsibility for my defense.

Mr. STARNES. I understand that; but he is an employee. Both you and Mr. Denny are employees of the Federal Communications Commission.

Dr. WATSON. As I understand it, Mr. Denny is here as an observer. We are both employees of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. STARNES. And he is here at the request, as I understand it, of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Fly. He is here at his request?

Dr. WATSON. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. And I think Mr. Denny will bear the Chair out in the statement that he has been accorded every courtesy and every consideration as a member of the Commission and given the widest and the freest latitude to listen and to hear everything that has gone on.

Mr. DENNY. I have been permitted to attend this hearing. You told me I was free to attend any other hearing involving an employee of the Commission. The Commission appreciates that. I appreciate the fact that you have made the record clear on the point that I do not appear as counsel for Mr. Watson. As a matter of fact, I have seen Mr. Watson just twice in my life before today, so I would not have him—

Mr. STARNES. I just want the record to state the facts, and there was an implication, of course, Doctor, in your last remarks which was a studied implication—I think it was prepared and brought here for that purpose—that Goebbels' propaganda machine was quoted as approving of the work of this committee.

Dr. WATSON. Last evening, since I received the summons, this came to my attention. It was not prepared. It has come up. It came up before, and I think you gentlemen know about it.

Mr. STARNES. Of course, you know also that the committee has been publicly attacked by the Hitler regime, and in this country by Fritz Kuhn personally, and by the official publication of the bund, the Weckruf und Beobachter, and, furthermore, by Walter Kappe, who was an agent of the German Government, and he attacked this committee for being very effective in opposing the activities of the German Socialist Party.

Dr. WATSON. It has never awakened any hostility on the radio, as far as I know; only approval.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This memorandum of Walter Kappe was published recently by the State Department in its book on National Socialism, and in that document this Special Committee on Un-American Activities is condemned as the one agency of the American Government that has interfered seriously with the activities of the bund.

Mr. STARNES. Of course you know, too, Doctor, that the statement which you read here, which is purportedly a broadcast of the Nazi propaganda machine, like all propaganda machines, resorts to distortion and to lies and to machinations et cetera, or else they would not be worth a continental as propaganda machines.

Is there anything else you would like to say, Doctor?

Dr. WATSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May I insert those exhibits?

Mr. STARNES. Yes. It was understood that all the exhibits to which reference has been made shall be attached to the testimony as exhibits.

(Document of American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was marked "Watson Exhibit 1.")

(Document of American Congress for Peace and Democracy was marked "Watson Exhibit 2.")

(Document of American Student Union was marked "Watson Exhibit 3.")

(Document concerning American Youth Congress was marked "Watson Exhibit 4.")

(Document of Conference on Pan American Democracy was marked "Watson Exhibit 5.")

(Document of Descendants of the American Revolution was marked "Watson Exhibit 6.")

(Document of International Workers Order was marked "Watson Exhibit 7.")

(Document of the League of American Writers was marked "Watson Exhibit 8.")

(Document of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy was marked "Watson Exhibit 9.")

(Document entitled "List of Signers of Statement Defending the Communist Party" was marked "Watson Exhibit 10.")

(Pamphlet entitled "New America" was marked "Watson Exhibit 11.")

(Document entitled "New America News" was marked "Watson Exhibit 12.")

(Article entitled "We Study the Soviet Union" was marked "Watson Exhibit 13.")

(Article entitled "The Great Choice. Reformation or Transformation?" was marked "Watson Exhibit 14.")

(Article entitled "Across Fascist Frontiers" was marked "Watson Exhibit 15.")

(Article entitled "Six Capitals" was marked "Watson Exhibit 16.")

(Article entitled "Promoting World Citizenship Through Social Relations" was marked "Watson Exhibit 17.")

(Letter of Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder, dated October 18, 1941, was marked "Watson Exhibit 18.")

Mr. STARNES. The committee stands adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

(At 3:45 p. m. the subcommittee adjourned until Friday, April 2, 1943, at 9:30 a. m.)



INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee convened at 9:30 a. m., Hon. Joe Starnes (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Hon. Joe Starnes, Hon. Noah M. Mason, and Hon. Karl E. Mundt.

Also present: J. B. Matthews, director of research, and Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator for the committee.

Also present: Messrs. Houghteling and Tietjens, Treasury Department.

Mr. STARNES. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Reporter, in the proceedings this morning, when you start let the record show that Mr. Houghteling, from the Treasury Department, who is in charge, as I understand, or Chief Administrator, of the office of which the witness is a member, and Mr. Tietjens, Assistant General Counsel for the Treasury Department, are present and observing the proceedings.

Let me say to the witness that the nature of this hearing is supplementary to the work of and is intended to assist Judge Kerr and his appropriations subcommittee in reaching a decision on the statements or allegations made by Mr. Dies on the floor a short time ago that a number of Federal employees either had been members of or were publicly affiliated with or publicly associated with what have been commonly denominated as front organizations of a subversive nature.

As I recall it, there was no particular charge or allegation that any of the people named were subversive themselves, but that they had been members of these organizations or had been publicly associated or affiliated with them, as I recall the language.

It is for that purpose that the committee now is in session, and after we ask you some preliminary questions, and Dr. Matthews, acting as a committee employee, has asked you some questions with reference to your affiliations, if you have an additional statement you wish to make you can do so; and in the propounding of questions to you, if you feel that an unequivocal yes or no answer might be embarrassing to you, let me assure you that it won't be. Please answer yes or no and then give whatever explanation immediately thereafter you want to explain why. It saves you from qualifying

your answer and appearing evasive. You know how it is when a witness is asked a question. When he makes an unequivocal answer to it and is not given an opportunity to defend himself, he wants to explain himself. We understand that.

Will you stand and be sworn?

(The witness, William Pickens, was sworn by Mr. Starnes.)

**TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM PICKENS, PRINCIPAL DEFENSE
SECURITIES SPECIALIST, TREASURY DEPARTMENT**

Mr. STARNES. I will ask you a few preliminary questions, and after that Dr. Matthews will take over the examination. Give us your full name and your address.

Mr. PICKENS. William Pickens. My office address is United States Treasury Department, War Savings Staff. My permanent address is New York City—I mean my voting address. I have a residence here in Washington.

Mr. STARNES. Give us your address in New York.

Mr. PICKENS. 260 West One Hundred and Thirty-ninth.

Mr. STARNES. You are a native-born American citizen?

Mr. PICKENS. I was born in South Carolina.

Mr. STARNES. Give us the date and place of your birth.

Mr. PICKENS. January 15, 1881.

Mr. STARNES. Will you give us your educational training and background?

Mr. PICKENS. Well, my first 10 years or so I was on the farms in South Carolina and Arkansas. Then I got my public school education in Arkansas. I graduated from the school in Little Rock. Then I went to Talladega College in Alabama. I finished there. I went to Yale University. Then I went back to Talladega and taught 10 years. I taught 1 year in Wiley College in Texas. Then I was dean and vice president of Morgan College in Baltimore. For 21 years after that I was working for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Now, for about 21 or 23 months, I have been working for the Treasury Department.

Mr. STARNES. That gives us a summary of your educational background and your professional and business experience. That covers it in brief?

Mr. PICKENS. In brief; yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. You hold degrees from what colleges?

Mr. PICKENS. From Talladega, from Yale, from Fiske, and Selma University—

Mr. STARNES. Give us the degrees.

Mr. PICKENS. A. B. from Talladega and Yale; A. M. from Fiske; Literary Doctor from Selma; and LL. D from Wiley College; and I have a little diploma from the British Esperanto Association.

Mr. STARNES. Have you ever engaged in any work other than teaching and your work for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People?

Mr. PICKENS. I never have since I got out of school. Of course, I was a worker before I went to school; worked my way through college and school.

Mr. STARNES. No embarrassing implications are meant by the next question, but it is one of routine that we always ask. You have never been arrested or convicted of a crime?

Mr. PICKENS. I never have been convicted, but I was arrested once in a serious auto accident in California, where all the other people were white people, and I was completely exonerated.

Mr. STARNES. All right. That is all I have to ask, Mr. Mason, do you care to ask anything preliminarily?

Mr. MASON. No.

Mr. STARNES. Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your title in your present position?

Mr. PICKENS. In my office I am Chief of the Inter-Racial Section of the National Organizations Division. Of course, the Treasury appointed me as Principal Defense Securities Specialist, but I am chief of the Inter-Racial Section.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On what date did you assume the duties of that position?

Mr. PICKENS. Of this office?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. PICKENS. I started working for the Treasury on the 15th of May 1941.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your salary in that position?

Mr. PICKENS. \$5,600.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has that been your salary since the assumption of your present duties?

Mr. PICKENS. Since the assumption of my duties.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you traveled abroad?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes, quite a number of times; five or six times. I forget which. About five times, at least.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Can you, from your recollection, give an outline of the dates and places visited?

Mr. PICKENS. In 1913 I went abroad for the first time as a tourist. I went to practically all the countries of Europe except Russia. We did not have to have passports to go anywhere except Russia and Turkey in those days, in 1913.

The next time I went abroad was a long time after that, in 1927, when the Friends, the Quakers, of England asked me to come and deliver some lectures in England. I delivered lectures in England. I went to Germany. I went to Russia. I came back through Warsaw, came back to England, delivered 30 more lectures, then I came back home.

The next time I think was 1929, when I went to Frankfort, an anti-imperialist congress. Then I went to Germany and lectured in Germany again. I spoke the German language. I went to England first because in England the non-Communist crowd wanted to get with our crowd, which was understood to be non-Communist, and make preliminaries for that meeting in Frankfort. Those people got together and some of us went over to Frankfort, and then I went on with my lectures, and I came back. That was in 1929.

When I left Frankfort I went to Germany, up to Hamburg, Berlin, and other places. I had been there before.

In 1932, I think was the next time, I went to Graz in Austria with the Study Tour. This is an American concern that was run out of

New York. It went to Graz and then to Vienna and through Prague—a Czechoslovakian city—and up into Germany again, in the German cities. I always felt very much at home in Germany, and I came back through France. I went through France and Geneva—the committees on the disarmament conference. I heard them discuss whether they would rather be shot with a 14-inch gun than a 16-inch gun.

Then I went to the Quakers' place and tried to teach them how to sing Negro spirituals. It is the only time I was ever a music teacher. I went through the States at that time also.

The next time was 1938. I went to Paris and some of my friends knew that there were colored boys in the Loyalist Army, and they asked me to go down to Spain. I could not get a passport. My passport was marked not good for Spain. I told them I could not go. They told me they would send me to the Medical Bureau, which sent medicines and ambulances. They said they could get me one. They could not get me a passport.

While I was in Paris the Ambassador's office called me up and said they had a cable from the State Department to O. K. me to Spain. I went down to Barcelona. The Italians were bombing it every 2 or 3 days. That was not comfortable, but very interesting.

I came back to Paris, went over to London, and naturally, having been down to Spain and having a lot of pictures of children's camps and one thing and another, I was of interest in the Scotland Yard crowd very much, but they O. K.'d me and passed me through because my passport was all regular and everything I had was regular, and I went back to the United States after visiting England a little bit.

MR. MATTHEWS. You mean Scotland Yard detained you?

MR. PICKENS. No. Whenever you come in they look at everybody's bag, but they were very much interested when they saw what I had in my bag. At that time in England it was hands off, but they were rather partial to the Franco crowd. They looked it over. Everything was O. K. I went to England and stayed as long as I pleased—it was about 2 weeks—and then I came back to the United States. I think that was the last trip.

MR. STARNES. 1938.

MR. MATTHEWS. In telling about your visit to Europe in 1929 you mentioned going to the Frankfort congress.

MR. PICKENS. Anti-imperialist Congress, they called it.

MR. MATTHEWS. In 1927 did you attend the same kind of congress in Brussels?

MR. PICKENS. No. The only time I was in Brussels was in 1913 in my life.

MR. MATTHEWS. Did you attend a congress anywhere else in Europe in 1927, of the same sort?

MR. PICKENS. No. I spoke in Berlin, in the Herren House—thousands of Germans. I suppose they wanted to hear what kind of German I spoke. I spoke in Berlin and I spoke in Warsaw to the teachers who could speak English. They turned out a good many of them. They said they could speak English. It was not very much English to me.

You know, the Quakers, for whom I was speaking in England, had their men to meet me in Berlin. They had their men to meet me in Warsaw. They had their men to meet me in Moscow. There were

two girls, one English girl and one American girl, who would look after everybody sent there. The Quakers were the only tolerated religion in Russia, and they were the people who were looking after me.

One of the gentlemen I met was Trotsky. Someone murdered him. He was very interesting. I met him at that time, the only time I met him, but he was a very interesting man to talk to.

Mr. STARNES. He spoke English, did he, Dean?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; he spoke English. His English was not as good as yours or mine, but it was pretty good. He had been in the United States, as I understood, and Mr. Stalin was just coming into full works at that time, in 1927.

I had the usual tourist trip, and quite a good trip. I enjoyed it immensely. Lenin had been dead for 3 years, but it looked like he had been asleep. I visited at the Kremlin out there. They showed me all around. I went back to England and delivered 30 more lectures and came back to the States.

(There was a discussion off the record.)

Mr. PICKENS. I saw the old things of the czars and the things that the Queen of England and rulers away back had sent there. Some of our American people had sent in silverware and gold, and it was very wonderful. They showed me around a good deal. There was not any reason for not doing so. They were very cordial to me. I came back. They were always cordial to me, but I could never agree with them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever hear of the Congress of the League Against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism?

Mr. PICKENS. I heard of it, but I never remembered it until I read it again, frankly, in the Congressional Record. I had forgotten about that. You are talking about the one held in Brussels?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. PICKENS. I was speaking in England. People there were interested. I had heard of it at the time, but it had entirely gone out of my mind until I read it in the Congressional Record, and someone thought I had been there. I did not go. I did not have any particular interest in it at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know at the time, or subsequently when you read it in the Congressional Record, that you had been advertised as one of the delegates to the congress?

Mr. PICKENS. No. I was speaking in England, and a lot of people knew me. I have been a speaker all my life, not before I went to Yale, but since I left Yale. Someone might have added a title as a delegate. They did that many times with me, more times than that. They did not take pains to reckon with me. I did not know I was advertised as one of the delegates.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Roger Baldwin?

Mr. PICKENS. I have been knowing him quite well, quite well for many years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Baldwin ever say anything about attending the Brussels conference?

Mr. PICKENS. No. I was in England and the other places at the time it was going on. Roger Baldwin may have known about it. He did not have a chance to say anything to me about it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Manuel Gomez?

Mr. PICKENS. That is a name I have heard, I am sure, but I am sure I never knew him. I don't know whether I ever met him. I might have. I meet so many people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For your information, I will show you a photostatic copy of the Daily Worker for March 9, 1927, which lists you as one of the four American delegates to the First Congress of the League Against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism, held in Brussels in February of 1927.

Mr. PICKENS. I see. Well, they took that for granted, but I was not there. I came back to the United States. Yes, I see that. That is the first time I have seen that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the date of your visit to Europe in 1927?

Mr. PICKENS. Well, I went in the fall, about the last of November or the first of December.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of 1926 or 1927?

Mr. PICKENS. 1926, and then stayed through Christmas. I was in Germany—I was in Russia. The Christmas season the Quakers cut me out of their lecturing program. I went on this other jaunt and came back. Then some time in February, I think, I sailed back to the United States; that is, of course, just guessing. I stayed about 2 months or a little more abroad. I came back when they wrote this. I was either back in the United States or on the way back when that appeared in the Daily Worker. I never read the Daily Worker, only when it had things about me several times that people brought to me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not mean that you never read the Daily Worker?

Mr. PICKENS. I do not mean that I never read a single issue. I was not a subscriber regularly. I did not read it regularly. That is true of many papers that are not in the class of the Daily Worker.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you happen to recall where you were in the first week of February 1927?

Mr. PICKENS. I am sure I could not now. I do not know whether there is anything in my records anywhere that would show me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe it is your testimony that until you read about this particular congress in the Congressional Record, you had no recollection of having been apprised of the fact that you were advertised as having been there?

Mr. PICKENS. No; not at all. I do not remember anybody having—somebody might have—apprised me of the fact that I had been.

Mr. MASON. This was the trip after you spent the Christmas season up in Russia?

Mr. PICKENS. And Germany.

Mr. MASON. But you came back to England and delivered 30 more lectures?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. Those lectures would have to be delivered from the early part of January after you came back?

Mr. PICKENS. Not too early in January, because I think it was along the last part of January before I got back to England. I am not certain of that.

Mr. MASON. Then, if it was along toward the last of January that you came back to England and you delivered 30 lectures after that before coming back to America, that would mean that you would have to spend at least 20 days or so in England?

Mr. PICKENS. Just about a month.

Mr. MASON. And that would carry you into at least the middle of February, if not toward the latter end of February?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes.

Mr. MASON. So, according to that, he would be scheduled to deliver this series of lectures at least during the first 2 weeks of February; maybe the first 3 weeks.

Mr. PICKENS. I think it must have been about the first 3 weeks, because I did not get back to England until the latter part of January.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you sail directly from England back to the United States?

Mr. PICKENS. Back to the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not go back to the Continent?

Mr. PICKENS. Not at all. I had no further visits in the Continent.

Mr. STARNES. What does that Daily Worker purport to show, Doctor?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker gives a list of the delegates ostensibly sent to Brussels in the delegation from the United States. Four persons are named, William Pickens as representing the John Brown Memorial Association, and also the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Richard Moore as representing the American Negro Labor Congress; Roger Baldwin as representing the National Urban League; and Manuel Gomez as representing the Communist Party and also the All America Anti-Imperialist League.

Mr. MASON. When was this conference or congress held?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This congress was held the first week in February of 1927.

Mr. MASON. The first week in February?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. MASON. Now, if his lecture period covered that first week in February as according to the testimony it did, it would be impossible for him to have attended that, and I imagine that that lecture course could be checked up.

Mr. PICKENS. Oh, yes. John Fletcher, who arranged it, I think is still living in England, unless he got bombed, but the Quakers may remember that.

Mr. STARNES. Did you represent this John Brown Society?

Mr. PICKENS. This John Brown Memorial Association—I had almost forgotten that—was organized by a colored man in Philadelphia. What they did was every year have a pilgrimage up to John Brown's place up there in New York. I never had the privilege of going with them, but he is a man that has been knowing me practically all of my life.

Mr. STARNES. Were you a member of the association or affiliated with it in any way?

Mr. PICKENS. I was a member of the John Brown Memorial Association.

Mr. STARNES. At that particular time in 1926 and 1927 you were also working for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. This was just a side issue. It was one of the things that one of our friends was doing. We were not averse at all. The John Brown Memorial Association is something that amounted to nothing.

Mr. STARNES. Your main employment at that time was with the national association?

Mr. PICKENS. Since 1920 until I started with the Treasury I was working as a full-time, all-time officer for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you any further explanation as to why your name was placed among the list of delegates?

Mr. PICKENS. No. I went to Arthur Garfield Hays once—you know him—and these fellows had used my name in another connection. I went to him. I was going to sue. He said, "You will win the suit, but you will win and hurt them. What they will say is, the capitalists and others are putting you to it. They will find that is the date on which they wrote the lie, and they don't own anything."

That was Arthur Garfield Hays. That was his advice—not this particular thing, because I did not know it was in there, and I would not have sued them if I had known it. I would have just ignored it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you came back to the United States in 1927 were you publicly affiliated with or associated with an organization known as the Hands Off China Conference?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. I want to tell you about that. That is quite interesting. The little organization did not last but a few months, I guess. They dropped me and Chiang Kai-shek. I was a speaker. Some young people came to my office, I think. I think the only time they came they brought two or three Chinese in New York. They said here were these people to start a people's movement. They had heard me make speeches about this. They asked me if I would not serve as their chairman. These were young people. They did not say they were Communists. I never heard the word "Communists" applied to them until I read that in the Congressional Record. They may have been. I am not denying that they were, because I don't know, but they told me they were interested in Chiang Kai-shek. They were talking about smashing Chiang Kai-shek's movement. I told them they could use my name. In a few months the thing broke up and they dropped me and Chiang Kai-shek.

I went to Frankfort, and I found out the reason they ran out on me. The Communists had been fighting Chiang Kai-shek. I never knew him. I had never met him.

The chairman for the young people of this committee for Hands Off China, I never met them a single time. They came to my office whenever they wanted to talk to me about anything in the N. A. C. P.

At one time they brought a cable to me from a man by the name of Earl Browder. I never had heard of him or met him. I never met him until years after that in that anti-war conference. That was the first time I ever met Earl Browder. They brought me a cablegram from him asking me for funds. I said, "Who is he?" He was an American in China. Later on I found out that he was a representative

of the Daily Worker. He was interested in Chiang Kai-shek, but I never met him until 1933, I think, when we had the anti-war congress, but I did not know who he was at that time. I think that was in 1926 or 1927, somewhere along there, when we were having the hands-off-China business.

Mr. STARNES. Was that about the same period of time that Earl Browder testified before our committee that he went to China on a mission, Doctor?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the same period.

Mr. PICKENS. He was there, because he sent a cable or something asking for funds. Naturally, they had sent my name.

Mr. STARNES. Earl Browder sent you a cable from China?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. Evidently it came to the Daily Worker, and they evidently sent it over by these young people to me. It meant nothing to me. I did not know who Earl Browder was. I did not know he was a Communist. I do not know that it would have mattered if he was. He was interested in Chiang Kai-shek and so was I.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who were those young people?

Mr. PICKENS. I would not remember their names. Maybe somewhere in my files I would find them, but they were some young people. They were people who were interested in these movements, and they never mentioned the word "communism" to me, not once. They never mentioned that word.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe you stated, if I understood you correctly, that you met them only in your office?

Mr. PICKENS. That is the only place I met them. I don't remember speaking for them. I may have. I don't think I did, because I don't remember they had any public meetings at all, but in my office is the only place I can recall. It is something I never tried to remember, but in my office is the only place I can recall seeing them, when they came to bring their reports and talk to me about it, and that wasn't many times.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On or about March 16, 1927, do you recall having been present at a meeting at the Labor Temple where the Hands Off China conference organized itself?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I do not recall that. I may have been there. No; because when they brought it to me—did they organize after they asked me to serve? I don't remember that. I have spoken at the Labor Temple a number of times to groups. Our work with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was not a political work. We had a social program and our work was the work on the race line. When people ask us to speak, we never ask them their politics. I may have been at this meeting. I don't recall, because I have spoken a number of times there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have a suggestion to make: That if the witness will please abbreviate his answers—we have a great deal of material to cover—it will expedite matters.

Mr. PICKENS. Thank you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Unless the matter is particularly relevant to the point.

Mr. PICKENS. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the Daily Worker of March 17, 1927, the Hands Off China conference organized itself at a public meeting

at the Labor Temple at Fourteenth Street and Second Avenue, and the Daily Worker account reads, in part, as follows:

Last night's conference chose William Pickens as temporary chairman, and he was later made permanent chairman, with Patrick McClellan as vice chairman, and Vivian Wilkinson, secretary.

Does that refresh your recollection as to whether or not you were there?

Mr. PICKENS. No; it does not make me recall being there. They could have done that without my being there. Those young people that had spoken to me—I had to go out of town often.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall either one of these names: Patrick McClellan or Vivian Wilkinson?

Mr. PICKENS. I do not. You understand my position. So many people I have met and I have been to 10,000 meetings and engagements, and I don't remember either one of them, but I could not say that I did not meet them sometime and know them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Further on in the account of this meeting as it appears in the Daily Worker there appears the following:

Chairman Pickens in his opening address told how when he was in Russia recently he had met 25 of the Chinese generals who were fired with indignation as they told him of the fight of China against its foreign exploiters.

Mr. PICKENS. I may have done that. I may have spoken of it. I remember meeting the Chinese generals in Russia, when they were showing me everything. There were 25 generals of General Chiang's army there. That was a sight to see, but they did not tell me anything, because they spoke Chinese and I spoke English.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does that paragraph refresh your recollection as to your presence at this conference?

Mr. PICKENS. I am telling you those things were not part of my regular work, and it has been 14 and 15 years, and I would not recall being there, because it was not important to me. It was not anything that was part of my regular work. A good many things I can remember, but out of 10,000 occasions, I would not remember that, but if the evidence is there, perhaps I was there, but I would not know it because I told you I never read the Daily Worker. I never bothered about their reports.

Mr. STARNES. But you do remember the incident about the Chinese generals?

Mr. PICKENS. Oh, yes. I met them in Moscow.

Mr. STARNES. You do remember the incident of the young people coming to you and interesting you in the Hands Off China movement?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And you do remember the fact that there was a telegram presented you from Earl Browder asking for funds to aid Chiang Kai-shek?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. If that account appears there, while you may not have any independent recollection about it now, you are not prepared to say that that meeting was not held and that you did not preside as either permanent or temporary chairman. It is just one of the incidents that you do not have fixed in your mind?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; I do not have it in mind. I doubt that I presided there. They may have listed me as something there because we were interested in the Hands Off China movement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker account says that the other speakers were William F. Dunne and Bertram D. Wolfe.

Mr. PICKENS. I do not remember them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you remember that William F. Dunne and Bertram D. Wolfe were two of the outstanding leaders of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I never knew their politics.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that Dunne still is, as a matter of fact?

Mr. PICKENS. I suppose he is. I have known of him, of course. Anybody in New York would.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not recall at this time that Patrick McClellan and Vivian Wilkinson were also publicly identified as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I do not recall. I do not recall them, in fact. I do not recall the two people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In addition to being chairman of the Hands Off China conference, do you recall whether or not you were a member of the general advisory committee of the organization?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I do not. You know, sometimes they use your name in places where they did not give you a chance—the general advisory committee? I do not remember that they had one. If they put me on it, I don't remember if I ever met it. They could have put me on it. If you are working with them, they take liberties with your name and use it. I don't know that I would have objected if they did, because I was interested in the Hands Off China. I would not have objected if they wanted to put me on some advisory committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Richard E. Moore?

Mr. PICKENS. I have been knowing him for a number of years. Every colored person in New York knows him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are aware of the fact that Moore is a publicly professed Communist?

Mr. PICKENS. I think so. We always took that for granted. I can't say that he was publicly professed. I never asked him. But we always took it for granted that he was a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For the record, Mr. Chairman, I understand that Richard E. Moore has been a functionary of the Communist Party publicly. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. PICKENS. Oh, yes.

Mr. STARNES. Just like you took it for granted that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Farley were Democrats, even though you never heard them say so.

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. From his activities we always took it for granted that Mr. Moore was an open member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you any doubt in your mind as to whether or not the Hands Off China conference was a Communist organization?

Mr. PICKENS. I never really even heard that. In those times there were not supposed to be more than 10 or 11 Communists in the United States and nobody was afraid of them. If they were interested in something we were interested in, we did not fear them. These young people of the Hands Off China might not have been. They may have been of the same party I was, which was the Republican Party at that time, though I never questioned it at all and I never had any idea they were members of the Communist Party. I knew they were

radical and were interested in radical things, but I was not interested in that. They knew what I was interested in.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Inasmuch as these same individuals who invited you to become chairman of this organization subsequently brought you a telegram from Earl Browder, you are not satisfied—

Mr. PICKENS. I am satisfied now, but then I did not know Earl Browder.

I knew that it was an American name, because it came out of China. Earl Browder would not be Chinese. They did not mention that he was a Communist, but he was working for Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make any speeches for the Hands Off China movement or organization outside of the city of New York?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I don't remember ever speaking for the Hands Off China. In my speeches, my many speeches in many places, I might have mentioned this China business. I don't remember making any speeches. They could not pay my way. If I was going somewhere and met a group, I might have told them that I was interested in Hands Off China; let China have its revolution as we had ours.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not, on or about March 26, 1927, you delivered a speech for the Hands Off China movement in Philadelphia?

Mr. PICKENS. In Philadelphia? No; I don't recall. I may have, but I don't recall it. As I say, in my work and going, I might have spoken for them somewhere.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the Daily Worker of March 26, 1927, and again according to the Daily Worker of March 31, 1927, you were one of the principal speakers for a Hands Off China street demonstration in Philadelphia.

Mr. PICKENS. That might be just like the Brussels thing. I don't recall having any street demonstration or speaking in Philadelphia. I have spoken on streets in New York sometimes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was a parade which ended up down in one of the Philadelphia parks.

Mr. PICKENS. It seems to me I ought to remember that if there was a parade, but I don't remember that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the account of the demonstration in the Daily Worker of March 31, 1927, on page 5, we find the following:

The last speaker, William Pickens, field secretary of the Association for the Advancement of Colored People, spoke of the growing restiveness of the oppressed colonial peoples of the world and their growing determination to throw off the yoke of world imperialism.

Mr. PICKENS. You know, that is interesting. What I mean, that is their language, you know, and not mine. I don't recall that occasion. I don't even remember speaking.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The other three principal speakers named here are Albert Weisbord—

Mr. PICKENS. I remember Weisbord. I met him several times.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether you met him on or about this time?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I can't possibly do that; but I have met Weisbord. I knew him in New York, and if I was in Philadelphia and they were having a meeting—

Mr. MATTHEWS. You recall that Weisbord was one of the prominent leaders of the Communist Party?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I never heard that, but I would not doubt it, if you want to say that; but I did not know then and really don't know now that he was a Communist leader. I knew that he was radical and interested in certain things that I was interested in. I remember Weisbord.

Mr. STARNES. You remember him and you do remember having probably spoken with him at places in times past?

Mr. PICKENS. If I spoke with him at this place, I can't recall another place where I spoke with him. You see, I traveled all over the United States, from San Diego and Seattle to Boston and Maine. If we happened to be together and were interested in the same thing at the same time, I would not have refused to speak for the thing I was interested in.

Mr. STARNES. I understand, but what I was trying to fix in mind, Dean, since you said you recall you knew this man, was if you could not recall whether at some place or some places you had probably spoken with him from the same platform.

Mr. PICKENS. I do not doubt it; perhaps in New York City. I would not have remembered this Philadelphia thing. That is the first time that it has occurred to me since I was there, if I was there, but doubtless in New York or somewhere I was interested in this thing, because I talked with so many people. For all the cases you have down there I could put down there 300 others; but not with the radicals, but with the conservative ones, with the colleges and universities of this country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The public record shows that Albert Weisbord was a prominent leader of the Communist Party at this time, that he was subsequently expelled by the Communist Party and organized his own organization, his own Communist faction, known as the Weisbordites, somewhat in the same manner as Lovestone and his expulsion and the Lovestonites.

Mr. PICKENS. I did not know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The other two speakers besides Weisbord and Pickens who are listed here were Irving Green, representing the Young Communists League, and Alex Bail, who was secretary of the Communist Party in Philadelphia. Do you recall either Irving Green or Alex Bail?

Mr. PICKENS. No. I did not know those people well, just like any other people—I spoke on the platform with other people. I would not know them if I saw them. But that is interesting. I have spoken so many places, so much and so many times. These cases were just friends of my activity. My main activity was 250 to 300 meetings a year for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. We were asking these people to do things for us all the time. When they asked us, we did what we could.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you publicly affiliated with or associated with the All America Anti-Imperialist League? Will you say yes or not?

Mr. PICKENS. I do not recall, but the All America Anti-Imperialist League was the blueprint doubtless prepared for us to go to the Anti-Imperialist League in Frankfort, and it seems to me they had a dinner when we were getting up our delegation, and I remember being present at that dinner and being one of the speakers, but it had nothing to do with Communists. There was Roger Baldwin and other non-

Communists. I don't remember where I was, but I remember speaking.

Mr. STARNES. Your answer would be that you had been publicly affiliated or associated with the organization?

Mr. PICKENS. I suppose that is the name of it, but it was the non-Communist crowd and the other people who were gathering the delegation to go to Frankfort for the Anti-Imperialist delegation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On the letterhead of the All America Anti-Imperialist League, which is a letterhead dated April 11, 1928, and signed by Manuel Gomez, there is listed the national committee of the organization, on which your name appears.

Mr. PICKENS. I suppose so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a member of the national committee of the All America Anti-Imperialist League?

Mr. PICKENS. According to that record. I have never had any of their correspondence, and I suppose they wrote me. I was one of the delegates to Frankfort. I suppose I did not object.

Mr. STARNES. They probably wrote you that they wanted you to serve on their board.

Mr. PICKENS. Very likely. Sometimes they did things like that. Sometimes they took it for granted. I will say frankly that probably I would not have objected.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are overlooking the fact that this letter is dated a year and a half prior to the Frankfort conference, so there probably is no connection.

Mr. PICKENS. Well, I don't know. I am saying that the thing that I belonged to—I expect because I was going to the Frankfort conference was the reason that they put me on there. It may have been that they were organizing their forces for the Frankfort conference. I would not know, when I do not know the date of the letter or the date of the letterhead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you mean to imply that the preparations for the Frankfort conference were being carried on a year and a half ahead of the conference?

Mr. PICKENS. I do not mean to say that, because I do not know. I would not know. If that is a year and a half before, I had been to England and Germany and Spain, and this other conference must have been in preparation for a long time, because it was a mighty big thing. So I don't know, but it would not surprise me if they had that in mind. Anyhow, the Anti-Imperialist League, American, would be something that I would not have any objection belonging to. Communism is what I am driving at. Some of them may have been Communists. They were not to me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said you might not have objected to belonging to this All America Anti-Imperialist League?

Mr. PICKENS. I said that. All America Anti-Imperialist League did not appear to disturb my Republican politics or Democratic politics, as it is now, not at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you were apprised of the fact that the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, has recently held that Harry Bridges is deportable because he was affiliated with the All America Anti-Imperialist League, would that change your opinion?

Mr. PICKENS. You know, I did not know that the Attorney General had designated it, because it has been years since I was connected

with it. I mean, I did not know that until I read it in the Congressional Record, but it is interesting and I wouldn't be surprised. That is one of the reasons.

Of course, you know we are not discussing Harry Bridges, but I have, in my American feeling, had sympathy with him since the whole thing started. I never have met him or known him, but that is another matter.

If the Attorney General had told us back there 14 years ago that this was a Communist front—but no Attorney General said anything about that then, and I have not been affiliated with it since that time—that is true; I do not doubt that the Attorney General knows what he is talking about.

Mr. MASON. Summing that whole thing up, Mr. Matthews, you would have to say that Mr. Pickens has acknowledged that he was a member of or closely affiliated with it and was on their letterhead, but that at that time he did not realize or know that it was a Communist front organization, which we, of course, have developed it has been. I suppose that is a correct summary of this?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I think you might add to that, Congressman, that practically all of the prominent Communists, from William Z. Foster down, also appear on this national committee of the organization, and it is my recollection as of that time that anyone who was slightly—

Mr. PICKENS. I knew Foster was a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS (continuing). Anyone who was slightly acquainted with the Communist movement would have every reason to know that this was not a Communist front, but an auxiliary, an adjunct of the Communist Party.

Mr. PICKENS. You say that now, but at that time there was no sort of feeling. Those people never asked us to become Communists. They had nothing to do with it. They put these things out as general organizations.

Doubtless you will come to it, so I will say it now. When it was first organized, the International Labor Defense put itself out as labor defense and they invited me to become a member. I became a member. When I attended two or maybe one session and found out that they were radicals, I never went to another, but they did not organize themselves as Communist front or a Communist organization. They would have frightened us all out. William Z. Foster was running on his ticket. He was running on his ticket, but it was not anything connected with politics that interested us in becoming a member of that committee.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Pickens, in all fairness to you and in all fairness to the Congress and to those who have made these allegations, you will have to agree that any man with intelligence and training and Harvard degrees—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yale.

Mr. MASON. Yale degrees—

Mr. PICKENS. Do not insult Harvard.

Mr. MASON (continuing). Should have recognized the company that he was getting into, even at that date, and should have avoided, shall we say, the suspicion or condemnation that birds of a feather flock together. That is really the sum and substance of this whole case.

Mr. PICKENS. Yes, I understand. What you say is doubtless true,

but you must remember that I had no reason or no motive to run from anybody at that time. I am trying to explain to you that my motives and interests were not in the Communist Party, and they never even took it that way. They never even imposed on me by inviting me to become a Communist. In fact, they knew I would not have if they did.

Mr. STARNES. Proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Among the other prominent Communist leaders who ran this rather small committee of the All America Anti-Imperialist League were Charlotte Anita Whitney, of California; Scott Nearing, who at that time was a member of the party; Robert W. Dunn, Albert Weisbord, Ben Gold, Max Schachtman, Harry Gannes—

Mr. PICKENS. Who is that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Harry Gannes, now deceased, formerly editor for the Daily Worker—William F. Dunne, and some others.

Mr. STARNES. What is your next exhibit?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have stated you were publicly affiliated with the International Labor Defense, a moment ago.

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. When they were organized, under my definite question they said there is no politics and it is not a Communist organization, and I was working with an organization that was dealing with labor defense, and here was a great organization that the people wanted me to join. I joined it. I ran out. My case did not run with them. I saw they were radicals when I met them. I guess my name was on their letterhead somewhere, but I never bothered with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On the letterhead of the International Labor Defense, which contains a letter dated February 18, 1929, signed by Alfred Wagenknecht, there appears a list of the national committee of the organization, on which committee your name is found.

Mr. PICKENS. Yes, as I say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a member of the national committee of the International Labor Defense?

Mr. PICKENS. At that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The national officers listed on this letterhead were Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. You know she is one of the outstanding Communist Party members?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; and I helped vote her out of the American Civil Liberties Union because she was a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Edward C. Wentworth, vice chairman. Did you know Wentworth?

Mr. PICKENS. I may have remembered him. I may have known him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was identified publicly as a Communist. Alfred Wagenknecht, who was a charter member of the Communist Party of this country.

Mr. PICKENS. Of course, I would not know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And has been State secretary of the Communist Party in Missouri and elsewhere.

Norman H. Tallentire. Do you recall him?

Mr. PICKENS. No. There are all sorts of names there I would not remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Norman H. Tallentire was one of the Bridgman, Mich., defendants in the early days of communism. He was listed as assistant secretary of the International Labor Defense.

Karl Reeve, son of Mother Bloor, who has been a Communist for some 20 years.

Here are 5 officers listed here, all of whom at the time were prominent Communist leaders in the United States.

I want to know on what basis you deduced it was not a Communist organization.

Mr. PICKENS. I found out that the I. L. D. was a Communist organization by observation. I found out that they were radicals. I did not ask them if they were Communists. I dropped out. I never went to a third meeting. I don't think I went to a second, but I never went to a third.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know that in 1929, the date under consideration at the present time, the International Labor Defense was an affiliate of the International Red Aid, with its headquarters in Moscow?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I would not know that, because I was not interested.

Mr. STARNES. That is the testimony, as I recall it, of Mr. Browder and some of the other witnesses.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On this national committee, Mr. Chairman, with only two or three exceptions out of some 50 names, the persons were prominently identified as Communist leaders in this country.

Mr. PICKENS. At the time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. Earl Browder. William Z. Foster. Paul Crouch. Did you know Paul Crouch?

Mr. PICKENS. I do not remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Paul Crouch was convicted and received a 40-year sentence for engaging in Communist activities in the United States Army in Hawaii. He was released. He served about 3 years of his term, but this connection with the I. L. D. was after his release from prison.

Mr. PICKENS. In those cases where they have my name and a few other non-Communists, it may be that not 1 out of 10 of them—non-Communists and all—I never did meet. In our work for the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, if someone wanted to give us a chance to spread our propaganda out, we generally took it, with no criminal intent. This was not a crime.

On my own test for them, when I met them a time or two I found they were too radical for me, not for the association, and I dropped out. I did not put my name there. They put it there. Maybe I wouldn't object. On a list where a good many of them were Communists, and it was not anything to me—it did not matter to me, because I did not know them, had not met them, and was not interested in their party politics—we were interested in our program of Negro-white.

Mr. STARNES. You were perfectly willing to use the Communist Party if they were working along the same lines as you were working?

Mr. PICKENS. No. If they had said "Communist Party" I would have run out on them. I never joined in with the Communist Party at any time, but an organization like this, which had Communists, could have had objectives like ours. I suppose some of them were members of the N. A. C. R.

Mr. STARNES. Your job was to carry on the job of your own organization, and if one of these Communist front organizations had a similar

objective in its program, you would join up with them and had no objection?

Mr. PICKENS. Exactly, but not because of their communism. We were continually asking them, and they were white people, and ours was a black-white relationship. It was not a political—Communist, Democrat, or Republican—and here was a group of white people, and we had by experience as much trouble with the poor whites and the radical whites as we had with anybody. So we never objected to meeting them or saying a word. It was our program that was put up, but I never in my life made a speech for communism or wrote a word in favor of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you dropped out of the International Labor Defense did you give a written resignation?

Mr. PICKENS. No, I did not. I just dropped out and did not go any more. In fact, they never quite accepted me. I could see that. They wanted me in, but they never trusted me with their program, because they knew I was not of that kind.

Mr. STARNES. You make a proffer of all these exhibits that you are referring to in Dean Picken's testimony, and they can be attached at the end of the testimony, so it does not break the continuity of his testimony.

Mr. PICKENS. When I say I did not send a written resignation, it is because I don't remember sending one. Somebody might find one. Why should I say I am not coming any more, when I found out it was communism? I just dropped out. There was no reason.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a delegate of the Frankfort League Against Imperialism? You testified to that?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; with the non-Communist group.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was in July 1929.

Mr. PICKENS. I think it was in July.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you meet James Ford?

Mr. PICKENS. I saw Ford there, James Maxton, and several other American Negro Communists. All of them were not Communists. There weren't but three or four there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make a speech there?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are satisfied that it was under Communist control?

Mr. PICKENS. We were trying to keep it from under Communist control, but we were outdone.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are satisfied it was under Communist control?

Mr. PICKENS. The Communists took it. That is the way I saw it. I may have been too innocent about it. We met in England. We arranged with non-Communists and tried to keep it from being absolutely Communist. They outdid us, because the people did not come. The second party in Germany was Communist at that time.

I want to tell you something about that congress, if you want to know.

Mr. STARNES. Well, we have had testimony about that before from one of the leading Communists. We know that it was, as you have here stated so well, completely dominated by the Communist Party.

Mr. PICKENS. Before we left, and I wrote a report on it when I came back and stated the fact and said how we non-Communists were

outmaneuvered in a certain way and how they tried to keep me from speaking. I spoke in German. Fifteen thousand Germans threatened to tear the place apart unless they let me finish my speech. They did not regard me as a Communist. The people knew that the other Negroes were in the Communist Party. They took me along to show that all the Negroes were not Communists. When they stepped in, the audience did not know what they were talking about. I found out what they were going to do, and I started out in German. The Russians got excited and tried to ring me down after I had spent 7 minutes. The Germans would not let them, and made them let me speak my 45 minutes. Of course, the Communists outmaneuvered us and beat us out.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Since you have brought in the name of James Maxton—

Mr. PICKENS. He was with the Independent Labor Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From what you know of Maxton's views, would you say he was a Communist with a little "c"?

Mr. PICKENS. I knew he was very radical, and Maxton, and Baldwin, and myself, and others, and some people from India were not Communists. All of them were given a raw deal at this congress. Anti-Imperialist was not something that belonged to the Communists then. We were all interested in it. There were 150,000,000 Negroes in Africa, which made me dreadfully interested in it. They counted it and got out of it, and left it alone after that. I do not know whether they had another meeting.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did that cure you of all affiliations with Communists subsequently?

Mr. PICKENS. You say "all affiliations with Communists." I knew some of the Communist people. You know, you have in your record that I spoke once. You said I was a lecturer at the workers school. I never was a lecturer at the school, but I spoke once there on our problem, after many invitations, and they were just a half block from my office at one time.

You said "affiliations." That was a general word. There were people I knew who were Communists who were very human people. If they met me or wanted to talk to me, there were many things that we wanted to have in common. It is certainly fastened in my mind, the idea that I could never join the Communist Party, but in many things I could work toward an objective, toward justice for races and a fairer deal for the people who work; but I found plenty of Republicans and Democrats who agree with that, and I never wanted to become a Communist for those purposes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you mean that if you should find some small segment of agreement with the German-American Bund you would not hesitate to work with the German-American Bund on that theory?

Mr. PICKENS. No. That is what you say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am asking you the question.

Mr. PICKENS. No, because there is so much, just like there is so much in the Communist Party, that I can't agree with, that I can't ever become a Communist. I have never known the German-American Bund. They would not let me get as close to them as the Communists did. There is so much that I disagree with that I don't see how I could make any movement toward them, even if I did.

If they said, for example, which they won't say, that "We do not believe in giving the colored people a raw deal," I would certainly say they are right, but that would not let me join the bund. I said the Communists were right in this, that, or the other, which you doubtless have said.

Mr. STARNES. You and Mr. Matthews, as we will find out, worked together in some of these organizations. We will get to that later.

Mr. PICKENS. We were together, but we did not stay together. I pulled out of the infernal thing when I found out the Communists were in it. Mr. Matthews stayed in it. We had great respect for him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For the accuracy of the record, I would like to refresh the witness' recollection: I resigned from the American League Against War and Fascism 24 hours before he did.

Mr. PICKENS. You did?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is a matter of public record.

Mr. PICKENS. That is interesting.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you announced that you resigned because I did.

Mr. PICKENS. Well, that is interesting, because I had forgotten that.

Mr. STARNES. Let us go along with the examination.

Mr. PICKENS. Not only because you did, but because Mary Fox and others did. I went in with them, studied the way they acted at Frankfort. They acted as Communists. I went out when they told me what was happening.

Mr. STARNES. Let us go on with the record.

Mr. MASON. As a Government employee, you are not as free to join suspect organizations as you were at that time.

Mr. PICKENS. Exactly.

Mr. MASON. And you would be at least a great deal more circumspect about permitting your name on letterheads as the sponsor, and so forth?

Mr. PICKENS. Exactly.

Mr. MASON. Of every type of organization, without a mighty careful examination before that was permitted?

Mr. PICKENS. Exactly. For example, I belonged to the Civil Liberties Union, which has some of the most wonderful people I know, some of the most wonderful Americans I have known, like Neilson Smith and John Holmes, and at my suggestion they dropped my name from their national committee list because I am working for the Government; but all this time I had no checks that went on any other American for not taking part in these things, only the one thing.

The first time I registered I was a Democrat. Then I was a Republican. I voted for Bryan, and then later I became a Republican, and for the last 8 or 10 years I have been in the Democratic Party again. It is just a statement of fact. No other party has interested me, because these seem to be American parties.

I had to tell those people there in Frankfort. The Frankfort Zeitung, the editors and the writers were there when I made the speech. They invited me to come down to the office. They wanted to know how I made a speech. It was a conservative paper then. I said I just feel that way. I came here with the non-Communists, because we were trying to counteract some of these, and they wrote it up. There is just the situation.

I beg your pardon, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wanted to ask the witness a question.

You made the statement that you would join anybody, without any qualification, if you found that you had some point of agreement. I was going to ask you if that would include the Nazi groups.

Mr. PICKENS. I did not say that I would join anybody if we had a point of agreement, because I have not met anybody that was so bad that we could not agree on anything. I would not join the Nazi Party and I would not join the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am asking you about the Communist organizations such as the International Labor Defense.

Mr. PICKENS. This is not a quibble. I did not join them as Communist Party organizations. They had at least took the position that they were taking me in it because they were not going to be a party organization, because it was an open organization, nonpartisan. That's the word they used in the International Labor organization—"We have a nonpartisan organization. You are trying to defend black laborers. This is to defend labor everywhere."

I went to a couple of their meetings. There were just 4 or 5 or 16 people at the time I went there. I remember going once, but I will make it two times, just to be sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you publicly affiliated with the Prisoners Relief Fund?

Mr. PICKENS. No. I might have been, but I don't recall. They brought these things around to us—could I explain that?

Mr. STARNES. Yes. Make it as brief as you can.

Mr. PICKENS. Exactly. They showed those fellows behind the bars. When they come to us they show a black fellow behind the bars. "Here is a prisoners' relief organization. Won't you sponsor that?" Of course, as good Americans, we would. They did not say, "We are a Communist Party." Sometime later we found out they were the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. If you have an exhibit, show it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Labor Defender for July 1931 has a list of the national committee for the Prisoners' Relief Fund, which includes the name of William Pickens. The purpose of the organization is described as "To help the political and class war prisoners and their dependents."

Mr. PICKENS. They did not even show me that publication. They have asked me to be president of that for prisoners' relief. We never met with them about that. We were always—

Mr. MATTHEWS. You knew that the Daily Worker was the official publication of the Communist Party?

Mr. PICKENS. I have known that for a long time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Ever since you have known of it?

Mr. PICKENS. No; not when I first heard about it. I found out pretty quickly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you saw your first copy of the Daily Worker you were aware of the fact that it was the official publication of the Communist Party?

Mr. PICKENS. I don't know if I knew it then. I have been knowing about 20 years that it was the organ of the Communist Party. When you said when I saw the first copy—

Mr. MATTHEWS. The first copy that you saw carried on the mast-head, "The organ of the Communist Party of the United States"?

Mr. PICKENS. I can't say when—

Mr. STARNES. The only thing you can recall is that for at least 20 years you knew that?

Mr. PICKENS. For about 20 years I have known it was the Communist Party organization publication.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Approximately 20 years?

Mr. PICKENS. Approximately 20 years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was established in 1924.

Mr. PICKENS. Well, it is almost 20 years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you at any time write to the Daily Worker itself and say the following:

This is one occasion for every Negro who has intelligence enough to read to send aid to you—

that is, to the Daily Worker?

Mr. PICKENS. No. Just a minute. The committee of the Daily Worker was taking up the *Scottsboro cases*, and that was to send aid for the *Scottsboro* boys to help defend those boys. Our organization had not decided that they could take it up. Dr. Dubois and the rest of us thought maybe the boys are guilty. We decided we would not take it up. Later we took it up. When they were the only people trying to do anything, I would have sent \$3 to the devil, if they were trying to do something for those boys and help them get a day in court.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not sure I got the answer to my question. Let me repeat it and you answer it. Did you write a letter to the Daily Worker itself and say in that letter:

This is one occasion for every Negro who has intelligence enough to read to send aid to you.

Mr. PICKENS. If it is in connection with the *Scottsboro cases*, but not aid to the Daily Worker for themselves. I have to make that distinction, because if they were taking up this case—does the letter there refer to the *Scottsboro cases*, aid to you in this effort to defend these boys? I will have to stick to that, not aid to the Daily Worker. That sentence ought to be read in connection with the context, whatever it is, there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If the letter begins, "Dear Daily Worker," and then urges people to send aid "to you," it could not refer to anything but the Daily Worker.

Mr. PICKENS. There is nothing in the letter about the *Scottsboro* boys?

Mr. MATTHEWS. There are other things in the letter, but that is not the point. The letter is addressed to the Daily Worker, is it not?

Mr. PICKENS. That is correct, but it is in connection with a matter that is not in the letter—in connection with helping these boys who needed it awfully bad.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What does "you" refer to in the letter?

Mr. PICKENS. The Daily Worker, but in connection with the fight for these boys when nobody else was doing it. I can bring you many cases to get them out of it, when we saw they were going to make political propaganda out of it. There were plenty of letters in the United States to get them out of the case, to keep them from ruining

the boys, because they were trying to make Communist propaganda out of it. That was the very start, when nobody was interested.

Mr. STARNES. I handed to the judge during the course of the trial a telegram from the I. L. D. I was in charge of the troops there to keep order. The letter will speak for itself. I assume you are going to have it in evidence. I do not think we need have any further colloque about it.

Mr. PICKENS. Would it be possible for me to put something in the record there?

Mr. STARNES. In what respect?

Mr. PICKENS. In connection with the Daily Worker and the others and this *Scottsboro case*, to show that when they started out they were the only defenders, and any of us that had the right heart to do something—

Mr. STARNES. To summarize this whole thing, you do not deny writing the letter, but your defense is that it was in connection with the *Scottsboro boys*?

Mr. PICKENS. The *Scottsboro boys* and not the Daily Worker.

Mr. STARNES. Let me summarize it, and I have heard enough, unless you have something else to bring out. To summarize it, you wrote the letter, but it is your contention that you wrote it as a defense or contribution to the defense of the boys in the *Scottsboro case*?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; when there were no other defenders.

Mr. STARNES. And you are stating that you did not write the letter nor make the contribution to the support of the Daily Worker as a political organ, regardless of the verbiage in the letter?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. It is for this committee and the Kerr committee to determine that.

Mr. PICKENS. I have some things to show here.

Mr. STARNES. You can add those as exhibits at the close of your testimony.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you enclose an article to be inserted in the Daily Worker when you sent this letter?

Mr. PICKENS. I do not recall enclosing an article.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The letter says, "Enclosed is an article."

Mr. PICKENS. I was writing to the Associated Negro Press, very likely.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the fourth paragraph of this letter you speak of the possibility that these Negro boys may be executed or they may not be executed, depending upon the development of the case.

Mr. PICKENS. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then you close that paragraph with this sentence: "In either event, it will be a victory for the workers." Do you recall that?

Mr. PICKENS. "In either event"?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; whether they are executed or not executed.

Mr. PICKENS. It will be a victory for the workers if they fight so that they get a fair trial. In either event, if they fight to get a fair trial. That was a keen time. I was on the train in Illinois, and I picked up papers, and the Daily Worker at that time was the only paper that had a fighting attitude toward the execution of these boys—the condition in which they were.

I sent \$3 and I said, "Here is something to help out in this case." They had moved faster than anybody else up to that time. A few weeks later I found out they were making propaganda about it, and from a few weeks later right straight through the case I was fighting the Communists, because they were making Communist propaganda and not defending the boys as they started out pledging to do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to make this observation. The witness may comment on it. Some time ago during the questioning, the witness stated that an alleged quotation about his speech in Philadelphia was the regular Communist jargon and not his own language. I should like to point out that this viewpoint expressed here, "In either event, it will be a victory for the worker," was the most typical Communist jargon in such matters.

Mr. PICKENS. I was writing to a Communist paper. I use Communist jargon when I speak to them and use professors' jargon when I speak to them. That was endorsing their defense of the Scottsboro boys.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Whether they lost or won, the victory would be to the workers.

Mr. PICKENS. It would be a victory to them if they saw the boys had a trial rather than be executed without trial. It was not a victory for the Communist Party. You notice I was shrewd enough not to say that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker of April 16, 1931, is the issue to which you referred in your letter. You said, "I have just seen a copy of the Daily Worker for April 16."

Mr. PICKENS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That carries, right under the words "Daily Worker," "Central organ of the Communist Party."

Mr. PICKENS. Certainly. I had no doubt of the party affiliation of the Daily Worker at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The issue of the Daily Worker in which your letter appeared was that of April 24, 1931. Did you have any controversy inside the National Association for Advancement of Colored People arising out of their being sent this endorsement?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. Listen, I want to tell you this: That letter was not sent to the Daily Worker for any publication, but just accompanying my \$3 which I was sending, praising the work. It was no publicity stunt on my part. The association found out later that there was not any sort of intention of mine to do anything except to try to help defend the Scottsboro boys, and all of that was wiped out. I had some enemies besides those in the Communist Party. All of that was straightened out. They did not like it, of course—that is, some of my enemies—but some of my friends understood, and a great many other people sent money of the same kind.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You served on the national organizing committee of the United States Congress Against War, did you not?

Mr. PICKENS. That is the congress which we went in and came out when the Communists came in. I served, you say. My name was on it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You attended meetings.

Mr. PICKENS. Well, a meeting or two. I don't doubt I did, if I could, if they are in town.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you attend the United States Congress Against War itself?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; I spoke at the Congress Against War. It was in 1933, when Mr. Hitler was going strong.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker of October 2, 1933, refers to the speech made at the congress by Earl Browder, and then in the paragraph immediately under that it states that—

William Pickens, field secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, stressed the vital interest of the Negro and all oppressed colonial peoples in the resolute fight against war. He added that "To take the profit motive out of war we must take the class profit opportunities out of our economic system."

Do you recall whether or not you said that?

Mr. PICKENS. That does not sound like my language. The Daily Worker might have caught and put down what they wanted in their own jargon. I never read that until I read it in the Congressional Record. That is not my kind of language.

Mr. STARNES. But you were present and made a speech?

Mr. PICKENS. Oh, yes; I spoke as one of the non-Communist groups. Mr. Matthews spoke. He was elected chairman. I was elected as non-Communist chairman, to balance Earl Browder. The people liked my speech and they put me forward for it, but I did not ask for it and did not care.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean you were elected vice chairman with Earl Browder?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; and Earl Browder was another one. We had long debates among the non-Communists whether we should go into the thing, because I thought the Communists would not behave. I told them how they would act at Frankfort.

About 6, 8 weeks after we went in I got a telegram from the executive secretary that "they are not playing fair. The Communists are getting too prominent. We know you want to resign."

I wired my resignation. I went in not because of the Communists, but in spite of them. They were on this antiwar conference in 1933, which I wish more Americans had gotten busy in.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The letterhead of the Medical Bureau of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy contains a letter of November 18, 1936, and lists you as a member of the organization's national committee. Did you serve on that?

Mr. PICKENS. On the committee?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or were you a member of it?

Mr. PICKENS. I may have been a member of it, but I never served in it in any other way.

I want to explain. They had a Negro committee connected with that. They were not Communists. They were people like the head colored man of the Y. M. C. A. and the head colored man of the Urban League there, and it was not the business of communism but our natural American bias for the anti-Franco side and the anti-Italian side. The colored people, because of the thing that happened in Ethiopia, would have adopted any side that was against the Italians without respect to their politics. It had no relation to politics at all. I was on the national committee so the name would help to get influence for them. Some of the other people, I learned from the Congressional Record, were Communists.

Mr. STARNES. The Attorney General held that that organization was a Communist organization. You do not doubt that?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. I spoke for them, and Mrs. Roosevelt had her name behind for some of them. I pulled out of their Rescue Ship proposition because of that Communist proposition. Our participation in it had no relation to the Communist Party. We went in the Spanish Loyalist move also, and the anti-Franco—

Mr. MATTHEWS. The September 27, 1938, issue of New Masses lists you as speaking under the auspices of the Medical Bureau of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

Mr. PICKENS. At Manhattan Center?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was not at Manhattan Center. This was another meeting.

Mr. PICKENS. Well, I may not have been there. I don't know—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Edward K. Barsky is listed as one of the speakers, and Harold Laski.

Mr. PICKENS. Their names I have seen, but I did not know them.

Mr. STARNES. What Laski is that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Harold Laski.

Mr. STARNES. I am quite sure the Dean remembers who Harold Laski is.

Mr. PICKENS. I remember him chiefly from his name on the letter-heads, but not personally. I think I met him.

Mr. STARNES. On what faculty was he? Harvard or Yale?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was originally at Harvard.

Mr. PICKENS. I have seen his name many times.

Mr. STARNES. You know who he is and what his general reputation is?

Mr. PICKENS. I judge that.

Mr. STARNES. I suppose he was an instructor and a writer in political science.

Mr. PICKENS. I know he was a very bright man, but I do not know anything about his politics.

Mr. STARNES. He is in England now.

Mr. PICKENS. The last I read of him was in England. It was in connection with some English thing.

Mr. STARNES. On the Beveridge report. He is supposed to have some connection with it.

Mr. PICKENS. Something like that. I remember him. There were a lot of people that I did not know intimately well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you publicly affiliated with the Conference on Pan American Democracy as one of its sponsors?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; let me tell you something about that. I don't know about sponsor or what I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are listed on the letterhead, which contains a letter dated November 16, 1938, as one of the sponsors on Pan American Democracy.

Mr. PICKENS. May I tell you about that?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. PICKENS. Pan American Democracy—that appealed to me, but not because of that name. Pan Fascism was about to run all over Europe in that year. I think it was about the year 1939 and along there. They were in the next block to my office. But something they did for us, which any colored man would appreciate, for many years the Mexican Government had been making Negroes drop \$500 at the

border when they went into Mexico, and white people with their chauffeurs had to leave \$500. Sometimes they got down there and the chauffeurs liked Mexican society so well they deserted, and the white people could not get the \$500. We had tried in every way to get that held up.

So our organization in St. Louis appealed to the counsel, Redman and Espe. I was going to Mexico with Redman and Espe. We were going to try to get this. We were trying to get that broken up. It was a great burden. Teachers had to leave \$500 at the border if they came out.

The Pan-American Democracy sent their secretary to my office and said, "We can straighten that out for you," and, by George! they did it. They got something from the Mexican Government and brought it there. It was not a thing that this Government did. They were ordering it broken up.

I always argued for France and England, and they never argued for Germany, but they argued that France, England, and Germany were in the same boat. I knew they were radicals. I never asked them if they were Communists. They never asked me. Some of them were not Communists. Some of them were very intelligent people. But they did something which our conservative friends were not able to do. The head of it was a doctor with a long Spanish name, who was a professor in one of the colleges in New York. I used to be a professor. He did that for us. That looked like Pan-American Democracy, if they could do that.

I had no political interest in his organization except to argue with him. They never put me on any of their programs when they wanted big speakers. They had two or three meetings while I was connected with them, but they never put me on, because they knew my sentiments. Nobody ever even called the name of Communism to me when I went to one or two of their meetings.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever seen a copy of the letter which I show you, on the official stationery of the Communist Party of U. S. A. [handing a document to the witness]?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. I have got those two articles here that I wrote for the New Masses. One of them they did not publish.

When I was in Spain, down in Barcelona, another American there, hearing me talk, knew that I was an American. We were trying to get some legal money. He said, "I am from the United States also." He did not tell me he was a Communist or connected with the New Masses; just an American.

I told him I was with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He said, "You are Pickens." He said, "I will communicate with you when I get back."

When I got back I got a letter from Joe North. I doubt that he was going by that name in Spain.

He said, "I met you in Spain and I want you to write something on Negroes' opposition against fascism." I had an idea what he wanted, and I sat down and wrote an article, which is right here, which I knew he could not publish.

He said, "I have a good many Negro readers in New Masses."

The paragraph on page 2 of my article would explain to you why I knew he could not publish it. I wrote another article to contrast fascism with communism. I wanted to contrast it with democracy.

He said, "I can't publish that first one."

I wrote another one, contrasting fascism with democracy, and it is here, too. I never used the word "communism," and, of course, he published that, because it was a good article, and a lot of Negro papers carried it.

I would not mind reading it to you, which is quite enlightening about my attitude in that first article. There is something I wish you would put in this record. It is my attitude toward the *Scottsboro case*.

(Letter from William Pickens to the editor of the Republican was marked "Pickens Exhibit 1.")

Mr. PICKENS. There is another one here, *The Fight Against Fascism*.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Before we leave this letter, I wanted to ask you if you were aware of the fact that the Communist Party exploited the fact that you wrote for the *New Masses*, in order to obtain subscriptions for the *New Masses*?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I have never seen that before. They do things like that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is a letter signed by Earl Browder, soliciting subscriptions for the *New Masses*. One of the grounds on which a subscription to the magazine is solicited is that you are a contributor.

Mr. PICKENS. Yes [continuing to read]:

By training and by temperament I am a Democrat, believing in the compromise of the ballot after agitation and discussion, and having no favor for class warfare. Narrow discipline never suited me. Therefore, although I could work toward these universal ends side by side with any humans, I could never become a member of minority political parties, with the limitations implied. Some of the people with whom I worked, made the mistake of many—seeming to think that a man could not look upon "radicals" as being simply human beings, without being one of the radicals. From these I expected opposition, ignorant opposition. Soon I was to find also that with the radicals I was a "marked man," because I did not and could not agree with them in all things. Like Roger Baldwin I took the right which I accorded: the right to disagree in any detail. When I got to the great Anti-Imperialist Congress in Frankfort, Germany—

I told him how they came to invite me to talk 45 minutes—the non-Communists, who had a right to bring their people. When I got there they had a plot to keep me from speaking at all, and I heard about it. They had a colored man ready—Patterson—ready to tear up what I was ready to say in 8 or 10 minutes, because they were going to ring the bell on me. Someone I knew had talked to some of the radicals and told me what they were planning to do. I did another little bit of Uncle Remus. I said, "I have my speech in both German and English. I said, "I am going to use German again, because Patterson does not know a word of German."

The next day I started speaking, and the Russians tried to ring me down and got excited, because the Germans, 15,000 of them, were there and began to hang onto it. He tried to ring me down. The audience threatened to tear the place apart unless they let me finish my speech.

I told him that. He could not understand that. If you work with radicals, in anything you agree with them they take advantage of it and the other people think you are a radical, because they look at radicals as one kind of human beings. I said, "I am with the radicals or anything else against facism, but the other objectives I do not agree with"; and he would not publish it.

There was another one on "The Negro Must Be Anti-Fascist." It is a good article and all the Negro papers carried it. It contrasts fascism with democracy and has things in it that anybody would endorse.

I never saw this letter. They naturally used a letter. It is a pretty good article. They carried it. Here it is for your record, if you want it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you deliver a lecture at the Workers School on or about November 10, 1939?

Mr. PICKENS. I delivered one lecture there. They were a half block from my office. I do not know who carried it or who advertised it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The New Masses of November 14, 1939, has an announcement to the effect that there will be a lecture by Mr. William Pickens, director of branches, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, on Friday, November 10, 8 p. m., at the Workers School. You knew that the Workers School was the official training school of the Communist Party?

Mr. PICKENS. No; when you say I knew, that is different. I have no doubt that they were a radical group, but we were not interested in that. What I talked to them about was not their radicalism or communism. Maybe in the current case, whatever the case we had or were dealing with—and they were white people and we let them listen—and then I would always stand up for England and France, whatever the struggle was against fascism, and never agreed with them and would not expect to.

I have to say to you gentlemen, I was known as a speaker for all these things. Everybody wanted to hear me, whether they were Communists, Republicans, or Democrats. They asked me to speak. I was listed in the Congressional Record as a lecturer for the Workers School.

I passed there four times a day, and the only time I went in there was to deliver this speech, after many invitations, which, of course, is a thing I would be likely to do again if I was not working for the Government. Then I was just an American, with my rights as an American.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a sponsor of the Spanish refugee-relief campaign?

Mr. PICKENS. That is connected with the Spanish thing. I suppose I sponsored it for a while. Then we found out that the good lady was from the Friends Service Committee. We found out that there was something wrong about it. Mrs. Roosevelt had done something. I called up John Haynes Holmes, who had been on it. I called him up. He was a friend of mine and a fine American. I called him up.

I said, "Look here—this thing we are on." He said, "I am resigning."

I got out. We were interested in the Spanish business, and we found out they were using it for something else. We were a little doubtful what they were doing with the money. We resigned.

Mr. STARNES. What was your particular interest in the Spanish situation? Was it anything other than what you said a while ago—that after the unwarranted, the unjust, and brutal aggression of the Italian national against Ethiopia you would join with any group to fight the Italians?

Mr. PICKENS. Without regard to their politics on the other side. We were not for the Italians. It was only incidental that I went down to Spain. I was going to Europe. They said, "Are you going to Spain?" I said, "No, the passports do not allow us in Spain." They said, "We belong to the medical bureau."

I got in it so I could see about the colored business.

Mr. STARNES. After you made the trip you continued sponsoring some of these organizations?

Mr. PICKENS. All I did was to see what I saw in Barcelona and the bombing. It had no relation to politics. In fact, I never bothered about the politics over there. There was one official there, for example, in Barcelona, who helped me to see the bureaus of the Loyalists.

Mr. STARNES. You understand now, and we all do, that there was one faction in Spain backed by Hitler and Mussolini, and another backed by Russia?

Mr. PICKENS. Surely; and, just as I am now against the Italians, at that time I would have preferred the Russian side.

Mr. STARNES. What interests and intrigues me is that after you went over there and saw what the situation was, then you permitted yourself to become a sponsor and a leader and a speaker in numerous or several groups who were interesting themselves in the Spanish situation.

Mr. PICKENS. But not in politics of the Communist Party. It was not true, I don't think, that all of the people who favored the anti-Franco side were Communists.

Mr. STARNES. Not necessarily so; but at the same time, as we know, the leadership in this country on all of the organizations—on every organization—that interested themselves in that Spanish situation was Communist-controlled.

Mr. PICKENS. It has become clearer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The letterhead of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, which contains a letter dated January 16, 1940, lists the name of William Pickens as a sponsor—

Mr. STARNES. He admits that.

Mr. PICKENS. We were with the Negro committee that was trying to help the anti-Italian and anti-Fascist and anti-Franco side by ambulances. The Negroes got up an ambulance in New York that they sent, but it had nothing to do with politics.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights?

Mr. PICKENS. We have three or four organizations now which if they brought them to me in that—a Conference on Inalienable Rights, without any mention of communism—sponsorship meant that we put our names down, that we would want them to go there and listen to what was going on. Perhaps I gave them my name as a sponsor, but I never met them or knew anything about it.

Mr. STARNES. But you did lend your name there?

Mr. PICKENS. I said I used my name.

Mr. STARNES. Let him see it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is the official program of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, which has you listed.

Mr. PICKENS. Where was it held?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In New York.

Mr. PICKENS. Was it a hotel?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Society for Ethical Culture.

Mr. PICKENS. I did not go to it, then. I was not there. It has been a longer time than that since I have been in there.

Mr. MASON. Do you not realize that any person who has been as prominent as you have been among your people, who permits his name to be used as a sponsor, is practically recommending to his people that they at least give consideration to this committee where you might have had the objectives of the committee in mind? Your people in following your lead would become dupes and susceptible to that organization, which is placing them in a dangerous position, because they all do not have as keen an intellect and cannot see the danger as someone like you might have been able to; and it was at least, shall we say, a culpable attitude of yours in permitting those things to occur so often.

Mr. PICKENS. Not so often; not as often as seems here. We sponsored many things, and most of those were perfectly American. Sponsorship did not mean that we recommended what an organization is going to say. We might say, "Read this and consider it." That meant they are going to have a conference. That was on inalienable rights. We say, "Go there and take part in it and agree or disagree with it." That is because we were asking them—the N. A. C. P.—at many of our meetings. We were saying, "Go there and see what they have to say." We could not investigate, because we had no funds or money to find out what politics they had, but the idea was not to sponsor what they had to say.

Mr. MASON. I am not saying that your idea was, I am saying that the general impression would be, that when you permitted your name to be used that was bait to attract your people to be exposed to their policy, and it was rather a dangerous thing.

Mr. PICKENS. I understand, but as an American—and that is another thing, and I have been an American ever since I followed George Washington—and as an American we were never taught to be very much afraid. As an American out there, somebody wants to bla-bla. I have listened to fellows I could not agree with. We said to go ahead and listen to their program, especially when it is a history-book name, a conference on inalienable rights—

Mr. MASON. Of course, you understand that they use just such attractive names in order to attract?

Mr. PICKENS. Just as they used the *Scottsboro cases* in order to build it up. We know that. We knew that kind of thing. You do not know, sir, how many things we turn down. Generally, when we went into one of these things it was because we probably saw some names like Rabbi Wise, Franz Boas, who was a great friend of the colored people, whatever you might think of his anthropology. When we saw a citizen that we knew was a good citizen, we said, "We will go there and get them to help us."

Mr. MASON. As a teacher in a small community and trying to set an example, there were many things that would never hurt me and that would have been a good example for adults, but there were many things that I could not do because the youngsters in the community

might follow in my footsteps. You were in the same position. As a leader of your people, they looked up to you; and I would say you did not always protect impressionable, naive members of your race from these dangerous philosophies.

Mr. PICKENS. I understand; and do you know that the Communist leaders of this country regard me as the most effective barrier that they have met in the Negro race, because they know very well—

Mr. MASON. In spite of the aid and comfort you have given them by lending your name to many of their front organizations?

Mr. PICKENS. Exactly; because they knew I knew them well, and they knew I would not yield on any point against democracy or against the interests of the colored people or for communism. I don't think Earl Browder ever wrote my name on a money-gathering sheet like that, unless he knew I was not a Communist—

Mr. STARNES. I cannot follow that logic or that reasoning. I cannot understand why my enemy would want to use me as his trap, apparently, and use my name if it meant anything in the way of prestige and power and influence in his numerous endeavors and if he knew it would destroy his endeavors. That just does not make sense. That is just like joining up with the devil to be with Christ. That is what it means to me.

If I followed that same logic in my personal community, I would associate with every harlot that came along. If I wanted to improve my prestige and standing with the church, then I would get into every crap game, every chicken yard, and every watermelon patch that I could. It just does not make sense.

Mr. PICKENS. For example, I wrote that article for the New Masses because he said that he had a great many Negro readers. I got something into that which I knew New Masses would not get into.

I said they used my name because they preferred to use my name instead of Patterson or Ford or some of the known Communists to write an article about anything, even though they knew I would not write an article on communism. I can see it their way. It was a bit dangerous, but not as dangerous as it looks, because they never expected to get by me, and they never expected me to yield, and they knew the colored people knew about it.

On the floor is the only time I have ever had the implication brought against me, from one end of the country to the other, that I was a Communist.

Mr. STARNES. I do not think they said you were a Communist, but what they said was that you publicly affiliated or associated yourself with them on their front movements, which you have admitted under oath you have done on numerous occasions.

If you will cooperate, we will try to finish by 12:30.

Mr. PICKENS. Thank you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was the New York chapter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which the Attorney General in his interdepartmental memoranda has described as a subversive organization.

Mr. PICKENS. Would you say that this sponsorship was some meeting they wanted to have at the Ethical Culture Hall? They may put

me down on their list, but this meeting is what they brought up to us. I know they have me in the list.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a sponsor of the organization.

Mr. PICKENS. Had they had the organization yet or are they going to have it at the meeting?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; the organization was established before.

Mr. PICKENS. But it was established under a different name, but this inalienable-rights meeting would be the thing that we would be sponsoring—that is, put our names down as sponsors.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

Mr. PICKENS. That was in our line. We were helping the foreign born to help out with the Negro. Here was somebody who wanted to do something to protect the foreign born.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On the letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, dated March 1940 there is a list of sponsors which contains the name of Williams Pickens as one of them.

Mr. STARNES. He admits he was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The New Masses of April 2, 1940, published an open letter or a petition to the President protesting against various activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice that had to do with apprehending Communists. The document carried your name as one of the signers.

Mr. PICKENS. I have not seen the document, but they doubtless submitted it to me to read, because I would not sign anything I would not read, but it does not have anything of any kind to do with communism, but, of course, with the American process of dealing with any defendant or any accused person. We were all wrapped up in that. Our organization was all wrapped up in that.

Mr. STARNES. His answer is that he did sign this or that; he was a sponsor, but he has given his reason for it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the specific occasion was that the Attorney General at that time had called a grand jury to investigate Communist activities. The grand jury was meeting here, and this group in its petition to the President alleges that this constituted a badgering of Communists, to use the language—

Mr. PICKENS. That was in our line. We were helping the foreign remember, but it is doubtless the kind of thing we would sign in our organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it be your view that there should not be a grand-jury investigation of Communist activities?

Mr. PICKENS. No; not exactly that, but what is written in the article there, I agreed with the sentiments in it, not that there should not be a grand-jury investigation of anything or anybody.

Mr. MASON. But the tenor of the letter was a protest against the grand-jury investigation of the Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Who else sponsored it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is a very long list.

Mr. STARNES. Were there any Communists?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oh, yes. The list is quite well sprinkled with prominent Communists.

Mr. PICKENS. And non-Communists. I was with them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Theodore Dreiser, Franklin Folsom, Dashiell Hammett, Rockwell Kent, Ring W. Lardner, Jr., Harvey O'Connor, Walter Rautenstrauch, George Seldes, Donald Ogden Stewart, Paul Robeson, and at least 40 or 50 others who have long Communist records of affiliation with Communist organizations in the committee's files.

Mr. PICKENS. Would you object to my seeing that list?

Mr. STARNES. The whole list will be in evidence. Those are both Communists and non-Communists in there, and they will be in evidence.

Mr. PICKENS. They have people from Vassar College. There are a great many people on there whom I do not know; but they brought it to us. We signed for that idea and not for any—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever publicly associate yourself as a sponsor with the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom?

Mr. PICKENS. You say publicly associate myself. I do not know whether I signed as a sponsor for one of their meetings, but I never met with them. I don't even remember that. I never met with them and would not have remembered even signing it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On one of the official circulars of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom your name is listed as a sponsor.

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; I understand.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not deny that that was a Communist organization?

Mr. PICKENS. No; I do not deny it, but I do not remember it, because I never met with them. They brought many things to us.

Mr. STARNES. How recent was that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was April 13, 1940.

Mr. PICKENS. Some meetings we wanted to help them, and I sponsored it, which meant to get people out to listen to it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you address a meeting of the United American Spanish Aid Committee at Manhattan Center on December 1, 1940?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; I think so, and I think that is one in which a Member of the Congress spoke, and I spoke about what I had seen in Spain.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are satisfied that the organization, United American Spanish Aid Committee, was a Communist organization?

Mr. PICKENS. I tell you, I can't say that I am satisfied. I have just heard it here, but there were so many people in it who were not Communists—not in the committee, but on this Negro committee that had asked me to speak. They were interested in Spain for other purposes. I can't say that I am satisfied. At that time it did not occur to me to ask what their politics were. We were interested against the Italians and against Franco and for the Loyalist people there, and for the Negro boys who were over there helping them, but we had nothing to do with the politics.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The objective of the meeting of December 1, 1940, was to raise funds for the American Rescue Ship Mission also?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. I said we had pulled out of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thought you said you were satisfied it was a Communist organization and then pulled out of there.

Mr. PICKENS. Later, but not when I was speaking at Manhattan Center. My speech was a report that told what I had seen in Barcelona.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your speech you are alleged here to have said something as follows:

Dean William Pickens, director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, denounced the American consul general in Mexico for refusing a visé to the famous Spanish writer, Constantia de la Mora, who wanted to come to the United States to lecture.

Mr. PICKENS. Of course, that is false. I will tell you what I did do. This person had shown me all through the Spanish Loyalist Government bureaus, and when somebody passed around a petition that this person be permitted to come in for a short visit to the United States, I just normally signed a petition to the President. I did not denounce that. Anybody who wrote that—I suppose that is the way they wrote it. I suppose other speakers denounced it, but I signed a petition to the President that this person be permitted to come in.

Mr. MASON. Would you not say that now you would agree that the Communist leaders of this Nation have certainly capitalized upon your sympathies and your objectives and your loyalties to your people in a way to aid them in furthering their objectives?

Mr. PICKENS. Oh, they have done that continually. For me, while I had one or two cases like that, I had thousands of other cases. I have spoken at every college in the United States, from the college of the university at Seattle, Wash., and Los Angeles, east to Harvard. I could not remember them all. I spoke at all the Rotary Clubs.

I was known as a good speaker. They would exploit it more than they would another colored man. You do not know how many times we refused to give them the opportunity. We would be fighting our cases and always saying "No" to those who were fighting their cases. If they came to us with any politics we could have turned them down, and we did.

I could have been on other things. These things sound like things out of the history book—inalienable rights—and there was no objection to hearing them if they wanted to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the executive committee of the Council for Pan American Democracy?

Mr. PICKENS. I spoke about that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was the organization under a different name, under a different date.

Mr. PICKENS. Pan American Democracy. That was the organization that got us this lift from Mexico of not having to deposit \$500.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The organization's letterhead, on which is contained a letter dated July 18, 1940, lists the executive committee's members and lists Pickens as one of them.

Mr. PICKENS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Council for Pan American Democracy, of which Clifford T. McAvoy was chairman at the time, issued an open letter to the President of Brazil on behalf of Luiz Carlos Prestes, and among the signers of this letter your name appears.

Mr. PICKENS. As a member of the council, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; it appears as a signer of this letter.

Mr. PICKENS. I say, as a member of the council, and this was not a political matter. We were asking people to sign up to help us get a fair trial all the time for 20 years. Here they brought the name of a man whom they said they were holding in Brazil and he was likely to be murdered in jail, and they brought a letter from a high official

of the Mexican Government asking us to create a sentiment to see that this man got a fair trial and did not get done off in jail.

It was the most normal thing to sign. They did not put him forward as a Communist. I suspected that he was one of the radicals like that, but that did not say he was a Communist. I would have been sympathetic with his having a fair trial.

Mr. STARNES. Have you ever known anybody except a Communist or a Fascist or a Nazi or somebody who is not an American to interest himself in forming an organization with reference to the conduct of trials, et cetera, of men alleged to have violated State laws in some other nations? Did you ever know of a prominent Democrat or Republican or a prominent American citizen who was a member of these alien-inspired organizations, who interested himself in the trials or courts of other countries?

Mr. PICKENS. I have known of such cases, but it was professional, through the Civil Liberties Union. I have seen people there who were not at all Communists, who were interested in these people—

Mr. STARNES. I can understand that. You have known them through the American Civil Liberties Union, but as a usual rule it is somebody with an international viewpoint and more interested in interfering with the affairs of the other nation than looking after abstract justice at home.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will ask the witness to comment on this. Luiz Carlos Prestes, on whose behalf the witness signed this letter, was the Communist International's representative in Brazil. He organized and led an armed insurrection against the Brazilian Government and for that act was arrested, tried, and convicted; and it was for his freedom after that conviction that this letter was sent to the President of Brazil.

Mr. PICKENS. Of course, they did not say anything about that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know about that?

Mr. PICKENS. No; they did not say anything about that, but whatever he was charged with, they wanted him to get a fair trial and not be killed in jail, and they presented a memorandum to the Mexican Government. To get him a fair trial would not disqualify a man's Americanism, even if they had said he has been a rebel.

Mr. STARNES. You have testified here under oath that you were a member of many of these organizations, served on their executive boards, been an official, your name and prestige as a leader of your race were used by these organizations, and you have protested over and over again that all you were interested in was seeing that there was a fair trial under what you deemed to be American procedure.

Mr. PICKENS. Surely.

Mr. STARNES. Have any of these organizations, that have been named and identified for the public record and of which you were a member, ever asked you to sign a letter or sign a protest against the conviction or the trial or the execution without trial of prisoners in Russia at any time? Can you name a single, solitary instance in which any one of these organizations here ever protested against the execution or the imprisonment of a single Russian?

Mr. PICKENS. This particular organization, I don't remember that.

Mr. STARNES. Or any of the others?

Mr. PICKENS. The others—I did not sign letters for protesting against treatment of prisoners. We were always on that other side,

just where you were, against that Russian procedure against those men—

Mr. MASON. Will you read that again, because I gathered from that statement you read, asking him to comment on it, that this letter was written after the man had been tried and convicted and sentenced?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. Which then would not have anything to do with his getting a fair trial. Read it again.

Mr. PICKENS. The thing that we signed was that he should get a fair trial and not be killed in jail.

Mr. MASON. Then they misrepresented the situation in order to get your signature?

Mr. PICKENS. It was not against the execution of a convicted criminal, but the man was supposed to be held and not convicted. Maybe he was trying for an appeal.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I did not read from the letter.

Mr. MASON. You read a statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I made a statement to the effect that Luiz Carlos Prestes was the Communist International's official representative in Brazil going back as far as 1924—we have that on the authority of Earl Browder himself—and that he led an armed insurrection for the purpose of overthrowing the present Brazilian Government in or about 1935. He was then convicted and sentenced to prison, and in 1940 this letter was sent under the auspices of the Council for Pan American Democracy to the President of Brazil, demanding the release of the prisoner.

Mr. PICKENS. From 1934 to 1940. It shows that there was discussion in his case.

Mr. MASON. He had been convicted and sentenced and was in prison for that length of time.

Mr. PICKENS. I thought he was to be executed and they asked us to protest.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He received a 17-year prison sentence for his abortive insurrection.

Mr. PICKENS. They did not go into all that. Here was a man in jail. We often asked men to do that.

Mr. MASON. Why do you not put the letter in the record?

Mr. PICKENS. They propose to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is nothing particularly in the letter except an appeal for his release.

Mr. STARNES. That is different from being given a fair trial or being executed. Since he was not sentenced to be executed, there was no reason to stop him from being executed. This was just an appeal to release him.

Mr. PICKENS. The thing was presented to us that he was likely to be murdered in prison. They did not say anything about having had a trial. Here was a man charged with certain things and very likely to be murdered in prison unless there was a petition. They brought something from the Mexican Government that they protest lest he be murdered in prison. I can see what his situation was—

Mr. STARNES. You mean the Mexican Government was bringing things to the attention of this organization and to private citizens of the United States of America asking them to petition?

Mr. PICKENS. That some action be taken against the Government, as it was presented to us.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The last sentence states:

We do so in the firm conviction that his release will serve the cause of democracy and liberty in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; democracy and liberty.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is no intimation in the letter that he is in danger of being murdered.

Mr. STARNES. I suppose it was for the same reason that a lot of American citizens have interested themselves in the political situation in North Africa.

Mr. PICKENS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On or about December 19, 1940, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties published an appeal on behalf of Sam Darcy, which published appeal carries the name of William Pickens as one of the signers. Did you sign that appeal?

Mr. PICKENS. I suppose so. I remember the name Darcy. Don't forget that they were asking us to do things that we were always asking them to do, and an appeal for him for justice, to get justice, get a square deal, and get a fair trial; get an American deal—that was the only interest we had in it.

Mr. STARNES. Who was Sam Darcy and what is involved here?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who Sam Darcy was?

Mr. PICKENS. I have learned who he was. I did not know then. But here was a man in prison. They presented it as a man who was getting a raw deal in California. We knew a lot about California. He was not going to get a fair trial in California. To sign a petition to get a fair trial was justice.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker itself says:

Darcy was recently extradited by California authorities from Pennsylvania, where he was State chairman of the Communist Party. He faces up to 14 years' imprisonment for a minor inaccuracy in his registration as a voter in California in 1934.

The minor inaccuracy consisted of the fact that he swore that he was a citizen when he was not.

Mr. PICKENS. Of course, they did not say that. They did not say that he—

Mr. STARNES. I do not mean to insult your intelligence, but you do not mean that you would sign a petition for someone in all the jails in the country because somebody came to you and alleged that he had been unfairly treated or did not have a fair trial or that it had been unjust?

Mr. PICKENS. Except, Mr. Chairman, you will admit that in many cases we asked people to sign things which they could not investigate, and we presented our facts to them and they had faith in them, and they often signed up with us without having opportunity to investigate the individual cases we had had.

Mr. STARNES. You did the same thing sometimes?

Mr. PICKENS. We did the same thing sometimes.

Mr. STARNES. I do not recall whether you asked him about his connection with the American League Against War and Fascism.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. PICKENS. We went into that when it was the Congress Against War. Mr. Matthews reminded me, which I did not know about, that he resigned 24 hours before I did. We resigned because the Communists were getting control of it. We found later that we could not stay in it.

Mr. STARNES. I think that is all we have. Is there any further statement you care to make?

Mr. PICKENS. The statement which I made for the other committee. I did not know I was going to have the honor of meeting this committee. I have that statement, and if you want to put it in the record, all right. It is addressed to the other committee.

Mr. STARNES. Is that Judge Kerr's committee?

Mr. PICKENS. Congressman Kerr's committee.

Mr. STARNES. Have you appeared before the Kerr committee yet?

Mr. PICKENS. No. This is the statement I prepared for them.

Mr. STARNES. You prepared it for them?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes. It is here, if you want to put it in the record.

Mr. STARNES. Attach it, because all of these papers will be received. It does not have to be incorporated. Just attach it as an exhibit, Mr. Reporter.

(Written statement was marked "Pickens Exhibit 2.")

Mr. PICKENS. I want to say that I realize now that in a good many cases—I had no occasion to run out. I was an American and a free man. I tried to help them toward a common objective, not any party politics, which I would not do as a member of the United States Government or as a member of any particular other organization but the N. A. C. P., but the N. A. C. P. was always asking for favors and help itself. Our objective in helping the other was to help the objective of freedom and a square deal.

I have seen many Communists, but never have any of them ever suggested that I join their party or become a member.

Mr. STARNES. Briefly to summarize the testimony, Dean, you admit under oath that you have been an officer in some Communist-front organizations, that you know now to be Communist, that you have been members of others, and that you have been publicly affiliated or associated with other front or subversive organizations that you now know to be that?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. But, of course, as you have so stated here in the last minute, for certain purposes?

Mr. PICKENS. Yes; I mean for purposes of the objectives of the organization to which I belonged.

Mr. STARNES. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. PICKENS. We asked them to come. Of the 21 organizations he mentioned here, 14 of them stand up—they want 21. I have them grouped there in the first part of the article. There was this committee, and this committee, and that committee. There were 14. While I was doing those 14 connections, I did from 6 to 10 thousand regular connections, but we did not run out on any white people that wanted to give us a chance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should like these exhibits to be put in the record.

Mr. STARNES. Very well.

(Article referring to Hands Off China conference was marked "Pickens Exhibit 3.")

(Article referring to Philadelphia Hands Off China conference was marked "Pickens Exhibit 4.")

(Article referring to America Anti-Imperialist League was marked "Pickens Exhibit 5.")

(Article referring to International Labor Defense was marked "Pickens Exhibit 6.")

(Article referring to League Against Fascism was marked "Pickens Exhibit 7.")

(Article referring to Daily Worker was marked "Pickens Exhibit 8.")

(Article referring to Prisoners Relief Fund was marked "Pickens Exhibit 9.")

(Article referring to National Organizing Committee, United States Congress Against War, was marked "Pickens Exhibit 9-A.")

(Article referring to United States Congress Against War was marked "Pickens Exhibit 10.")

(Article referring to American League Against War and Fascism was marked "Pickens Exhibit 11.")

(Article referring to Fight Against War and Fascism was marked "Pickens Exhibit 12.")

(Article referring to Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, was marked "Pickens Exhibit 13.")

(Article referring to Medical Bureau, North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, was marked "Pickens Exhibit 14.")

(Article referring to Conference on Pan American Democracy was marked "Pickens Exhibit 15.")

(Article referring to Communist Party of the United States of America was marked "Pickens Exhibit 16.")

(Article referring to Workers School was marked "Pickens Exhibit 17.")

(Article referring to Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign was marked "Pickens Exhibit 18.")

(Article referring to Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was marked "Pickens Exhibit 19.")

(Article referring to American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born was marked "Pickens Exhibit 20.")

(Article referring to open letter in New Masses was marked "Pickens Exhibit 21.")

(Article referring to American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was marked "Pickens Exhibit 22.")

(Article referring to American Rescue Ship Mission was marked "Pickens Exhibit 23.")

(Article referring to Daily Worker was marked "Pickens Exhibit 24.")

(Article referring to Council for Pan American Democracy was marked "Pickens Exhibit 25.")

(Article referring to National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was marked "Pickens Exhibit 26.")

(At 12 noon the subcommittee went into executive session.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., the Honorable Joe Starnes, presiding.

Present: Hon. Joe Starnes, Hon. Martin Dies, and Hon. Noah M. Mason.

Also present: J. B. Matthews, Director of Research for the committee and Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator.

Mr. STARNES. You may proceed, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. We have with us this morning Mr. Tippet.

Mr. STARNES. Please be sworn, Mr. Tippet. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TIPPETT. I do.

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS H. TIPPETT, CHIEF, FIELD OPERATIONS BRANCH, RENT DIVISION, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give your full name?

Mr. TIPPETT. Thomas H. Tippet.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. TIPPETT. Peoria, Ill.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When?

Mr. TIPPETT. October 27, 1890.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give your educational background?

Mr. TIPPETT. I went to the common schools in Peoria. I later attended the University of Chicago and I later attended Columbia University, and then I took some work in Washington recently at the George Washington University.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you hold any academic degrees?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give your professional experience; the positions or jobs which you have held?

Mr. TIPPETT. For how long a period?

Mr. MATTHEWS. From the time of the beginning of your adulthood; chronologically, if possible.

Mr. TIPPETT. I worked in a coal mine as a coal miner, as a young man, until I was married. Then I left the coal mines.

Mr. MATTHEWS. About how old were you when you worked in the coal mines?

Mr. TIPPETT. I was between 18 and 25.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you work in the mines about 7 years?

Mr. TIPPETT. About that. Then I was a union official for awhile, and then I became an organizer for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, a different union from the miners.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a mine union official?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; a local mine union official.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What years, approximately.

Mr. TIPPETT. I will have to guess there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it before the World War?

Mr. TIPPETT. Oh, yes. I was working in the mines during the World War, until about 1917, 1918, or 1919, along in there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that the United Mine Workers of Illinois?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right; Illinois.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you a union official?

Mr. TIPPETT. In Peoria, Ill.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And what was your office?

Mr. TIPPETT. I was secretary of the local union. I was on the grievance committee of the local union. I was a delegate to the Trades and Labor Council, and so forth.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then you say you became an organizer for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right; out of Chicago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you hold that position?

Mr. TIPPETT. Not very long; 1 or 2 years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that after the World War?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All right. Now, proceed, chronologically.

Mr. TIPPETT. Then, from there I went to work for the Federated Press in Chicago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you go to work for the Federated Press?

Mr. TIPPETT. I believe I have that here. In 1919.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you work for the Federated Press?

Mr. TIPPETT. Until 1922.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From 1919 to 1922?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What were your duties in the Federated Press?

Mr. TIPPETT. The Federated Press was just being organized then, or had just been organized. I went around to the trade-unions and labor papers soliciting money to finance the Federated Press. I then became Federated Press correspondent, and later became its business manager.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the head of the Federated Press?

Mr. TIPPETT. A man named E. J. Costello and Robert Buck who was the editor of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What title did Costello hold?

Mr. TIPPETT. I am not positive now, but he was the editor or director or head man.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who organized the Federated Press?

Mr. TIPPETT. I was not there and I don't know, but it was organized by a group of trade-unions; the Chicago Federation of Labor, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and the Engineer's Journal. When

I went there those persons were members of the board. I think William Foster——

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is William Z. Foster?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right, representing the Daily Worker, was on the board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was not representing the Daily Worker back in 1919 to 1922, was he?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; he was representing the Daily Worker on the Federated Press.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just a moment. I think perhaps your memory fails you slightly there.

Mr. TIPPETT. That might be.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker was not established until about 1924. He must have been representing the Trade Union Educational League.

Mr. TIPPETT. Well, some publication.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or some publication of the Trade Union Educational League.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the names of other persons who were on the board at the time?

Mr. TIPPETT. Mr. Schlossberg.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that Benjamin Schlossberg?

Mr. TIPPETT. His name is Joseph, is it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. There were two of them.

Mr. TIPPETT. Joseph. He was secretary of Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Robert Buck represented New Majority.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Represented what?

Mr. TIPPETT. Represented New Majority. That was the Chicago Federation of Labor official organ. A man by the name of Coyle, I think, represented the Engineer's Journal.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was Albert Coyle?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think his name was Albert. I don't remember the others.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration or salary in connection with your duties in the Federated Press?

Mr. TIPPETT. I can't recall that off-hand; between \$50 and \$75 a week.

Mr. MATTHEWS. After you left the Federated Press, what was your next employment?

Mr. TIPPETT. Educational director for the United Mine Workers in Hillsboro, Ill.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what your remuneration was in that position?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't recall specifically, but it was something similar to the figures I have just given you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you hold that position?

Mr. TIPPETT. From 1922 to 1927.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you stationed in Hillsboro, Ill., during that entire period?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And when you left the position of educational director of the United Mine Workers of America in 1927, where did you go?

Mr. TIPPETT. Brookwood Labor College.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you at Brookwood?

Mr. TIPPETT. From 1927 to 1932.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your position at Brookwood?

Mr. TIPPETT. I was an instructor in economics, and I worked on a half-time basis the first year. I attended Columbia University during that time. Then I think the next year I became its extension director, as a full-time job. I taught and directed extension work.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration at Brookwood?

Mr. TIPPETT. Again, I don't know off-hand. There was a money remuneration, and then there were living quarters, and that kind of thing. Oh, it was four or five thousand dollars a year, I would guess. All of that is listed somewhere in my personal-history statement. I have it right there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the head of the Brookwood Labor College at that time?

Mr. TIPPETT. A. J. Muste.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that M-u-s-t-e?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he the head of Brookwood during the entire period of your employment there from 1927 until 1932?

Mr. TIPPETT. He was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is Brookwood Labor College, or was Brookwood Labor College located at Katonah, N. Y.?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you travel extensively during your employment at Brookwood?

Mr. TIPPETT. Fairly extensively.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the purpose of your travels?

Mr. TIPPETT. Developing the extension work of Brookwood; making lectures. I was sent out by this school as a lecturer, attending labor conferences, et cetera.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you at Brookwood Labor College when the American Federation of Labor withdrew its support from the institution on the ground of its communist character?

Mr. TIPPETT. I was there. I think I was. I am not sure that they had ever formally supported this group and withdrew it, but I was there during the criticism of the school by the American Federation of Labor; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it be correct to say that the American Federation of Labor denounced the school or repudiated the school?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I think it would not be correct to say that, because the school was largely supported and made up of American Federation of Labor unions. I think it would be fair to say that some officials of the American Federation of Labor denounced the school; Mr. Woll in particular, and maybe others.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did they do so in their personal capacities or in the name of the federation as a whole?

Mr. TIPPETT. In the name of the federation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. They did it in the name of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, did they not?

Mr. TIPPETT. I imagine that is true. I don't know the details, but I suppose so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the charge against the school that of communism, in general terms?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think that is correct. I don't know the specific charge, but it was similar to that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your recollection is that it involved the issue of communism?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. The school was called radical, Communist, and so on. I don't know the details. I have never seen the charge myself, and I have forgotten.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you active in writing during your employment at Brookwood Labor College?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of any trade-union yourself during your employment at Brookwood?

Mr. TIPPETT. I was a member of the United Mine Workers and the Teachers Union. I joined the Teachers Union at Brookwood.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you belong to Local 189 of the American Federation of Teachers?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know the number, but if that was the local at Brookwood, I belonged to it, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it refresh your recollection if I showed you a copy of the cover page of a booklet which deals with the conferences held at Brookwood, and which states that it was edited by a committee of Local 189?

Mr. TIPPETT. I suppose that is true, and I imagine that committee was a committee of the members at Brookwood, but I am not sure of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were active in such work as the editing of pamphlets and publications emanating from Brookwood, were you not?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I never edited. No. I didn't do that there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a member of the American Federation of Teachers, did you have a part in the editing of this particular pamphlet which was issued at Brookwood, Katonah, N. Y., 1931?

Mr. TIPPETT. No. If that is a report of a conference at Brookwood, I imagine I participated in the conference, but I had nothing to do with preparing the booklet.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a copy of a booklet entitled "Ten Years of Workers Education, a Survey. Eighth Annual Conference of Teachers and Workers Education, February 21-23, 1931," edited by a committee of Local 189, American Federation of Teachers.

Have you seen that publication before?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't think I have, but I am sure it existed, and I might have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a member of this eighth annual conference held at Brookwood Labor College, were you not?

Mr. TIPPETT. I assume I was. If that is the date I was there, I was, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated that you were employed at Brookwood until 1932.

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right. What year was that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was 1931.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I assume I was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you employed at Brookwood during the year 1932?

Mr. TIPPETT. No. I left Brookwood during that year, and I don't remember off-hand when.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your next employment after you left Brookwood Labor College in 1932?

Mr. TIPPETT. My next employment for an organization was with the Affiliated Schools for Workers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the official title of that organization Affiliated Summer Schools for Workers or just Affiliated School for Workers?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; and then the name has changed now to American Educational Labor Service, I think. It was called Affiliated Schools, and the Affiliated Schools were the summer schools that you refer to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you actively associated with the Affiliated Schools for Workers?

Mr. TIPPETT. When I left Brookwood in 1932, somewhere until 1936. And I was not employed by them constantly, but all the work I did during that time, other than for myself, I was employed by the Affiliated Schools; fairly constantly, I should say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration in connection with your duties with the Affiliated Schools for Workers?

Mr. TIPPETT. I can't answer that off-hand. I would be employed by the schools on a project to do a special kind of job, and I would be paid for it, and I would guess it was around \$75 a week or something like that; I don't remember. I don't have my notes with me on that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you teach at some of the summer schools of the Affiliated Schools for Workers?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; and I think we were paid then by those schools, and not the Affiliated Schools. No; I think we were paid by the Affiliated Schools.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were these schools located where you taught?

Mr. TIPPETT. During that period I taught at Bucknell. I think that is all. That was a school for office workers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1936, or after 1936, what employment did you take up?

Mr. TIPPETT. In 1936 I went to work for the Work Projects Administration, a research project, with headquarters in Philadelphia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you hold that position?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't remember offhand; approximately a year, and then I was transferred from there, without losing employment, to the Research Department of the W. P. A. in Washington; so my employment was continuous.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From 1936 until what year?

Mr. TIPPETT. 1940.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For a period of approximately 4 years you were employed by W. P. A.?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration in that position?

Mr. TIPPETT. Thirty-two, thirty-eight, forty, forty-two, I think, hundred dollars a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. \$3,200?

Mr. TIPPETT. \$3,200, \$3,800.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Oh, I see.

Mr. TIPPETT. \$4,000 and \$4,200.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You had three increases after you took the position; from \$3,200 to \$3,800 and \$3,800 to \$4,000 and \$4,000 to \$4,200; is that right?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you located elsewhere after you came to Washington with the W. P. A., during your employment with W. P. A.?

Mr. TIPPETT. What do you mean?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I mean, after you came to Washington with the W. P. A. did you remain here until 1940?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. I went out once or twice on a research job for W. P. A. Then I was transferred from the research division to the personnel office, the chief personnel office, and I remained there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1940 what new position did you take?

Mr. TIPPETT. In 1940, in May, I went from W. P. A. personnel office to the newspaper PM in New York, or in Brooklyn, N. Y. I remained there until October of that same year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your official position on PM?

Mr. TIPPETT. Personnel manager, I think they call it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that from the time of the inception of PM until October 1940?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. PM was not published when I went there. I have forgotten the date it was published, but it was a month or two before its publication in May.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The first issue of PM appeared under date of June 23, 1940.

Mr. TIPPETT. What date in June?

Mr. MATTHEWS. June 23, 1940.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. Then I was there. I went to work on May 15. It was a little more than a month before the first issue.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did your duties on PM involve assembling of the staff for the publication?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. The staff was largely assembled. My duties on PM were to put order in the employment of the staff, work out personnel procedures, the negotiations of labor contracts, and so forth, and the laying off of people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You had authority to lay off, did you?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have authority to hire?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you both hire and lay off employees on PM during your work there?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir. The authority would be based in this way: The paper would need certain kinds of employees, and I would be instructed to hire that many of that kind of people. Then it had a large staff, and as soon as it began publication, it began to reduce its personnel, and I would be told to lay off so many people from each department. And, there would be conferences on that, and they would be selected by the heads and the rest of us, and I would lay them off.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your salary on PM?

Mr. TIPPETT. \$5,600.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you go in October 1940, when you left PM?

Mr. TIPPETT. I returned to Washington, to the National Youth Administration.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you take that position in October 1940?

Mr. TIPPETT. November first I began working there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the title which you held with the National Youth Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think it was business manager, or something similar.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration there with the National Youth Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. \$3,200 and \$3,800.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you with the National Youth Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. Until June first the following year, 1941.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you receive your raise from \$3,200 to \$3,800?

Mr. TIPPETT. At the end; very end. I am not positive now that I actually received it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What were your duties as business manager of the National Youth Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. My job actually was assisting one of the Deputy Administrators, and my job was to purchase the supplies, to run the files and the stenographic services and space, and so forth.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the Deputy Administrator for whom you were an assistant?

Mr. TIPPETT. Karl Borders.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the Administrator of the National Youth Administration at that time?

Mr. TIPPETT. Aubrey Williams.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In June 1941, where did you go?

Mr. TIPPETT. To the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you still employed at the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your official title in the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. Now?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. TIPPETT. Chief, Field Operations Branch, in the Rent Division.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your title when you first went with the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. Assistant Chief of Field Operations, I think.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the Rent Division?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir. The Rent Division at that time was in the Consumers' Division in O. P. A. It was taken out later and put in the Price Division.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your salary when you first went to the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. \$5,600.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your present salary?

Mr. TIPPETT. \$6,500.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you receive the increase?

Mr. TIPPETT. I am not sure offhand, but after it was reorganized and turned over into Price, approximately 6 months ago. That may be wrong, but it is something like that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who sponsored your employment with the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. What do you mean by that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you invited by someone particularly to take the position or were you recommended by other persons, or the same person, or what were the circumstances under which you became employed as the result of the assistance of other persons?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know. I didn't know of anyone in the Office of Price Administration. I was asked. I was recruited by the chief in charge. I didn't know him, and I don't know who recommended me. I didn't ask for the job. I don't know anything about that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By "the chief in charge" do you refer to Karl Borders?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was with the National Youth Administration.

Mr. TIPPETT. The man who recruited me was Joseph Tuffs.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How do you spell his last name?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think it is T-u-f-f-s.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is he still in the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. No. He is in Washington. I think he is with the War Production Board, but I am not sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know of any other persons who were interested in your employment at the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I do not. They telephoned to me out of the clear sky. I didn't know them. I did nothing myself. I didn't know anything about that, and I was a stranger there. I didn't know anyone there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it Tuffs who telephoned you?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who sponsored your employment with the National Youth Administration? And, by "Sponsored," again, I mean the same general situation as I described in connection with your employment in the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. TIPPETT. Again, I don't know. Mr. Karl Borders recruited me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Borders personally extend the invitation to you?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To come with the National Youth Administration.

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right. I went in as his assistant, really.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who invited you to take your position with the newspaper PM?

Mr. TIPPETT. Mr. Ingersoll, the managing editor, or the owner.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Had you known Ralph Ingersoll prior to that time?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know how Ralph Ingersoll knew about you?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I don't. They were looking for a personnel man and a man with a labor background; at least, that is what they told me, in writing back, and I went up to see him, and we talked back and forth for a while, and I took the job.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether anyone recommended you to Ralph Ingersoll?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know the facts about the matter, but I imagine it was the attorney. I am not sure about that. I knew his attorney, Mr. Louis Weiss. He knew me, and he was then and is now the chief attorney for the PM. And while they were building the thing and looking around for people, I assume he mentioned my name, or told Ingersoll about me, or something like that. Mr. Ingersoll didn't tell me that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He spells his name W-e-i-s-s?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think you do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In respect to your employment in W. P. A., who invited you to that position, or who sponsored you for that position?

Mr. TIPPETT. Mr. David Weintraub was the director of the project. He recruited me. I had written a novel, which was published about that time or sometime prior to that, and he had read it. It was about coal miners. The title it had was "A Labor Study of Coal in West Virginia." That was how my name got to him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was going to ask you if you are an author?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give the titles of the books which you have published?

Mr. TIPPETT. Well, the one I just mentioned and Horeshoe Bottoms, a novel. When Southern Labor Stirs is a labor research job. Your Job and Your Pay is an economic textbook for workers' classes. That is all the books.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you written for publications, newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; some.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For which ones?

Mr. TIPPETT. Well, long ago, of course, in the Federated Press. I wrote for the Federated Press, and it sold its service to lots and lots of papers. I have written, not very much, but I have written some for magazines. The old Mercury I wrote something for; New Republic, I suppose, and The Nation; not very much, but maybe one or two articles. The Survey Graphic, I think, I had an article in once. That is all I recall at the moment. I didn't do very much of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On January 24, 1936, at the Hotel Lismore, in New York, there was held a banquet in celebration of the forty-fifth anniversary of Mother Ella Reeve Bloor. Were you one of the sponsors of that banquet?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that in celebration of her forty-fifth year of activity in connection with organized labor or other political activities?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know for sure, and I have never seen the document you have. I didn't attend the dinner. I was asked to sponsor it, because she had published or was about to publish her biography, and

that banquet or dinner was organized around her as a person, but it was partly, also, to publicize her book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The banquet was organized by the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States, was it?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know. I was asked to sponsor it by a non-Communist, a miner's wife from Illinois whom I had known all my life, who was in New York at the time and interested in the banquet.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was that?

Mr. TIPPETT. Mrs. Agnes Wieck.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How do you spell Wieck, W-i-e-c-k?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think there is an "s" on it too, but I am not sure. She is Mrs. Her husband is Edgar Wieck, of the Russell Sage Foundation. Or, Edwin Wieck, I think it is, of the Illinois Coal Miners.

Mr. MATTHEWS. My information is that her name is Agnes Burns Wieck.

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right; Burns.

Mr. MATTHEWS. W-i-e-c-k?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is correct. Burns is her middle name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever seen the booklet which was put out preparatory to the banquet?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will ask, Mr. Chairman, that this booklet be received in evidence as an exhibit.

The CHAIRMAN. It may.

(The booklet referred to was marked "Tippett Exhibit No. 1.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a copy of the booklet. On what would be page 2 of the booklet, if the pages were numbered, there appears a statement concerning the auspices under which the banquet was held, signed, "Central Committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A."

On page 9, or what would be page 9 if the pages were numbered, there appears a list of the sponsors of the banquet, which includes the name of the witness, Tom Tippett.

Among the advertisers who placed advertisements in the booklet are: Unemployment Council of New York, the American Student Union, the United Council of Working Class Women, the Labor Research Bureau, the Jewish Morning Freiheit, Commonwealth College, Young Communist League, American League Against War and Fascism, Workers School, the Artists Union, the Communist Party, International Labor Defense, Finnish Workers Federation, Workers Library Publishers, Farmers National Committee for Action, Methodist Federation for Social Service, New Theater League, and the hotel where the banquet was held.

Mr. TIPPETT. Those of us who were asked to sponsor, or at least, in my own case, knew Mother Bloor was a Communist. I knew that it would be a Communist show. There was no attempt on the part of Mrs. Wieck to fool me. I was working for the Government at the time. There were other non-Communist speakers, and it was an obvious attempt to get people to come to the banquet who were not Communists to hear about Mother Bloor and to read her book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you attend the banquet?

Mr. TIPPETT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether Earl Browder was the principal speaker at the banquet?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know, but I would assume he would have been.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are well acquainted with the career of Mother Bloor?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is, you knew of her.

Mr. TIPPETT. I knew she was a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She is one of the outstanding Communist women leaders in America.

Mr. TIPPETT. I would say so. It was a publicity stunt and everybody knew that, I think.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you connected in any way with the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I suppose I was, in a way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your connection with the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. TIPPETT. I was at Brookwood when that was organized. It grew out of, or partly grew out of the activities of Brookwood at the time, and was what it says. It grew out of, or the organization grew out of a conference or a number of conferences of people for progressive labor action. Mr. Muste was one of the leading men in it. And I was at Brookwood, and I think they used my name in the beginning of its organization, and so forth. I didn't participate in it much. I was not interested particularly in the political aspects of labor, but my connection with it was in that way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was A. J. Muste the chairman of the organization?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think he was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who the executive secretary was?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the publication known as Labor Age of September 1932, Louis F. Budenz was executive secretary of the organization. Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. TIPPETT. I know him, and he was at that time editor of Labor Age.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have some doubt that he was executive secretary at the time?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the same publication, Labor Age for September 1932, on page 5, there is a list of the national executive committee and officers of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action. On this list the name Tom Tippet appears as educational director of the West Virginia Mine Workers Union.

I am not sure in my own mind whether "educational director" means that you were educational director for the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, or whether you were educational director for the West Virginia Mine Workers Union.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is a comma there, and I didn't know which it referred to.

Mr. TIPPETT. I assume it means I was educational director for the West Virginia Mine Workers. I was never educational director for the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, and I did do more work, educational work for the West Virginia Mine Workers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a member of the national executive committee of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, were you not?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think my name appears as a member.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever attend any meeting of the executive committee?

Mr. TIPPETT. No. So far as I know I never did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are satisfied that you were listed as a member of the national executive committee?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the organization?

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever read the program of the organization?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I don't think I ever did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever read the publication Labor Age?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I have read it off and on over the years, in the old days when it was going.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you employed during September, 1932?

Mr. TIPPETT. September 1932?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. Had you already gone to work with the Affiliated Schools for Workers at that time?

Mr. TIPPETT. I am not sure whether I was working for the Affiliated Schools or for Brookwood.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The stated objective of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, as it appeared on its official letterhead which, Mr. Chairman, has already been introduced as an exhibit in connection with the testimony of E. J. Lever, states:

It aims to inspire the workers to take control of government and industry, to abolish capitalism and to build a workers republic.

Is that your recollection of the stated objective of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. TIPPETT. I never read it in that way, but according to the atmosphere of the world then, I should say that that is what it would say it was trying to do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The preamble to the Constitution of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action begins with the following:

Planless profiteering, war-provoking, imperialistic capitalism must be abolished. It cannot be reformed. Sham, political delusion which has been the tool of capitalist business and finance must also go.

Do you recall that that was part of the constitution of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. TIPPETT. No. As I say, I am not familiar with its constitution or the slogans. I don't doubt but what you are saying were their stated aims at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This also, Mr. Chairman, is already introduced as exhibit 11 in connection with the testimony of E. J. Lever.

Mr. TIPPETT. The Conference for Progressive Labor Action work, however, was attempting to revive life in the labor movement at the time, organizing trade-unions and labor parties, etc. It was never considered a subversive or illegal organization. It was opposed by the Communists. It was an anti-Communist group. And it didn't live very long, and I had nothing to do with it, other than having my

name used, with my permission, I am sure, to get it going, as was common in those days when people were trying to revive the renaissance of labor which has taken place, or which took place in a few years, with the obvious development of the C. I. O., and so on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever publicly repudiate your association with the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I never publicly repudiated it. What happened was that in those days, at that time, when they were trying to get started, my name was used and I was asked to come in and participate. I was not a good labor politician. I was not interested in the political developments. I didn't have enough interest in it; just a drop to me from the activities I had; because of that reason.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever attend any of the conferences of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. TIPPETT. I assume I did, sir, because I was out practically all the time and I was attending all sorts of conferences at that time; not very many, I should say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not in your attendance at any of the gatherings of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action you took issue with its officially stated program?

Mr. TIPPETT. I might have and I might not have; I don't remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Labor Age for December 1931 has an article entitled "C. P. L. A. A Positive Statement of Program and Action, by A. J. Muste."

This article has already been introduced as an exhibit in connection with the testimony of E. J. Lever and marked as "Exhibit 10."

Labor Age of November 1931 contains the statement of purpose of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action on page 26. This also has been introduced in connection with the testimony of E. J. Lever and marked "Exhibit 9."

When the Conference for Progressive Labor Action went out of existence and was succeeded in part, at least, by the American Workers Party, were you associated in any way with the American Workers Party?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not your name was used by those who were leading the American Workers Party?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your recollection is positive, however, that you were not associated with them?

Mr. TIPPETT. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the city of Cleveland, in August of 1931 or 1932, there was held a trade-union conference, which was arranged by the provisional committee, Trade Union Conference for United Action. Do you recall that conference?

Mr. TIPPETT. No. I am familiar with the episode because that was brought up in another investigation. I am aware of it because of that ring. I never saw that call until the investigational meeting I referred to. At that time I was working, in the summer, with the Progressive Mine Workers in Illinois. That was an organization that had split off from the United Mine Workers of America. It was an anti-John L. Lewis development. At that time the communistic groups, under their various subterfuges, were attempting to influence that particular

movement. I assume, without knowing, that the meeting you refer to was called by that group. If I had seen that call I would have recognized it at once for what it was. I never saw it. I know nothing about the meeting. I understand my name is on there as one of the persons who sponsored it, or something.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who signed the call?

Mr. TIPPETT. Who signed the call; yes. I did not attend the meeting. I never heard of it until it was referred to in an investigation by the Civil Service Commission, but I am and was then sophisticated enough to know, even though I may have been ideological for united action, I would recognize that for what it was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which was what?

Mr. TIPPETT. An attempt on the part of the Communist Party to influence non-Communist labor activities, and I assume that my name would be tossed in there, because that name might influence miners in Illinois to come to the meeting. I never heard of the meeting, and I know of no miner who did go. I was not asked to give my name. I know nothing about it other than what I have stated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Alex Fraser?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was connected with the Progressive Miners, of which you spoke.

Mr. TIPPETT. In Illinois?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. TIPPETT. I may know him, too, if you can tell me something more about him. I don't recall him by that name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. My information is somewhat restricted to the fact that he was an official of some capacity with the Progressive Miners Union.

Mr. TIPPETT. He was not an official of the head union. He may have been a local union official. I don't know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is listed as one of the signers of this call. Did you know Edward Ryan, Jr.?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Wasn't he a student at Brookwood?

Mr. TIPPETT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. While you were there?

Mr. TIPPETT. Maybe. Was he a miner?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. He worked in the textile union, incidentally, in Philadelphia.

Mr. TIPPETT. Oh, yes; I remember him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Popularly known as Eddie Ryan.

Mr. TIPPETT. Oh, yes; I remember him, from the hosiery workers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. He was a student while I was a teacher there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was listed as the president of this conference, together with Louis Weinstock as secretary.

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know Mr. Weinstock. I would know Eddie Ryan, and Eddie Ryan at that time was no longer at Brookwood, and I hadn't seen him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Wasn't he, however, active in the Conference for Progressive Labor Action at this time?

Mr. TIPPETT. I am not sure. I don't know. I wasn't, and I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know Louis Weinstock by reputation, do you not, of the painters union in New York?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you examined the list of those who allegedly signed this call?

Mr. TIPPETT. I saw it once. I didn't examine it very thoroughly, but I said at the time and I would say now from what you have already read, that it would be a meeting that I would not participate in because of its Communist complexion and leadership.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not the Conference for Progressive Labor Action was, to some extent, flirting with the Communist Party at this period?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know, because I was not interested in the Conference for Progressive Labor Action.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a member of the national executive committee or listed as such, with your consent.

Mr. TIPPETT. Was I still then?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; in 1931.

Mr. TIPPETT. I just don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The names of William Z. Foster, J. W. Ford, Earl Browder, Max Bedacht, Israel Amter, and a score of more or less equally prominent Communists are listed among the signers. That would convey to your mind that the Communists had a very prominent role.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. Even if those names were not, some of the others I would have recognized.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, also from the fact that the names of Louis Budenz, E. F. Cope, E. J. Lever, A. J. Muste, Edward Ryan, and others of that sort appear on here, would suggest to your mind, would it not that the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, in which all of those individuals I have named were, at least, prominent, was the main cooperating group with this Communist Party in this enterprise.

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know. I never saw that before. The first man you mentioned there was Mr. Budenz?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know the chronology of dates, but Mr. Budenz did leave the Muste movement and become a Communist, and I would have known that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He did not leave it at that time. He was still active with the Muste group. And, you recognize the other names I read in connection with Budenz as persons in the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever see the report of Helen Norton, of Brookwood Labor College, as she gave it at the Eighth Annual Conference of the Teachers and Workers Education at Brookwood, in 1931?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't remember seeing it, but I am sure I must have. I know Miss Norton. She was on the faculty at Brookwood.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what her exact position on the faculty was?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. She was an instructor of journalism and did edit, of course, things like that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to this pamphlet you were present at the conference that participated in the discussion?

Mr. TAPPETT. Yes. I am sure I must have then.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At least, do you recall having heard Helen Norton's report on the history of Brookwood?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I don't recall, but again, I say, when I was at Brookwood, reports like that were constantly coming up. Conferences like that were being held. I was at the school and out of the school and I ought to be familiar with that report, and I must have known. I never heard it before in the form you have it, and I don't remember having heard Miss Norton read it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 75 of the booklet of the Eighth Annual Conference of the Teachers and Workers Education, there appears the following, with reference to graduates of Brookwood Labor College:

Out of 43 persons engaged in labor political activity, 31 are Communists. Be it said to Brookwood's credit that it has not manufactured any Republicans or Democrats.

Do you recall having heard Miss Norton give that report?

Mr. TIPPETT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The 43 persons referred to are said to have graduated; 13 of them in the period 1923 to 1926 and 30 of them in the period 1927 to 1930.

Mr. TIPPETT. How many of them during that time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Thirty; thirty of the forty-three. In the period 1927 to 1930, that would cover the period of your own instruction at Brookwood Labor College, would it not?

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't have any recollection of having challenged Miss Norton's figures?

Mr. TIPPETT. Oh, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied that she was giving a correct report?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I would assume that was correct, if Helen Norton gave it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this pamphlet or booklet be received in evidence as an exhibit entitled "Ten Years of Workers Education, Eighth Annual Conference of the Teachers and Workers Education," published at Brookwood, Katonah, N. Y., 1931.

(The booklet referred to was marked "Tippett Exhibit 2.")

Mr. TIPPETT. You know, of course, that to the school came students who were Communists, every year. There were a few who were Communists. The schools did not turn out Communists. Most of the Brookwood graduates were not Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. However, that would be the plain inference of Miss Norton's statement, would it not, when she states that 31 of them were Communists, and immediately follows with the statement—

Be it said to Brookwood's credit that it has not manufactured any Republicans or Democrats.

Mr. TIPPETT. Well, that statement could be amplified. Brookwood was at that time—as the general labor movement and as the general labor forces in the country were—attempting to organize an independent movement, and if the inference is that most of the Brookwood students became Communists, that is a wrong inference, and that is not what Miss Norton meant. You would have to look at statistics different from that. There was always a minority of Communists there. The Communist Party was always opposed to the school. There was always an awful lot of argument and trouble, because it was the business of the faculty of the school not to deny freedom of speech to Communists, but to see that the other students, from the North and from the South and from abroad, were given the whole picture. And, as you know, there was a great deal of unnecessary talk and argument because of the Communist position that was constantly being produced by the two or three Communist students that would be there. It had Socialist students, too, and the usual fights between those factions were always going on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Communist students were not rejected as students; were they?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; they were not admitted either as a whole. Some of them were brought in, because the Communist activity was a vital part of the American labor scene. And students coming to Brookwood, or entering college, going out into the movement, were rendered Communists the next day. And the school took in some Communist members, some Socialist members, and the rest, because you would have representatives of the current labor scene there then.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As I understand Miss Norton's report, the inference is that there may have been two or three hundred graduates of Brookwood over this period, but 43 of them had gone into labor organization work, and that out of those 43, 31 were Communists.

Mr. TIPPETT. That would not be correct. All of the students who came to Brookwood were supposed to go into labor work. A large number of them came from active labor work. The trade unions sent them there as organizers, or they were already developing in the labor movement. Then they sent other members to become leaders. And the school's whole program was directed to making, creating, and training them for participation in the labor movement, and it did not create them to participate in the Communist movement.

Now, it may be that a Communist as a Communist, an individual Communist, attacked some of them, but a great many of them they didn't, and the school was under constant attack by the Communists and they sent some of their members up there to raise hell with the school, as was their program.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The exact language is:

The number of the graduates engaging in labor political activity has risen from 13 in the 1923-26 group to 30 in the 1927-30.

I suppose "group" should have been there, but it is not—
and out of 43 persons engaged in labor political activity, 31 are Communists.

Mr. TIPPETT. I never saw that before, and there were very many more students at Brookwood around that time, and I don't know what Communists she means there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated that you wrote a book entitled "Your Job and Your Pay." Was that in collaboration with Catherine H. Pollak?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know where Catherine Pollak is at present?

Mr. TIPPETT. She is in Washington, but I don't know specially where. I have not seen her since I left Brookwood, to speak of.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether she is employed in the Federal Government or not?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. One section of the book entitled "Your Job and Your Pay" deals with the Constitution of the United States; is that correct?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I think it is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should like to read you some of the statements from the book:

We are often told that the men who started the United States Government were wonderful, all wise men who were acting for the good of all people forever after. We are often told that the United States Government is perfect and is equally fair to all. But as a matter of fact the men who started the United States Government, although they were able leaders, were also property owners; like other property owners they wanted a form of government that would protect property and help property owners, and they set up the kind of government that would help them.

Then, to skip onto the next page:

They were not drawing up a constitution for the welfare of the people as a whole; they were trying to set up a government that would protect their interests as property owners. So property owners have fostered stories about the Constitution that would make the people think the Constitution is perfect and sacred. The Constitution was, in fact, drawn up in secrecy by a convention of property-owners; merchants, money lenders, lawyers, and great land owners. These people had not been given the power to draw up an entirely new form of government. But they took the power. The Constitution was, in other words, the work of property owners.

All that I have read is an exact quotation, although I have skipped from page to page culling out the specific references to the Constitution as the work of property owners. I take it that was your view of the Constitution when you wrote the book.

Mr. TIPPETT. If you have the book before you, you will see that the reference is footnoted and taken from page 309 of the Rights of American Civilization, by Charles A. and Mary R. Beard. And, that is historically correct, is it not? And, it does account for the Bill of Rights; I mean, historically. That is a direct quotation from, I imagine the most eminent historians in America, and which is read in every school and college of any importance in the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The portions which I read from the book are not indicated as quotations from another source.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; there is a footnote there. I have a reference to that here. I could give you the page number.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There was also a section dealing with war in the book entitled "Your Job and Your Pay," wasn't there?

Mr. TIPPETT. I assume there was. I don't remember the book. It was written, incidentally, by myself and Miss Pollak. Miss Pollak did the writing. She was my assistant at school, and it was taken

from the discussions, pro and con, of the Brookwood classes; my class in particular.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 222 there appears the following: "Why do wars take place?"

On page 223 there is what appears to be an answer to that question:

Naturally the businessmen try to make people think they are fighting for ideals. Workers wouldn't fight just to make their employers rich. But the desire for profits lies back of it all. And workers are actually dying in wars to make money for other people. Read the story for yourself in other books.

Do you recall that?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't recall that, but I don't deny that it appeared there. And, there was in the back of that book a long list of other readings. The attempt obviously was to get students to read other books and make up their opinions about war. And, I should say, if you consider war at the time that book was written, it has a little different connotation than this present war.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the date of publication of the book?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I don't; but it was in the early thirties. It was written around the early thirties, maybe 1932 or something like that, 1931.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 237 of the book appears the following:

The Communists pretty much agree with the Socialists about the ideal society. Both Communists and Socialists are trying to bring about a better world by the methods they think will be successful.

And on page 241 we find this:

The Communists are trying, unselfishly, to run industry and the Government for the welfare of the workers.

That last quotation refers to Russia.

On page 244 there appears the following:

For in Russia men are at last using all their knowledge for the welfare of the people as a whole. They are doing their best to build the better world that surely we would all like to see.

Do you call those discussions of imperialism and Russia?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't recall them exactly, but I assume they were there. You can't take them out of their context of that kind; you have to read the whole book to get the meaning. And, there was, or there is in the book somewhere reference to the Communist tactics in this country, at any rate, and as I remember it now, not a recommendation to accept Communists in here, but on the contrary—

Mr. MATTHEWS. To take the last sentence which I read, "They are doing their best to build the better world that surely we would all like to see," did that sentence receive any important modification or clarification in the context of the book?

Mr. TIPPETT. I am not sure, but generally speaking, that book at that time would point to the Russian experiment as an experiment that was significant to the world, and particularly to the workers of the world. It did state that those changes or improvements in America would not necessarily come in America like Russia, because of the different historical background, et cetera.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not there was any definite criticism of Russia's Communism in the book?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't recall. I don't have the book before me. There was enough in the book against the Communist program in America to bring down the condemnation of the Communist Party to the book. The book was widely used in all workers educational classes that I know of, and in those sponsored by the United States Government and, until this investigation, was never called anything but an accurate or a fairly accurate textbook for workers classes, and it was written by workers who were participating in that kind of business around the country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 237 the following appears:

Both Communists and Socialists are trying to bring about a better world by the methods they think will be successful.

Then it says:

So if you want to understand efforts that are being made to bring about a better social order, you ought to know both the Socialist and the Communist points of view.

You don't recall whether or not anything appeared in this section or elsewhere in the book indicating that there might be some other alternative?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; there were other alternatives there, and the book ought to be read, and I cannot give you the page and verse, because I don't have the book here, but it does discourage and point out, I am sure, that the Communists believed in the end that you might have to have force and violence, and the Socialists didn't and various others didn't.

Now, every workers' school that I ever attended, and every other kind of school that I ever attended, where political and sociological problems were being discussed, it would be considered good teaching to tell students that they ought to familiarize themselves with the program of these various groups being offered to them, but they were never recommended in Brookwood, for the same reason I should think one might now analyze Hitler's program to see whether one would want to adopt it, and the answer, I think, would be that one would not adopt it if he were an American.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The categorical statement appears that the Russian Communists are doing their best to build a better world that surely we would all like to see.

Mr. TIPPETT. Meaning in Russia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the other sentence, referring to Socialists and Communists, states that they are also trying to build a better world, by better methods, and that anyone interested in their subject should know both from their point of view.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I should think that would be sound.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You would not put reference to Nazi Germany in the same kind of language?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, I would not; but the same kind of category, same sort of teaching, I should say, would be one way by which American trade unions would not participate in Communist Party activities, would be to see their tactics. The same would be true of any other group, including the Nazis.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you were with the magazine PM, was James Wechsler on the staff?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think so; in the labor end.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know James Wechsler?

Mr. TIPPETT. I knew him very casually. I didn't know him. I wouldn't know him if he came in the room, but he was there, I think.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you hire James Wechsler for PM?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you lay him off?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know by reputation, if not by first-hand knowledge, what James Wechsler's political affiliations have been?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. James Wechsler has contributed an article to the Young Communist Review; one of his booklets was published by the Workers Library Publishers; he was affiliated with the American League Against War and Fascism, American Student Union, was editor of the publication of the American Student Union; was a contributor to the New Masses; he wrote a book for the International Publishers; he was a member of the Communist Party campaign committee; he was a member of the editorial board of the magazine Champion, official organ of the Young Communist League. Did you know of any of those connections with those organizations while he was employed on PM?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I don't know, and I don't know Mr. Wechsler. I think he was in the labor department, they called it then. Now, when I went to PM from here, PM was pretty much unknown to me. I had not heard the name until I received a letter from Mr. Ingersoll, and when I went to New York, and it became known that I was there by some of my friends I was told, and there was quite a campaign in New York at the time, that PM was a Communist sheet, and so on. There was a whole whispering and audible campaign that this was going to be—or, that this was an undercover, under a Communist front, and it was full of Communists, et cetera, et cetera. There were Communists there on the paper when I got there, I believe. There may still be Communists there, so far as I know. I had nothing to do with employing those people and I had nothing to do with the program of the party. I know that PM was not a Communist publication, from its first publication to the last one. Its record is public property, and I think the gossip about it being a Communist sheet has died out, and some of the persons said to be Communists are no longer there, but that is true of a great many other people that were there in the beginning.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were apprised of the fact that the publication was widely called the uptown edition of the Daily Worker?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know David Ramsey?

Mr. TIPPETT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was on the staff of the magazine while you were connected with it at one time.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; well, I don't know. I was there about 5½ months. It was an awfully busy time and I met everybody there. Some of them I knew before slightly, and some I got acquainted with there, and I don't remember all the names.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The committee's records show, Mr. Chairman, that David Ramsey was on the staff of PM during the period in which the

witness was personnel director of the magazine; furthermore, that David Ramsey was at one time prior to that one of the editors of the Communist Party publication, the Communist, and also on the staff of the Worker, and that the Communist Party alias is Herbert Rosen.

Were you apprised of any of those facts at the time?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Margaret Bourke-White?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir; I met her there. I know her.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know by reputation or first-hand information anything about her political orientation?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I was very much surprised to hear when I was there that she was called by some people, or she was one of the persons whose names was mentioned as a Communist. She was a photographer when I was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know that she was listed in 1935 as a member of the contributing staff of the Sunday Worker, the official publication of the Communist Party?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I had nothing to do with her coming to the paper. She was considered then, and is considered now, one of the outstanding photographers of the country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Leo Huberman?

Mr. TIPPETT. I met him there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know anything about his affiliations or associations with Communist organizations?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know that. No, I don't know. He was another person that was said to be a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He wrote a book which was published by the Workers Library Publishers. He was a member of the National Council of the League of American writers. He was affiliated with the American Student Union; has contributed frequently to the New Masses. Were you apprised of any of those facts?

Mr. TIPPETT. Mr. Huberman and the others you mentioned were on the paper. It was a going concern on the day of my arrival there. I had nothing to do with that. Mr. Huberman's writings, his department, reporting labor, as I say, speaks for itself. I think he is no longer there. He left shortly after I did. I have heard that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As personnel director of the magazine, didn't your duties cover the entire staff?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What segment of the staff?

Mr. TIPPETT. Well, as I say, when I went there the paper was practically ready to publish, and it was overstaffed. Now, they would need a reporter of some kind or other, or photographer or telephone operator, or another kind of clerical help. The office was besieged all the time. There were thousands and thousands and thousands of applicants there. My job, in the first instance, was to organize those applicants and to pick out and hire and interview and select a very few additional personnel that was added as the paper got going. I don't know how many were hired after I got there, but I should say a very small number, 10 or 12. A great many people were laid off.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was there any other personnel director on the paper when you were there?

Mr. TIPPETT. Not when I was there. Mr. Ingersol had done much of it himself and had hired the most of the personnel.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Weren't you the personnel director for the whole paper?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I was personnel director. That was my name. I was brought there to bring order in the personnel office and to help negotiate the contracts with the unions. The paper was staffed when I went there and began to decrease in numbers immediately.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you dismiss any member of the staff on the ground of Communist affiliations?

Mr. TIPPETT. No. The dismissals of the staff were made by the department heads, and I would implement those dismissals.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe you stated in the beginning that you had more or less of a final decision to make in the matter.

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I didn't mean to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether any individual was dismissed on the ground of Communist affiliations while you were on the pay roll?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I don't know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Louis Kronenberger?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he on the paper when you were there?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. He was dramatic critic.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you apprised of any Communist affiliations or associations of Louis Kronenberger at the time?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; except I think his name was one of them that somebody would say was a fellow traveler, or Communist, or something.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was affiliated with the League of American Writers, International Labor Defense and the National Committee for People's Rights. In a memorandum circulated by the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, to the departmental heads of the Federal Government, for their guidance, in dealing with subversive affiliations of employees, all three of those organizations were designated as subversive. They were the League of American Writers, International Labor Defense, and the National Committee for People's Rights.

Is it your understanding, of those three organizations in particular, that they are properly classified as Communist or subversive organizations?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know about those organizations. I don't know about Mr. Kronenberger. I had nothing to do whatever with the staff, to hire him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You surely know about the International Labor Defense?

Mr. TIPPETT. I would consider that a Communist organization, or one arm or one of the united front organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know anything about the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; but again I would assume that that was one. I don't know anything about it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That organization changed its name to the National Committee for People's Rights a few years ago.

Mr. TIPPETT. I would suspect that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, speaking about the League of American Writers, aren't you satisfied that that is another Communist educational organization; Communist dominated?

Mr. TIPPETT. I have heard so. I would assume so. I don't know anything about it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Leane Zugsmith?

Mr. TIPPETT. I met her there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She was on PM while you were there?

Mr. TIPPETT. A while, yes I don't know whether she left while I was there or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether she is the wife of Carl Randau?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I think so. He was there also.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know anything about the extensive Communist affiliations of Leane Zugsmith?

Mr. TIPPETT. No. She was there before I came. I had nothing to do with her.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She was affiliated with the International Labor Defense, League of American Writers, Friends of the Soviet Union, American League for Peace and Democracy, American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy, National Committee for People's Rights, contributor to the New Masses, on the staff of the Sunday Worker, and published a book for the Workers Library Publishers. That would suggest that she had considerable affiliations with Communist-front organizations, wouldn't it?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I should think it would. I had nothing to do with her coming or going from PM.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From this very partial list of individuals whom I have cited, who were on PM in the beginning of the magazine, do you know that there was some ground for the widespread allegation that the Communist Party subsequently penetrated or infiltrated the magazine?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know how to answer that. I think you have to judge a magazine by what it says. And I think Mr. Ingersoll, who organized the paper, for whatever reasons he organized it, he certainly didn't have in mind that it was to be a Communist publication. It never was. These persons whom you mentioned were hired, I assume, by Mr. Ingersoll; yes, I am sure they were. Now, what he knew about them, I don't know. It was not true that the Communist Party or the Communists had any influence there. The board of directors indicated that. The policy of the paper indicated that. The absence of some of the persons who may not be there now indicates that, I think. It was a prowar paper. It was attacking John L. Lewis at that time when the Communists were in his corner, and it was quite non-Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know personally or by reputation the Communist labor leader Lombardo Toledano?

Mr. TIPPETT. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have heard of him, haven't you?

Mr. TIPPETT. I don't know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You haven't heard of him?

Mr. TIPPETT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, there is a very considerable amount of evidence in the committee's hearings, and even more in the committee's files, that Lombardo Toledano is distinctly a Communist leader in the Mexican labor movement. The first issue of PM which appeared on June 23, 1940, features Toledano with a large degree of enthusiasm. The issues of PM from June until October of 1940 have numerous similar eulogies featuring prominent Communist leaders, in addition to Toledano. We have not made an analysis of the paper from that standpoint, but we do have issues which I should like to introduce as exhibits to substantiate that statement.

Mr. TIPPETT. May I make a statement in reply to that?

I had nothing to do with the policy of the paper. I had nothing to do with what went in it. It is my definite impression, from what I know of PM, that a charge of communism of that paper will not stand up before any intelligent analysis of the paper's record from its first day to now. Mr. Ingersoll's personality was expressed in every issue of that paper, and Mr. Ingersoll is a long ways from being what would be considered here a fellow traveler or Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all of the questions I have to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything you want to add?

Mr. TIPPETT. No; I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mason.

Mr. MASON. No; I have nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. I have one or two questions, Mr. Tippet, I want to ask you. You, of course, agree with this, that the members of the Communist Party, owe their primary loyalty to the Communist International, dont they? I mean, from your observation of them and from your long contact with them, hasn't that been one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Communists, or members of the Communist Party, plus the fact that they are subject to discipline and changing, according to the public's reaction, and so forth?

Mr. TIPPETT. You mean, they have a prior loyalty to Russia?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I think that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you believe that those who carelessly or knowingly affiliate with any organization where the primary loyalty of the organization and its members is to any foreign country, have some degree of responsibility for such affiliation? What I mean is this: Let us take the German-American Bund, which is a Nazi organization. A number of people have let the organization use their names, sponsored meetings, and spoke at the meetings. In practically every instance there wasn't any hesitation to brand those people as pro-Nazi; I mean, the Government took official cognizance of it. Now, what is your reaction to a general policy that a Government official or Government employee, who carelessly or knowingly affiliates with subversive organizations, should be disciplined for such action.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes; I agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you agree to that?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think, Mr. Tippet, it would be manifestly dangerous if, we will say, a number of people in your department would sponsor the Klu Klux Klan, or a meeting of the Klu Klux Klan on the street?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And if Government employees and officials are permitted to that, it gives a certain dignity and respect to the organization, doesn't it?

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes. I think that one who comes from another country and becomes a citizen, swears allegiance to this country, that his allegiance is to this country. I think native Americans are extremely foolish to affiliate with any foreign political party, or a political party that owes its allegiance to a foreign government. That is certainly why I am diametrically opposed to the Communist Party in America, because I believe its first allegiance is to a foreign government; to the Russian Government. I know, as you do, that in the present war, when the Communist Government of Russia was not fighting Germany, by its understanding of Germany was assisting the Axis Powers.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I will be perfectly frank with you, Mr. Tippet. I believe that any careless or knowing affiliation with an organization, the manifest purpose of which is to destroy our form of government by revolutionary methods, and not by the elective system, the free ballot—I believe that such Government officials or employees, whether they are affiliated with the Nazis, Fascists, or Communists, or whatever the organization, have no place on our Federal pay roll, to be perfectly frank with you.

Mr. TIPPETT. I agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. As a general policy.

Mr. TIPPETT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, there are exceptions to that. I can see where a man has been induced to join an organization upon a misrepresentation of fact, and then when he finds out about it, he repudiates it. It shows that he doesn't have any part in it.

Mr. TIPPETT. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But, this practice that has grown up in Washington of Government officials lending their names, their influence and prestige to all sorts of organizations, revolutionary and subversive, simply must stop, or otherwise there is no way in which to check the growth of the organization. My sympathies are with the man, if the man has actually been duped, if he has been misled, but an intelligent person, who over a period of time is constantly in the association of these people, even assuming he is not a Communist or he is not a Nazi, the very fact that he has been careless with his association, with his name, should bear some degree of responsibility; don't you agree to that statement?

Mr. TIPPETT. I think I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything else you care to say?

Mr. TIPPETT. No. I assume that your committee has access or will have access to previous investigations in which I have been involved and have made statements, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we have access to all of that.

Mr. TIPPETT. I am not a Communist. I never was a Communist. I am not now in sympathy with the Communist activities in America. I never have been. And I, by and large, knowing the field, would know if there was what we call a transmission belt or front organization; I would know them by name and by the general program of the

party, and I have never knowingly affiliated or participated in any of the Communist activities on principle before the present conflict between Hitler and Stalin and since. I have never changed my mind. I believe that the American labor movement and liberal forces and radical forces will develop an American movement here that will be different and should be different. I think that is what has been the trouble with the Communist Party and the Socialist Party. It had a foreign ring to it. The foreign people brought it here and it didn't go down in America. America is not like that. The history of our country and under our form of government is an entirely different matter. It cannot be imported here. I believe since my early manhood I have understood that, and I have not knowingly affiliated or joined or helped the Communist movement, even when it was not known as it is now.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, sir.

Mr. TIPPETT. May I be excused?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir; and we will recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon at 11:30 o'clock a recess was taken until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

The subcommittee reconvened at 2 p. m., pursuant to the taking of the recess.

Also present: Charles R. Denny, Jr., general counsel, Federal Communications Commission and Mr. R. E. Lambert, clerk of the Kerr committee.

Mr. STARNES. The committee will come to order. Will the witness stand and be sworn, please? Do you solemnly swear the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DODD. I do.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM E. DODD, JR., ASSISTANT NEWS WIRE EDITOR, FOREIGN BROADCAST INTELLIGENCE SERVICE, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please give your full name.

Mr. DODD. William E. Dodd, Jr.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. DODD. Ashland, Va.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When?

Mr. DODD. August 8, 1905.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please outline your educational background.

Mr. DODD. How far back do you want?

Mr. MATTHEWS. From the beginning.

Mr. DODD. From high school?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. DODD. University High School in Chicago. That is connected with the University of Chicago. It is a branch of the university. Then the University of Chicago. Do you want the date on that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You may give the date.

Mr. DODD. I am not sure. I graduated from the University of Chicago in 1928 and got my master's degree from Harvard in 1932; I got it in 1932 or 1933, and a doctor's degree at the University of Berlin in 1935.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not say, but did you receive your B. A. at Chicago?

Mr. DODD. Ph. B. It is the equivalent without the Greek.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give your professional experience; the jobs or positions which you have held?

Mr. DODD. I have been a teacher. I taught at Rutgers University.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just a minute. When did you teach at Rutgers?

Mr. DODD. In 1928 and 1929.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What did you teach at Rutgers?

Mr. DODD. Freshman history.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your salary at Rutgers?

Mr. DODD. I think \$1,200.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you left Rutgers, where did you go?

Mr. DODD. University of North Carolina, and there I taught freshman history also.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you go there in the fall of 1929?

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you there?

Mr. DODD. I was there a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Until the end of the academic year?

Mr. DODD. Until the end of the year, that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1932.

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration at the University of North Carolina?

Mr. DODD. \$1,900.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you next have appointment?

Mr. DODD. Well, then I went to graduate school at Harvard. I got a fellowship at Harvard, to work on a master's degree, and I worked there 2 years. Then the next experience I had, after I took my master's degree, I came to American University, here in Washington, but not as a full-time instructor. I was simply doing one course and working on my doctor's thesis in the Library of Congress, and I got nothing but my board and lodging for teaching one course.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you at the American University?

Mr. DODD. Just the year, 1932 to 1933.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And where did you go next?

Mr. DODD. Then in 1932, or in the summer of 1933, I went to Berlin with my father when he was appointed Ambassador to Germany.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What month did you go to Germany?

Mr. DODD. I think we left the 1st of July; yes, the 1st of July; around the 1st of July 1933.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you in Berlin?

Mr. DODD. Two years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Until what month?

Mr. DODD. Until September 1935.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then did you return to the United States?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What did you do when you returned?

Mr. DODD. I went to William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you teach there?

Mr. DODD. I taught there as a fellow but not as an instructor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was there an honorarium in connection with that relationship?

Mr. DODD. Yes; there was \$500, plus room and lodging, and I was brought there to finish revising my doctor's thesis for publication.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you at William and Mary?

Mr. DODD. Just a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were there any unusual circumstances surrounding your leaving William and Mary?

Mr. DODD. No. I was offered another job. My appointment was for only a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any controversy with the authorities or the faculty?

Mr. DODD. No, sir. I know that economically the university was in very bad shape and they could not afford to continue a person who came across or, rather, who was teaching the same grounds that another professor or two were teaching.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever seen the statement that you were dropped from William and Mary College on account of your views?

Mr. DODD. No; I have not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write an article for a magazine called Champion for its March 1938 issue?

Mr. DODD. I would have to see it. I believe I wrote for Champion, but I don't know that that was the month.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The article was entitled "In the Land of Terror." Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. DODD. I think so; yes. It was a reprint, as I recall it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you see a copy of the article after it appeared?

Mr. DODD. No; I have not. I know I haven't got one in my files.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't recall having seen one?

Mr. DODD. It was a reprint of an article which appeared in Rabbi Wise's magazine, which I have forgotten the name of—well, it was not a reprint. It was given to both magazines at the same time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did give it to Champion at Champion's solicitation?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you provide the magazine Champion with any biography material for use in connection with the article?

Mr. DODD. No; they probably knew as much about me as I could have given them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were the persons in charge of the publication Champion well acquainted with you?

Mr. DODD. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thought you said they knew as much about you as you did about yourself.

Mr. DODD. I beg your pardon. I guess they knew. I misunderstood your question. I thought you meant that I knew them personally. Well, I did not know them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited the article for the Champion?

Mr. DODD. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you offer it for publication or was it solicited from you?

Mr. DODD. It was solicited.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have no recollection as to who solicited it?

Mr. DODD. I could check in my letters, but I haven't offhand got any recollection or who asked me for it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you think the magazine, *Champion*, would have access to some written information about you, or could you suggest where that written information might be, to which they would have access?

Mr. DODD. No; I don't; not that I know of; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For example!

Mr. DODD. Except in the press at the time that we went to Berlin. The family was described pretty much at length in the *New York Times* and several other *New York papers*.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether the *New York Times* or any other papers listed your degrees and the various universities from which you obtained them?

Mr. DODD. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At the heading of the article headed "In the Land of Terror," published in the *Champion* magazine for March 1938, there appears the following biographical material to the right of your picture: William E. Dodd, Jr., has a B. A. from Chicago University; M. A. from Harvard; Ph. D from the University of Berlin. Taught American history at the University of North Carolina and at William and Mary College. The latter dropped him for his honest views. Spent 2 years 1933-35, in Germany. Now active in the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. DODD. Well, that is probably where they got it, from the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the basis of the statement that William and Mary College dropped you for your honest views, do you know?

Mr. DODD. I have no idea.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You worked at William and Mary until 1936; is that correct.

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were there 1 year?

Mr. DODD. One year, that is right; 1935-36.

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1935-36.

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And where did you go from William and Mary?

Mr. DODD. I went to work in Europe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where?

Mr. DODD. In Europe. I went to Paris and Geneva.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under what auspices did you go to Europe?

Mr. DODD. International Peace Campaign.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where was the headquarters of the International Peace Campaign?

Mr. DODD. Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the head of the International Peace Campaign?

Mr. DODD. Lord Robert Cecil.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what capacity were you working for the International Peace Campaign?

Mr. DODD. As an editor and writer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you located in Paris or in Geneva?

Mr. DODD. Both places. I came back. I went back and forth from Paris to Geneva.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the International Peace Campaign publish a magazine?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the title of the magazine?

Mr. DODD. I think it was called Peace Campaign.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you listed in the periodical as one of the editors?

Mr. DODD. I think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write for it under your own name?

Mr. DODD. I wrote book reviews under my own name; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you engaged in that work under the auspices of the International Peace Campaign?

Mr. DODD. I began working for them in July.

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1936?

Mr. DODD. That is right, and worked for them until about September, last part of August or September, of the following year, which would be 1937.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At whose solicitation did you take this position with the International Peace Campaign?

Mr. DODD. At Mr. Dolivet's.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where was he residing at the time?

Mr. DODD. He was also in Geneva and Paris. They had offices in both Geneva and Paris.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he an American?

Mr. DODD. No; he was French.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you engage in any other work simultaneously with your employment under the auspices of the International Peace Campaign?

Mr. DODD. That is all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration in that position?

Mr. DODD. I think it was \$2,000.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you return to the United States in September 1937?

Mr. DODD. No; I returned earlier than that. I returned, I think, in May, the last of May or first of June.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you were still holding the position?

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the organization?

Mr. DODD. That is right. I was sent over, in fact, to organize an American committee for the International Peace Campaign.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you come back and fulfill that duty?

Mr. DODD. Yes. Well, I tried to. I did not succeed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You came back to this country and tried to organize an American section?

Mr. DODD. American branch, that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the International Peace Campaign?

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have offices for that purpose in this country?

Mr. DODD. Well, I used the Church Peace Union. I had a desk at the Church Peace Union in New York.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is the address of that?

Mr. DODD. Atkinson. I think it is on Fifth Avenue about Thirteenth, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is Henry Atkinson, is it?

Mr. DODD. Henry Atkinson; that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you severed your connections with the International in August or September of 1937, what employment did you undertake?

Mr. DODD. I went to work for the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you work for the American League?

Mr. DODD. Until the 1st of March 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your title in your work for the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. DODD. Secretary of the China Aid Council, and I believe for a very short time, for about a month, I was secretary before I got into the China work for the Spanish relief. There was an attempt made to raise money for Spanish relief.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under whose auspices?

Mr. DODD. Of the American League.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the head of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the time you worked for it?

Mr. DODD. Harry F. Ward.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the national executive secretary?

Mr. DODD. You have me there. I don't remember. It was Paul something.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Paul Reid?

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What remuneration did you receive for your work in the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. DODD. \$1,200.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you left the league, in March 1938, where did you go?

Mr. DODD. To Virginia, Round Hill, Va.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you enter any employment there?

Mr. DODD. No, sir. I ran for Congress.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that the campaign of 1938?

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What district of Virginia was that?

Mr. DODD. Eighth District.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a candidate in the primaries?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For the Democratic nomination?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your next employment after severing your connection with the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. DODD. My next employment, I think, was with the Modern Industrial Bank in New York, as a radio commentator.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does that bank sponsor programs?

Mr. DODD. News programs.

Mr. MATTHEWS. News programs?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir; several, in fact.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What station?

Mr. DODD. WMCA it was on. They have several other stations over which they sponsor programs, however.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you a radio commentator for the Modern Industrial Bank?

Mr. DODD. I should say from December 1940 to the end of March 1941. I was not the only commentator. I was with Madame Genevieve Tabouis.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How often did you broadcast?

Mr. DODD. Three times a week.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration in that position?

Mr. DODD. We got altogether \$150 a week. Of course, our expenses had to come out of that, that means \$75 a week. And then we had to pay for any research or for any writing help that we got on our programs.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By "altogether" you mean you and Madame Tabouis?

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You received \$75 apiece per week?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. After March 1941, what employment did you have?

Mr. DODD. The next one was with the—I beg your pardon. I omitted one employment. I worked for W. P. A. for 6 months in 1938, in the last of November or first of November, 1938, to March or April 1, 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From November 1?

Mr. DODD. Yes; about November 1, 1938, until March 31. I believe it ran into 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your position with W. P. A.?

Mr. DODD. I worked in the personnel office as junior administrative assistant.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To whom were you junior administrative assistant?

Mr. DODD. Mrs. Francis Kelly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that K-e-l-l-y?

Mr. DODD. I think it is e-y.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What remuneration did you receive with W. P. A.?

Mr. DODD. At \$3,000 a year, but, of course, I did not work a full year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who sponsored your employment with W. P. A.?

Mr. DODD. Williams, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which Williams?

Mr. DODD. Let me see, Aubrey Williams.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Aubrey Williams.

Mr. DODD. Yes; he and Dave Niles.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were appointed to this position in W. P. A., then, a few days before the election of 1938?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the date of the election that year?

Mr. DODD. No; I don't. In fact, there was no congressional election in our district that year. The primaries were the election that year. Is that what you mean?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I mean when was the election day that year?

Mr. DODD. I don't remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thought you might have recalled.

Mr. DODD. No; I don't remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At least, it was subsequent to November 1, 1938?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, coming down to March 1941, when you left your work as radio commentator for the Modern Industrial Bank, what did you do?

Mr. DODD. Then I was unemployed from March to the 1st of December 1941, when I came to work for the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you go to work for the Federal Communications Commission on December 1, 1941?

Mr. DODD. I think I have got that in my records here. I can tell you exactly. No; it was November 26, 1941.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you held a position with the Federal Communications Commission from that time until the present?

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is the title of your position?

Mr. DODD. Assistant wire editor; assistant news wire editor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what division of the F. C. C.?

Mr. DODD. The Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has that been your title since your going with the F. C. C.?

Mr. DODD. No. I was simply an assistant, editorial assistant, when I first went there. I was in a subdivision, a different subdivision. The F. C. C. is divided into Labor Section, Wire Section, and the Analysis Section. I was in the Labor Section at first, working with the German desk that edited broadcasts from Germany exclusively. Then I was asked to go to London the last of November, about the middle of November, and they changed my title. I didn't succeed in getting a passport or haven't yet succeeded in getting a passport, so I have not been assigned to the wire service.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your remuneration in your present position?

Mr. DODD. \$3,200.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you received that salary from the beginning of your employment with F. C. C.?

Mr. DODD. No; I began at \$2,900; \$2,600, I beg your pardon.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you now in the Broadcast Analysis Division of F. C. C.?

Mr. DODD. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the News Reporting Division?

Mr. DODD. In the News Reporting; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you in the department headed by Dr. Goodwin Watson?

Mr. DODD. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who is the head of your department?

Mr. DODD. Mr. Granden.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is his first name?

Mr. DODD. Thomas Granden.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that work usually in German?

Mr. DODD. No, sir. All of the news comes into one editorial desk in English, and it is all translated elsewhere. I have nothing to do, of course, with the German or translating from the German.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said you received a Ph. D. from the University of Berlin in 1935?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the subject of your doctor's dissertation?

Mr. DODD. Francis Preston Blair's Family and Its Influence on the Outbreak of the Civil War.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that written in English or German?

Mr. DODD. It was written in both. It was written in English. I wrote it in English and translated it into German, with some assistance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it published in Germany?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it published by the university?

Mr. DODD. No. Each candidate for a degree has to publish it at his own expense. It was published in Leipzig; I don't remember the name of the firm.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated that you had not yet received a passport from the State Department for travel to London.

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you been denied a passport by the State Department?

Mr. DODD. I have not been denied. It has been postponed. The official standing, as far as I know anything about it, is that they said they had to have further check with the security agencies before they could issue a passport.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What do you mean by the "security agency"?

Mr. DODD. The F. B. I., Army Intelligence, and Navy Intelligence.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you apply for a passport to go to England?

Mr. DODD. I can give you that, too. November 20, 1942.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you received any formal communication in writing from the State Department relative to your application for a passport to go to England?

Mr. DODD. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you written to the State Department with respect to your passport application since you made the application?

Mr. DODD. No, sir; I have not. That is left up to the department with which you work, or the agency with which you work. I have nothing to do with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has the Federal Communications Commission or any division of it or any person employed there received any formal reply from the State Department with respect to it?

Mr. DODD. I am sure they have, but I have not seen the formal reply. I know I have not received a passport.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you been apprised of the contents of any reply that the State Department may have directed?

Mr. DODD. The general contents; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What were those general contents?

Mr. DODD. They were withholding the passport until further investigation could be made.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has there been more than one communication from the State Department relative to this matter?

Mr. DODD. I imagine there has been, but I haven't seen them all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you been told about any other communication?

Mr. DODD. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On or about September 16, 1937, did you deliver a speech or lecture at the Manhattan Lyceum on East Fourth Street in New York, under the auspices of the American Friends of the Soviet Union?

Mr. DODD. You got me. I might have; I might not have. I don't recall. When I was working with the league and with the International Peace Campaign I did a lot of speaking, and I don't recall every place that I spoke.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You heard of the organization known as American Friends of the Soviet Union.

Mr. DODD. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall ever having spoken under the auspices of that organization?

Mr. DODD. I don't recall ever having spoken under it. I may have when they were joint sponsors of a meeting, but I was never aware I was speaking under their auspices.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker of September 16, 1937, on page 8, announces that William E. Dodd, Jr., will be a speaker at Manhattan Lyceum under the auspices of the American Friends of the Soviet Union, Russian section. Do you recall anything about that occasion?

Mr. DODD. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't deny that you may have spoken there?

Mr. DODD. No; I don't deny it. I just don't recall, because I don't remember even the hall by such name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you regard the American Friends of the Soviet Union as a Communist front organization?

Mr. DODD. No; I would not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the head of the organization at that time; do you have any recollection of that?

Mr. DODD. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it Corliss Lamont?

Mr. DODD. I think so, but I wouldn't say for sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say you would not classify it as a Communist front organization?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have stated that you were employed by the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you classify that organization as a Communist front organization?

Mr. DODD. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has the so-called interdepartmental memorandum, circulated by the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, to the departmental heads of the Federal Government, relative to subversive organizations, ever been brought to your attention?

Mr. DODD. I have never seen a copy of it. I have seen newspaper reports of it; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you see a reprint of it in the Congressional Record?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Last September?

Mr. DODD. I don't think so. I don't read the Congressional Record regularly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware of the fact that the Attorney General described the American League for Peace and Democracy as a subversive organization?

Mr. DODD. Yes; I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you dispute his findings in that matter?

Mr. DODD. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you care to state your grounds for disagreement with the Attorney General?

Mr. DODD. No. He has his opinions. There are differences of opinion.

Mr. MASON. You say that the decision of the Attorney General was not based on facts that were presented to him, on which he gave that opinion? You would not say that; that is, the Attorney General, in making a decision, an official decision, in a matter of that importance, and it was in connection with certain other things, that he would not have a basis for that decision; of facts that had been brought to his attention.

Mr. DODD. It must have convinced him, certainly.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What do you understand by the expression "a Communist front organization"?

Mr. DODD. I don't know. I have heard a lot of organizations called Communist front organizations, but I have no opinion on that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you don't know what a Communist front organization is and have no definition of your own or description of your own, why would you dispute the Attorney General's findings?

Mr. DODD. Well, my opinion is not important, it seems to me, in view of the fact that the Attorney General has given his.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make any attempt to ascertain the nature, announced objectives, concealed objectives, of personnel and background of the American League for Peace and Democracy when you took employment with it?

Mr. DODD. Surely. I had read the program. I don't remember the specific points of it. I can remember in general what they were. I don't think you want me to repeat them, I suppose. It is in the record. I knew some of the people who were on the executive board, who were sponsors of the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were there any persons known to you as Communists who were officials in the organization?

Mr. DODD. There were in the old organization before I became associated with it. There were several, one, at least, I can recall. That was when it was the American League Against War and Fascism. I think Clarence Hathaway was in it; on the executive board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. During your employment by the American League, did you find that Communists were unusually active in the American League?

Mr. DODD. I wouldn't say unusually active. I would say there were some Communists in it. Undoubtedly there were some Fascists also active in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Could you name some of the Fascists who were active in the American League?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having delivered an address under the auspices of the American Friends of the Soviet Union on or about March 17, 1938, at the Washington Irving High School?

Mr. DODD. No. March 8, you say?

Mr. MATTHEWS. March 17, 1938.

Mr. DODD. March 17, 1938, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't deny that you delivered such an address?

Mr. DODD. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do deny it?

Mr. DODD. Yes; I do. I was in Virginia at the time. I was already organizing my campaign for Congress. I wasn't in New York at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated in your testimony a moment ago that you were employed by the American League from the fall of 1937 until March 1938.

Mr. DODD. The 1st of March.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you leave the American League on the 1st of March?

Mr. DODD. Yes. It may have been a couple of days before, even.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not you accepted an invitation to address the American Friends of the Soviet Union on March 17?

Mr. DODD. To my recollection I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you have any explanation as to why the Daily Worker in its issue of March 15, 1938, on page 10, would feature an announcement of your addressing the American Friends of the Soviet Union?

Mr. DODD. No; I have none.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever publicly been associated with the League of American Writers?

Mr. DODD. I am a member of it and I was a member of it from about 1939 and on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are a member of the League of American Writers?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In June 1941 the League of American Writers held its fourth annual congress in New York City. In preparation for that gathering of the League of American Writers, a call was issued. Did you sign that call?

Mr. DODD. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not sign that call?

Mr. DODD. I think I have seen my name signed to it. I have been told it was signed to it, but I didn't sign it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you authorize the use of your name in that call?

Mr. DODD. No; I don't recall authorizing the use of my name in that connection, because I didn't agree with all of the points in the call.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you attend the congress?

Mr. DODD. Yes; I attended the conference.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Wasn't a program circulated there which contained this call?

Mr. DODD. I don't recall. You mean at the congress?

Mr. MATTHEWS. At the congress.

Mr. DODD. I don't know. There probably was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you apprised at the time that your name was signed to the call?

Mr. DODD. No. I am oftentimes, however, confused with my sister. She is a member of the same organization, and she signed it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your sister did sign?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't mean to suggest that she may also have used your name as well as hers?

Mr. DODD. I would not suggest that without consulting me, no; but I would suggest that someone in the office had seen her name signed to it and thought that my name could be on there too just as well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your names appeared side by side on that call.

Mr. DODD. Quite frequently our names have been associated with various calls and various letters.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You consider the League of American Writers a Communist organization?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware of the fact that the Attorney General in his interdepartmental memorandum has criticized the League of American Writers as a subversive organization?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know when the League of American Writers was founded?

Mr. DODD. I think it was in 1934, but I am not sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1935.

Mr. DODD. Or 1935.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The League of American Writers was founded at a Congress of American Revolutionary Writers, held in New York City April 26-27, 1935. Did you know that that was the title that the gathering chose for itself at the time of the founding of the League of American Writers?

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know that Earl Browder, Isidor Schneider, John Spivak, Michael Gold, Clarence Hathaway, and M. J. Olgin were among those who signed the call for the Congress of American Revolutionary Writers, which founded the League of American Writers?

Mr. DODD. No, sir; I don't. I am not denying that they did, but I say I didn't know it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who is the present national head of the League of American Writers?

Mr. DODD. I don't recall either. I should know. He was a mystery writer; a Hollywood mystery writer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean Dashiell Hammett?

Mr. DODD. Dashiell Hammett; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you take any steps publicly or privately to repudiate the appearance of your signature on the call for the Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers?

Mr. DODD. No. As I say, I didn't know it was on there, until I read about it in the papers last fall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are a member of the organization, anyhow.

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know that the magazine, the Champion, was an official publication of the Young Communist League?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you deny that it was such?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On what basis?

Mr. DODD. According to my records, the letterhead of the request asking me to write an article for them listed John R. Tunis, a sports writer, as one of the editorial board. Excuse me while I look this up.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, if it will assist the matter at all, I can assure the witness that the name of John R. Tunis did appear as a member of the advisory board of the Champion in the March 1938 issue, in which issue the witness' name appeared, if that is what you are after.

Mr. DODD. That is what I was looking for. There were several other names I wanted to verify, but I don't see them. Yes; here they are. Former Senator Lynn J. Frazier, North Dakota; Kenneth Gould, managing editor of the Scholastic Magazine; and John R. Tunis were the ones that I recall from the letterhead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Edward Strong?

Mr. DODD. I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know James Wechsler?

Mr. DODD. No, sir. I know who he is, but I don't know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know James Lerner?

Mr. DODD. I have met him; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider that he was a Communist when you knew him?

Mr. DODD. I have no idea whether he formerly was or not. I suppose he was, but I don't know for sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He professed it publicly.

Mr. DODD. He did?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Angelo Herndon?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know him by reputation?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know that he ran for office on the Communist ticket?

Mr. DODD. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know him by reputation, of course?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know that Langston Hughes is also an avowed Communist?

Mr. DODD. I have also heard it, but I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is running for office on the Communist Party ticket.

Mr. DODD. I don't know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am reading some of the advisory board members. Did you know John Gtath?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You didn't know whether he was a Communist or not?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you dispute the fact that a majority of the individuals who appeared on the masthead of the Champion, aside from the advisory board, were avowed Communists?

Mr. DODD. I don't know because I don't know. I know that some of the names you read off to me are avowed Communists, that is right. That is as far as I know. I never considered Langston Hughes a Communist. I never heard he was an avowed Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. He ran for office on the Communist Party ticket in New York.

Mr. DODD. I didn't know that. My judgment on these matters would not be too recent, of course.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the testimony and records in the files of the committee show that the Champion was an official publication of the Young Communist League. That is in documents supplied by the Young Communist League itself.

Mr. DODD. At that time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; at that time.

Mr. DODD. I had no idea it was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you publicly affiliated with the Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign, a subsidiary organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. DODD. Yes. The Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. DODD. That is right. I was a sponsor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a sponsor for the organization?

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said that you were sponsored in one of your positions in the Government by a Mrs. Kelly.

Mr. DODD. Mrs. Francis Kelly?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mrs. Francis Kelly.

Mr. DODD. I was employed by her; I mean, I worked under her. She was the head of the division I was working for. No; she was not a sponsor of mine. I never met her before I started working for her.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was she connected with the Washington office of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. DODD. To my knowledge, not; I don't know. She is not a Washingtonian and she doesn't live here any more. She lives in New York. I think you have someone else in mind.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. I desire to elicit facts here. The committee is in possession of a letter on the stationery of American League for Peace and Democracy, Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign dated August 3, 1939, addressed to Mrs. Kelly, without any first name.

Mr. DODD. There is no first name?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No first name in the letter: "American League Office, Washington, D. C., Dear Mrs. Kelly," and so on. I thought you might know whether or not Mrs. Kelly, for whom you worked, was in the American League Office?

Mr. DODD. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you sponsor a committee known as the Schappes defense committee?

Mr. DODD. No; sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not.

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you any explanation as to why the Schappes defense committee used your name?

Mr. DODD. Yes; I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a sponsor?

Mr. DODD. As many organizations do, of this nature, anti-Fascist organizations have names, quite extensive lists of sponsors of other organizations, and they write letters out to the people and ask them if they will join in sponsoring a certain campaign. Sometimes I think they don't even wait to hear from the individuals who are written to, and that is what I think happened in the Schappes committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you receive solicitation by mail?

Mr. DODD. I don't recall receiving one, but it may have been. Such things as that come second-class mail, and they may get mislaid, or they may come to you and be thrown in the waste basket.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean you have no recollection of having been solicited either by word of mouth or mail?

Mr. DODD. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or having declined to serve as a member of the Schappes committee.

Mr. DODD. As a matter of fact, I think I was solicited by telephone and declined to serve.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do recollect that?

Mr. DODD. Yes; but not by mail.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall who it was solicited you by phone?

Mr. DODD. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the basis of your declination?

Mr. DODD. I didn't know anything, at least, I didn't have sufficient knowledge of the case to take part in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is your testimony then that you dispute the fact you were solicited and declined and the committee went ahead and used your name anyhow?

Mr. DODD. Yes; that is my opinion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know anything about Morris U. Schappes?

Mr. DODD. No. I just read his name in the paper, that is all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You never met him personally?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was active in the American League for Peace and Democracy in New York at the time you were working for the league?

Mr. DODD. Well, that may have been the New York office of the league that he was associated with. I don't recall ever meeting him in the national office.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you affiliated in any way whatsoever with the American Youth Congress?

Mr. DODD. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your draft status, Mr. Dodd?

Mr. DODD. 3-A.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When was it made 3-A?

Mr. DODD. Let me see. I can give you the date of that. March 30, 1943. It will probably be changed in a couple of weeks. I understand they are reclassifying again.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were changed from 1-A to 3-A on March 30, 1943.

Mr. DODD. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Federal Communications Commission request that change?

Mr. DODD. I think so, but I don't know. They asked for a change in a lot of other people, I know, at the same time. Of course, I was given permission to leave the country back in November, so I imagine that would have affected my status.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not the Federal Communications Commission, through T. A. Moore, senior administrative officer, on February 19, 1943, requested the Selective Service Board, of Leesburg, Va., to give you occupational deferment?

Mr. DODD. Yes; since I have it here. I didn't realize that I was on the list.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the selective board's reply to that request?

Mr. DODD. I believe it was turned down; that they just refused to do so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Federal Communications Commission then appeal the decision of the board?

Mr. DODD. Yes. Mr. Moore did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was there a hearing on the matter?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But there was an appeal and a subsequent reversal of your board's classification.

Mr. DODD. Yes; I presume so. I know, according to my classification, it simply said the local board had reclassified me. This said nothing about the board of appeals.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know the grounds on which the Federal Communications Commission asked your draft board for deferment?

Mr. DODD. As far as I know, occupational. Of course, I understand that under the present rules of the Selective Service, I should have been normally anyway 3-A, because I am a married man with one child. When I was reclassified in 1942 I was put in 1-A, but I don't know for what reason.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, do you consider this matter of sufficient relevance to include in the record; the correspondence on the question of the witness' draft status?

Mr. STARNES. Well, I don't know whether there is any real connection or any relevancy on the subject of the hearing or not, Doctor. Of course, this other matter in a sense might be deemed relevant, but it is pretty farfetched.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please rule on the matter?

Mr. STARNES. I don't believe it is relevant.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all the questions I have.

Mr. STARNES. All right. Anything else you wish to say, Mr. Dodd?

Mr. DODD. No. Thank you. That is all.

Mr. STARNES. That will be all then. We will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon at 2:50 p. m. the subcommittee adjourned, to meet at 10 a. m. April 6, 1943.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 11 a. m., the Honorable Joe Starnes, presiding.

Present: Hon. Joe Starnes and Hon. Noah M. Mason.

Also present: J. B. Matthews, director of research for the committee, and Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator.

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

Mr. KARR, will you hold up your right hand, please, and be sworn? Do you solemnly swear the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KARR. I do.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Karr, you will recall that some time ago statements were made on the floor of the House by the chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, which pointed out and named a number of Federal employees against whom he alleged there was some documentary evidence of their public affiliation or association with what we commonly denominate front or subversive organizations, and it is for the purpose of giving you an opportunity to testify with reference to these allegations that you were asked to come up this morning.

Dr. Matthews will conduct the investigation, and you are assured that you are at full liberty to make any explanatory statements to any questions propounded at any time during the proceedings.

We feel, in simple justice, that you should be called upon and given an opportunity to reply to the statements.

Mr. KARR. Thank you, sir.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

You may proceed, Dr. Matthews.

STATEMENT OF DAVID KARR, ASSISTANT CHIEF, FOREIGN LANGUAGE DIVISION, OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your full name?

Mr. KARR. David Karr.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. KARR. In New York City.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When?

Mr. KARR. August 4, 1918. I was born under the name of David Katz.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When and by what process was the name changed from Katz to Karr?

Mr. KARR. The name was never changed legally. I assumed the name Karr about 1937, 1938, for professional purposes as a newspaper man.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever used any other name?

Mr. KARR. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Other than these two?

Mr. KARR. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give an outline of your educational background?

Mr. KARR. I attended elementary school in New York City; went to Peacock Military School in San Antonio, Tex., in 1928 and 1929.

I attended Boys High School in Brooklyn, N. Y.; taking courses since I have been in Washington at George Washington University, in Economics and English, and American University in Economic Theory.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you a college graduate?

Mr. KARR. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give an outline of your professional experience, stating the jobs or positions which you have held?

Mr. KARR. In 1934 I got a job with the New York World-Telegram as assistant to the school sports editor, while I was in high school. I kept that position until about 1936; writing school sports, and later covering other sports such as polo, track, hockey, baseball and football.

Around 1936—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). Just a moment. What was your remuneration with the New York World-Telegram.

Mr. KARR. Oh, it varied, because it was so-called free lance pay; free lance writing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it based on space rates?

Mr. KARR. Yes; 40 cents an inch.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then after you left the World-Telegram, what did you do?

Mr. KARR. In 1936 I started covering various sports for most of the morning papers in New York. I would cover one event for three or four papers at one time on space rates.

And, at the same time, in order to make a living, I went to work as a shipping clerk for a handbag manufacturer, a firm in New York City, by the name of Rosenthal & Co.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, that was also in 1936?

Mr. KARR. About 1936.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you only 16 years old when you worked for the World-Telegram?

Mr. KARR. I was younger than that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Pardon me?

Mr. KARR. I was younger than that. On February 1, 1934, I got my first check. I got \$14.50.

Mr. MATTHEWS. After that employment in 1936, what did you do?

Mr. KARR. I was unemployed for a brief period after that, and then I went back to the same firm in 1937.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is the Rosenthal firm?

Mr. KARR. Yes, that is the Rosenthal firm.

Then I started selling Fuller brushes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What pay did you receive with the Rosenthal firm?

Mr. KARR. Fifteen dollars a week.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you sell Fuller brushes?

Mr. KARR. Oh, I don't remember. It was about 9 or 10 months.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that in 1937?

Mr. KARR. 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What did you do after you stopped selling Fuller brushes?

Mr. KARR. I stopped selling Fuller brushes when I was employed by the American Council Against Nazi Propaganda, 11 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you work for the American Council Against Nazi Propaganda?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what capacity?

Mr. KARR. As a reporter on the news letter, called the Hour.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you work there?

Mr. KARR. Until 1939, the summer of 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you work there a full year?

Mr. KARR. Yes; just about a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration in that position?

Mr. KARR. \$35 a week.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then in 1939 what did you do?

Mr. KARR. I went to work for Transradio Press Service, in New York, as a reporter and rewrite man.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you work for them?

Mr. KARR. I worked for them until February 3, 1942, as reporter, rewrite man, Washington correspondent, and assistant to the managing editor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What pay did you receive with Transradio?

Mr. KARR. It went from \$35 to \$60 a week. At the same time, during the last few months I was working for Transradio, I was also writing radio scripts for news commentators in New York, averaging an extra \$20 or \$30 a week.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you mean you began at the rate of \$35 and it was raised to \$60, or was there a variation in the pay?

Mr. KARR. It was raised at various times, as my work improved.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That brought you down to February 1942?

Mr. KARR. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then what employment did you have?

Mr. KARR. On February 3, 1942, I was employed by the Office of Facts and Figures.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On February 3?

Mr. KARR. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your title in the Office of Facts and Figures?

Mr. KARR. Senior liaison officer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What were your duties in that position?

Mr. KARR. My duties as senior liaison officer in the Office of Facts and Figures were to keep liaison with other Federal agencies, deal-

ing with problems concerned with foreign nationality groups in the United States; also with various nongovernmental agencies, embassies, private organizations, which had any bearing on foreign nationality groups in the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your salary with the Office of Facts and Figures?

Mr. KARR. \$4,600 a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who sponsored you in your position with the Office of Facts and Figures?

Mr. KARR. Alan Cranston, Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of Facts and Figures.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he personally invite you to take the position, or did you apply for the position?

Mr. KARR. I never applied for any position in the Federal Government.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he personally invite you to take the position?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you recommended by any particular individual—any other than Mr. Cranston?

Mr. KARR. No. Mr. Cranston knew me for about 3 years before that. He had just returned from Europe, where he worked as foreign correspondent for I. N. S., and he was slated to be the new managing editor for a newspaper in New York—not PM—and at that time intended to hire me for this new post. We had been in touch for 3 years afterward.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you continued with the Office of Facts and Figures, and its successor organization since February 1942?

Mr. KARR. I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And what is your present position?

Mr. KARR. I am now assistant chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your salary with the Office of War Information?

Mr. KARR. \$4,600.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you a specialist in foreign languages?

Mr. KARR. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you speak any foreign languages?

Mr. KARR. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you read any?

Mr. KARR. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And your title is Assistant Chief of the Foreign Language Section?

Mr. KARR. Foreign Language Division.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What are your duties in that office?

Mr. KARR. My duties are the same ones that I had before, when I first started with the Office of Facts and Figures, in addition to which I supervise a group of people who translate material for the foreign-language press and radio.

I develop material for the foreign-language press and radio, maintain liaison with other sections of O. W. I. to get the material which

would be pertinent to the foreign-language press and radio; and, further, examine foreign-language newspaper translations which are given to us by the Justice Department, which does all of our translating work, to determine which papers are cooperating in the war effort.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who is the Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information?

Mr. KARR. Alan Cranston.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On February 1, 1943, the Honorable Martin Dies, of Texas—

Mr. STARNES. Pardon the interruption.

There is one answer he made to a question there as to his duties that is not quite clear.

I believe you stated that it was a part of your duties to determine which papers were cooperating with the war effort.

Mr. KARR. That is right. We determine for our own guidance which papers are being as helpful as possible, or as helpful as, shall we say, they could be, and advise those papers informally, without any pressure at all, on what materials their own nationality groups might be more amenable toward reading.

Mr. STARNES. Now, is that to the newspapers generally or just to the foreign-language groups?

Mr. KARR. Just to the foreign-language press.

Mr. STARNES. On what basis do you make your determinations, Mr. Karr?

Mr. KARR. We base our determination on the type of material which those papers run. We have found some papers which continue to run material favorable to the enemy; material which will encourage people to listen to the short-wave radio of the enemy, and material which shows the enemy in a very favorable light.

And it is very obvious what happens. We have been zealously careful not to go into the question of the freedom of the press, or undermine it. We take no action whatsoever ourselves. All action is up to the Department of Justice. We may recommend to the Department of Justice for certain action, but that is as far as we go.

Mr. STARNES. In certain instances you have found that the publications have been so violently pro-Axis that it has been necessary to call it to the attention of the Department of Justice?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Of course, it is presumed that they will exercise the proper surveillance, as well as to take necessary legal steps to protect the interests of the United States in such cases?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall offhand some of the papers that have been so violently pro-Axis that the Department of Justice has had to be called in on the matter?

Mr. KARR. There are two papers in Pittsburgh, one a Communist paper and one a pro-Serb paper, the *Srbobran* and the *Narodni Glasnik*. Both of those papers were in a violent cat fight over the situation in Yugoslavia, to a point where actual fights had broken out in several factories in the Pittsburgh area.

On receipt of those reports and on examination of those papers, and developing the evidence, we developed what we felt was concrete evidence that they were harming the war effort.

We called that to the attention of the Special Defense Unit of the Department of Justice for action.

Mr. STARNES. All right. You may proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were both papers cited to the Department of Justice in that instance?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On February 1, 1943, the Honorable Martin Dies made a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, speaking in his capacity as an individual Member of the House and not as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, inasmuch as that committee was not at that time legally constituted, and in the course of that address, he made a reference to you in the following language:

Here is the case of David Karr, who is Assistant Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information, at a salary of \$4,600. For 2 years Karr was on the staff of the Communist Party's official newspaper, the Daily Worker. There is not the slightest doubt that all members of the Daily Worker staff were required to be members of the Communist Party. Karr was a writer for the Communist front publication, Equality, whose editorial council was composed largely of well-known Communists and Communist fellow travelers.

David Karr was also public relations director of the American League for Peace and Democracy, one of the Communist fronts which Attorney General Biddle branded as subversive. Karr was a frequent writer for the league's magazine, Fight.

Do you have any special dissent to make with respect to the facts which are stated in that passage?

Mr. KARR. Yes. First of all, I would like to state the following: I called—What is the name of the counsel of your committee?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You probably are referring to the chief investigator of the committee.

Mr. KARR. What is his name?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Robert E. Stripling.

Mr. KARR. Yes. I called Mr. Stripling after I found out that Mr. Dies had made these charges on the floor of the House, and made a number of comments.

The principal one is that any information as to my loyalty to the United States and proof thereof could be secured from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which not only has made a complete and careful check on me, but to which I have been of actual assistance for the past 5 years on all matters of subversive activity, including investigations of Nazis, Fascists, and Communist activities.

Secondly, the gentleman asked me if it was true that I had worked for the Daily Worker for 2 years. And I said, "No." I asked for a chance to explain that before Mr. Dies made his speech, and told him that he was absolutely wrong on that point, and yet I found that Mr. Dies persisted in making that statement on the floor, although he had been informed in advance, through the chief investigator of the committee, the facts were not as stated.

In 1938, I believe it was, I was working for the New York Daily Mirror, one of the papers that I was working as a free lance writer for, and became deeply interested in the question of subversive activities, particularly in Nazi activities, in the United States.

I became interested in that, frankly, gentlemen, because of some girl who I met who was working in the United States attorney's

office, and who told me about the investigation which was under way, and which was the first Nazi spy ring at that time.

I went to the city editor of the New York Daily Mirror with that story, and with several subsequent stories, and the Mirror, for reasons best known to themselves, refused to print these stories.

One of the young men on the staff of the Daily Mirror, who I found out subsequently was either a member of the Communist Party, or a close—shall we say—associate of the Communist Party people, suggested that I visit a man by the name of Lowell Wakefield, a staff writer for the Daily Worker, and tell him these things, since Mr. Wakefield was allegedly at that time conducting an extensive exposé of subversive activities.

I visited Mr. Wakefield and told him what I had uncovered, and told him that the Mirror had refused to print the stories.

He welcomed the information, and asked if I would be willing to give him all of the material that I was able to get through my own investigation at that point.

I said, "Yes."

I visited him a number of times at the Daily Worker offices and we became friendly. And he asked me would I write certain material down for him. I wrote it down for him, and he asked me if he could print it. And, after considering it briefly, I said "Yes."

As a result, about five or six articles, including the attack upon the chairman of this committee, by myself, were printed in the Daily Worker.

I never received any remuneration for any work that I did down there, although I did, at several points, get from Mr. Wakefield what probably never totaled over \$10 expense money for purchasing various samples of subversive literature for him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Over how long a period did you collaborate in the way in which you have stated it, with Lowell Wakefield and the Daily Worker?

Mr. KARR. Oh, it could not have been 4 or 5 months. That was terminated, if I may state, sir, when the editor in chief of the Daily Worker, or the editor, I guess it was, Sam Don, told Mr. Wakefield that he didn't want me to hang around their office. They didn't want me around there because I was not a party member; I was not a Young Communist League member, and I was not trustworthy, and he didn't want any people who were not trustworthy around his office.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Howard Rushmore at the Daily Worker?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You met him personally?

Mr. KARR. Surely. I knew Howard very well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know him before you went down to the Daily Worker?

Mr. KARR. No. I met him down there. He was a good friend of Mr. Wakefield's.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know him for a period of some months?

Mr. KARR. All the time I was there. I knew him subsequent to that, too.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did these articles in the Daily Worker appear under the name of David Karr?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the approximate month in which they appeared?

Mr. KARR. No, sir; I think it was around September of that year; September to about the first of the year. I would not be too sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of 1938?

Mr. KARR. I think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did I understand you to say that this material which you embodied in these articles was obtained by you from a young lady who worked at the Department of Justice?

Mr. KARR. She worked in the United States attorney's office in New York for awhile.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the United States attorney's office in New York?

Mr. KARR. I met her one night at a party at one of my friends' house, and she told me about it. After that I went up to Yorkville to several places and bought some of this information and became interested in what was going on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. She was divulging to you information which she had obtained in her position as an employee of the United States attorney's office; is that correct?

Mr. KARR. Well, it was primarily information, as I remember, which had been made public, but had received no attention. I don't think she was divulging anything confidential.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, you say that you could have read the information in the newspapers yourself?

Mr. KARR. Well, if you had read court records; yes, sir. And things which were not getting much attention at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All this series of articles deals with this Nazi spy ring?

Mr. KARR. It was a series of articles.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On this spy ring that was being investigated?

Mr. KARR. It was a series of articles. It was several different pieces. You mean the pieces I wrote for the Daily Worker?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. KARR. There were several different pieces of various phases, one of which I remember particularly. I stated Richard Krebs arrived in the United States as a member of the Gestapo. It turned out to be Jan Valtin.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you obtain this information from this young lady?

Mr. KARR. No; I obtained nothing from this young lady after my first acquaintance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you get the information concerning the arrival of Richards Krebs in this country?

Mr. KARR. From a confidential source.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Without asking you to divulge the name of the person who gave you the information, did you obtain it from the Communist Party or a non-Communist?

Mr. KARR. No, sir; it was from a non-Communist source, as a newspaperman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write for the publication Equality, as alleged in the speech of the Honorable Martin Dies?

Mr. KARR. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know how many pieces you wrote for Equality?

Mr. KARR. I think there were two.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you offer this piece to Equality or these pieces, or were they solicited by persons on the staff?

Mr. KARR. They were solicited by a fellow by the name of Abraham Chapman, I think his name is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How do you spell his last name?

Mr. KARR. C-h-a-p-m-a-n, whom I subsequently found out was John Arnold, of the New York Daily Freiheit, a Communist Jewish publication.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't recall whether or not his name appeared on the publication, do you?

Mr. KARR. I think it did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have here two sheets of the publication Equality—

Mr. KARR (interposing). May I see them?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Certainly, but just a moment—which contain articles written by you, and also the names of the editorial council of the publication. I don't see the name "Chapman" on the editorial council.

Mr. KARR. That was the fellow's name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was his first name?

Mr. KARR. Abraham Chapman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Abraham Chapman?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And he used the name "John Arnold"?

Mr. KARR. Yes. He was supposed to write, or did write a column in Freiheit.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How did you discover that he was working for Freiheit?

Mr. KARR. I found that out about a year later.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That satisfied you that he was a Communist, I presume?

Mr. KARR. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know at the time he solicited the article from you that he was a Communist?

Mr. KARR. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would be substantiating evidence in your own mind, would it not, that the Communist had penetrated Equality?

Mr. KARR. Beyond a question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have no doubt about its—let us say—general Communist complexion or orientation?

Mr. KARR. I would not pass judgment on the material contained in the magazine because I have not seen the stuff for 4 or 5 years, but I would definitely say that it was Communist penetration of the editorial direction of the magazine, that is clear.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, when you were writing for the Daily Worker, did you write any book reviews for the Daily Worker?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. They were in addition to the articles?

Mr. KARR. Eugene Gordon, one of the employees of the Daily Worker, was around the office there one morning and he had a stack

of new books, as come into all newspaper offices for review. One book struck my idea. And I asked him if I could read it.

And, he said, "You can read it if you will review it, and you can keep the book if you review it."

I read the book, and I kept it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write more than one book review for the Daily Worker?

Mr. KARR. I don't think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. During your association with the Daily Worker, did you make any reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make more than one report to the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the nature of the information which you submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. KARR. You will have to get that from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, is it appropriate for this committee to propound that question?

Mr. STARNES. Mr. KARR, I am assuming that Dr. Matthews would like to know the nature of that. He is not asking about the details.

Mr. KARR. You don't want the details? You want the nature?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The thought in my mind is this, that this committee is empowered to investigate subversive activities, as much so as is the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. STARNES. Of course, because we are set up by an act of Congress for that purpose.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And if a citizen of the United States, or witness before this committee—whether a citizen or not—is in possession of information on subversive activities, it seems to me within the jurisdiction of this committee to ask what that information was, or the nature of the information.

Mr. STARNES. Can you indicate the nature of the information for us?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir. The nature of the information was such as to expose both Nazi activities and the workings of some of the Communist people in New York.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did any of this information affect persons on the staff of the Daily Worker whom you met in your association with that publication?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Gardner Jackson?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long have you known Gardner Jackson?

Mr. KARR. Since I came to Washington. That would be January 1, 1940. No; I met him in New York before that, in 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under what circumstances did you become acquainted with Gardner Jackson?

Mr. KERR. I met him at the National Committee of Independent Voters for Roosevelt and Wallace, with headquarters in the Roosevelt Hotel, in New York.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had any professional association with Gardner Jackson since that time?

Mr. KARR. No, sir. Well, we were both working for the committee which, if I may call the attention of the committee here, the Communist Party was opposed to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where is Gardner Jackson now?

Mr. KARR. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When was your last contact with him?

Mr. KARR. Oh, several weeks ago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that before or after he left his position at the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. KERR. I think it was before.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know whether Mr. Jackson now is affiliated or connected with the Federal Government in any way?

Mr. KARR. To the best of my knowledge, sir, he is not.

Mr. STARNES. Have you any other questions, Doctor?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

In the speech of the Honorable Martin Dies, on February 1, 1943, he stated that you had been public relations director of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Was that correct?

Mr. KARR. That is not correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware of the fact that the magazine Fight stated that you had recently been made public relations director?

Mr. KARR. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have seen that reference?

Mr. KARR. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was there any foundation whatever for that statement?

Mr. KARR. The only foundation for that was that Rev. Thomas L. Harris, if I remember correctly, was executive secretary, or executive director; one of your successors, Dr. Matthews, I think—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). No. He was not my successor, because I never held the position.

Mr. KARR. He asked several people if they thought I would be a good choice as public relations director of the League for Peace and Democracy. And, apparently I was highly recommended. I was never consulted on it, by anyone, and was called in one day and was made public relations director.

My association with the league had been rather obscure. I was still selling Fuller brushes, more or less effectively, at that point.

I didn't want to work for the American League. I made several talks in their behalf, and had come to their offices a number of times to secure research material from their research files. And I declined with thanks the offer. I was never a member of the League for Peace and Democracy, but apparently in the intervening time that article was already in, shall we say, the works, and they were honoring me without my knowing about it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated that you made speeches for the American League for Peace and Democracy. Where did you make those speeches?

Mr. KARR. I don't remember. There were several in New York City and one in New Jersey. They were all concerned with exposés

of the German and American—the German-American Bund, primarily.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write several articles for the magazine *Fight*?

Mr. KARR. I think one, two, or three.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The records of the publication, I believe show that you wrote an article for the issue of *Fight* in May 1939; another in the issue of March 1939; and a third in the issue of June 1939.

Mr. KARR. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. After the magazine had changed its name to "The World for Peace and Democracy?"

Mr. KARR. I wish I had copies of them, too.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Karr, you say you declined the invitation to join. Did you do that in writing or orally?

Mr. KARR. Orally.

Mr. MASON. That is all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. During your association with the American League for Peace and Democracy, such as it was, did you make any reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, touching that organization?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied in your own mind that the American League for Peace and Democracy was a Communist front organization?

Mr. KARR. As satisfied as you are.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have no dispute, then, with the Attorney General on that question?

Mr. KARR. None whatsoever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the magazine, *Equality*, dated January 1940, you contributed an article, which article is entitled "Strange Friends of Congressman Dies."

Mr. KARR. Wasn't it "Strange Friends of Martin Dies"?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The heading is "Strange Friends of Congressman Dies"—both on the cover and at the bottom of the article.

In the article, on page 12, you referred to a banquet held in the grand ballroom of the Hotel Commodore, New York, December 8, 1938, and then you state:

Among the sponsors of that meeting at which Dies was the principal speaker was James Wheeler Hill, national secretary of the German-American Bund. A guest at that luncheon was Fritz Kuhn, convicted leader of the German-American Bund.

When you wrote that, did you believe that those facts were correct?

Mr. KARR. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have been apprised since that they were false, have you?

Mr. KARR. No; but yes, to the extent that—well, I don't remember correctly, offhand. I probably have some reference to it somewhere. I think that the *New York Times* reported to the effect that Mr. Kuhn had been present when Mr. Dies spoke, and subsequently, at another time, I think at the Astor, when Senator Reynolds spoke.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the case of a luncheon to which the general public has access, where those who participate are not invited by anyone, but simply come and pay for their lunch, do you consider it appropriate to describe those who attend as guests of the luncheon?

Mr. KARR. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then you would say that the statement that Fritz Kuhn was a guest at the luncheon was incorrect, would you not?

Mr. KARR. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you stated that a sponsor of the meeting was James Wheeler Hill. James Wheeler Hill bought an entire table at which Fritz Kuhn sat. Would you say that that would make James Wheeler Hill a sponsor of that luncheon?

Mr. KARR. Not if what you say is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, you were doing research in this.

Wasn't that the fact, as you obtained it, that he bought a table?

Mr. KARR. There is no doubt about what my research showed. It didn't come from regular clippings. It came from accredited sources.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied that that was a misstatement of the actual situation?

Mr. KARR. If what you say is correct, yes. I assume it is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the questions I have.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Karr, any further statement that you would like to make?

Mr. KARR. Yes. I would like to point out again for the guidance of the committee that since 1938 I have been in constant touch with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have helped them develop a number of cases. I won't tell you what the cases were, no more than I would tell you I don't think it is proper at this point, but those cases consistently touched on Communist, Nazi, and Fascist activities in the United States.

I would like to go a little further and state that on Communist activities right here in Washington I have written a number of articles, denouncing and exposing Communist activities in the United States, one of them based on statements made by our learned friend over here at the time of the demise of General Krivitsky. You remember we were down at the morgue here that night?

I wrote stories expressing my conviction that he was a victim of the O. G. P. U. I don't know how much of that material the F. B. I. would be willing to make accessible to the committee, but I am sure that you will be satisfied in that connection if you inquire.

I have checked with Mr. Hoover's executive assistants, and they said that Mr. Hoover would be glad to substantiate that information for you.

I have here a picture of myself with one of the leaders of the Ku Klux Klan in New Jersey. I am surprised that that never came to the attention of the committee.

Here is one of myself with Gustave Elmer, G. Wilhelm Kunze, Fritz Kuhn, James Wheeler Hill, and myself, five of us walking together up in Webster, Mass., and the caption on the picture says that Mr. Kuhn is flanked by four bundsmen. It might be taken, conceivably, by that, that I was a member of the German-American Bund.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you photographed in those pictures incognito?

Mr. KARR. Well, as a newspaperman, but the caption was wrong.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was your identity known to Kuhn and others?

Mr. KARR. Well, as I always obscured my identity, as far as I could, as any investigator would.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was this picture cleared in the press?

Mr. KARR. Yes. This was out of the Boston Transcript.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are not identified by name in the picture.

Mr. KARR. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You would not suppose that this committee's research facilities would make it possible to examine all of the newspapers in the country.

Mr. KARR. I don't know. This committee has done some amazing things.

Mr. STARNES. To summarize, Mr. Karr, with reference to the allegations made by Mr. Dies on the floor to the effect that you were employed by the Federal Government in the Office of War Information at a salary of \$4,600, that statement is correct?

Mr. KARR. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That you had contributed articles to the Daily Worker, that is correct?

Mr. KARR. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That you had contributed articles to the Equality magazine, is correct?

Mr. KARR. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And that you had been publicly associated with the American League for Peace and Democracy, but that you never did accept the official position which they had assigned to you, and which was carried on their masthead; you didn't do that?

Mr. KARR. No.

Mr. STARNES. But you did make speeches for the league on a number of occasions?

Mr. KARR. When you say "speeches for the league," Mr. Chairman, there is a question whether you are endorsing the position of the league.

Mr. STARNES. Of course the record will disclose what he said, and it may be that I just did not hear him correctly, but I thought he said that he did not accept that official position.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is true.

Mr. STARNES. But he did make a number of speeches for the league; under the auspices of the league.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think his own language, in his original testimony, was that he made speeches for the league.

Mr. STARNES. That is what I understood you to say, Mr. Karr.

Mr. KARR. Under the auspices of the league, I think, would be more correct, sir.

Mr. STARNES. All right. So the only denial that you would make of the statements made by Mr. Dies on the floor is that any implication that you were a member of the Communist Party or circulated with it because of the fact that you had been on its staff—

Mr. KARR (interposing). I have never been on its staff, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Or had contributed articles to it, that would be the only denial that you could enter relative to that statement; is that correct?

Mr. KARR. Yes; in addition to which I reiterate and take issue with the entire tenor and the effect of the statement that the chairman of this committee made, in that it does impugn my patriotism and Americanism. I volunteered for the armed services of this country three times. I have been finally accepted and will be in the beginning of next month.

Mr. STARNES. And the only inaccuracy or any statement that you would take issue with, that he made at all, was the inference to the effect that you were a member of the Communist Party, or sympathetic with it.

Mr. KARR. That was the only inference that Mr. Dies drew; that I was either helping or was very friendly to the Communist Party or its front organizations.

Mr. STARNES. I was going to point out, however, that he just recited a number of facts, and of course, drew an inference from those facts. The facts that he recited were true, but you deny that the inference is true.

Mr. KARR. Most of the facts were true, but I deny the inference; yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. MASON. You say, Mr. Karr, that you take issue with the tenor or the implication of the facts that Mr. Dies gave on the floor.

Would you say that perhaps I have as much right to take issue with the tenor of that article which you wrote, which placed the direct implication that Mr. Dies spoke with Fritz Kuhn being there as a special guest, and that some others were there?

Would you say that the tenor of that was deliberately wrong?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. You were guilty in 1938 of the things that you say Mr. Dies is guilty of in 1943; is that right, Mr. Karr?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. MASON. Would you say, Mr. Karr, that it would be about a fair description of your activities during this 3- or 4-year period in New York, as a newspaperman, that you played the Communists against the Nazis and the Nazis against the Communists, in order to get information from both, so that you could furnish it to the F. B. I.?

Shall we say that that would be a pretty good description?

Mr. KARR. That would be a broad statement of the truth, sir.

Mr. MASON. And, of course, naturally when a person plays with two sides, and playing with fire, he is liable to get smoked up a little bit.

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. That is a fair statement?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. All right.

Mr. STARNES. All right, Mr. Karr. That will be all.

Mr. KARR. Thank you, sir.

Anything else?

Mr. STARNES. No, sir. That is all. You are excused.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. STARNES. The subcommittee will now hear the testimony of Mr. Stripling with reference to the telephone calls to which Mr. Karr, the previous witness, referred to a moment ago.

We will have Mr. Stripling take the stand and give his statement with reference to the facts.

Mr. Stripling, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. STRIPLING. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF ROBERT E. STRIPLING, CHIEF INVESTIGATOR,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES**

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Stripling, you heard the statement of Mr. Karr a moment ago that he called you prior to the time that Mr. Dies made his talk, when he learned that Mr. Dies was going to mention his name in a speech on the floor, in connection with the Daily Worker and other Communist publications.

Will you state to the committee, just in a brief, concise form, what actually took place with reference to any telephone calls or connection that you had with Mr. Karr.

Mr. STRIPLING. Just prior to February 1, which was a few days before Mr. Dies made his speech, we were assembling the facts and material on these people, and we came across a book review in the Daily Worker, signed by David Karr.

I called the Office of War Information, Mr. Karr's office, six times, and finally, on the sixth call, late in the afternoon, Mr. Karr was in and spoke to me.

I had left word to have him call me when he came in.

Dr. Matthews was present in the room when I called.

I asked Mr. Karr if he was the same David Karr who had reviewed a book for the Daily Worker in the January 18, 1939, issue.

He said he did not recall whether he had reviewed any books for them or not, but that he had written a number of articles for the Daily Worker. So I asked him to repeat that and he said, sure, he had written a number of articles for the Daily Worker, including some about Martin Dies.

I then asked him if he had written articles for the Fight Magazine. He said he had, and he said he had also for Equality Magazine.

I thanked him and hung up.

The next day Tom McNamara, who is the leg man for Drew Pearson's column, came to my office and said, "I understand that you all are going to blast little Davy Karr because he wrote some articles against Martin Dies."

I told him that that was not the situation at all; that the committee was concerned with certain affiliations of Mr. Karr. And that was the end of that.

The following day Mr. Karr called me about three times. I was out the first two calls, and on the third call I talked to him, and he said he would like to come up and explain or talk to Mr. Dies about the articles.

He said he had been informing for the F. B. I. regarding communism. He asked me to get in touch with a party in Mr. Hoover's office.

I called the gentleman in Mr. Hoover's office, and he said he would check up.

Mr. Hoover's office called me later in the day and said they had checked the matter carefully, and while Mr. Karr had been to their offices once or twice he was of no service to them, and they were not concerned with him one way or the other as an informer, and that anything we wanted to do was quite all right with them.

Mr. STARNES. All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Stripling.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Our next witness is Mr. Weyl.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Weyl, will you stand and be sworn, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. WEYL. I do.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Weyl, this is a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, and we have asked you to come up and make any statements that you care to make with reference to the allegations contained in a speech made on the floor of the House by the Honorable Martin Dies, of Texas, on February 1, 1943, in which your name was mentioned in the following language:

Nathaniel Weyl is senior economic analyst of the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of \$4,600. For several years Weyl was very prominent in Communist activities among students. His writings in the Student Review, magazine of the National Student League, make it clear beyond the possibility of any slight doubt that Weyl himself was a Communist. His writings in the Communist Party's newspaper, the Daily Worker, also leave no doubt about his being a loyal Communist Party member.

The hearings here are an executive session, I may say to you and the gentleman who accompanied you. The testimony which you shall give will be made available to the special committee, set about by House resolution in the Appropriations Committee, to determine and pass upon all these matters, and it is to implement the documents and let you make your explanatory statements and anything you care to make with reference to that that you are called on.

May I say to you, as to any question that Dr. Matthews will ask, please answer it unequivocally first, and then you are at perfect liberty to make any explanatory statement. That will save equivocation and will save the record.

Now, Mr. Sher, if you will be good enough to give the reporter your full name and address.

Mr. SHER. Robert E. Sher, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. STARNES. All right, Mr. Matthews.

TESTIMONY OF NATHANIEL WEYL, PRINCIPAL BUSINESS ECONOMIC ANALYST, BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

Mr. MATTHEWS. Give your full name, please.

Mr. WEYL. Nathaniel Weyl.

Mr. MATTHEWS. W-e-y-l?

Mr. WEYL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. WEYL. In New York City.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When?

Mr. WEYL. July 20, 1910.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please give an outline of your educational background.

Mr. WEYL. Yes. My school education was in New York Friends Seminary, which is a Quaker school in New York City.

Then I took my undergraduate work in Columbia University, graduating with, I think, B. S., and majoring in economics and philosophy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What year was that graduation?

Mr. WEYL. I graduated in February 1931. Then I took 1 year of postgraduate work in economics in the London School of Economics in London, England, and another year of postgraduate work in Columbia University, New York.

And that completes my formal education.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your professional experience?

Mr. WEYL. As an economist?

Mr. MATTHEWS. State the positions which you have held.

Mr. STARNES. Chronologically.

Mr. WEYL. In 1933-34 I held a position with the Consumers' Counsel of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration of the Department of Agriculture, as an economist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration while in that position?

Mr. WEYL. \$3,800. May I add here that there were periods in which I have been engaged in writing and research, so that the employment record is not continuous?

In 1935-36 I worked as a statistician for the Humboldt Oil Co., in Houston, Tex., at a starting salary of \$35 a week, which was subsequently raised to \$50.

In 1937-38, I attempted newspaper reporting, starting in as a cub reporter for the New York Post at \$35 a week.

In 1940 I was junior economist for the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System. That is not a junior economist civil-service rating, by the way. My salary was \$3,400. There I was in charge of Latin-American research.

Then I transferred from that to the Board of Economic Warfare at \$3,800. I have been with the Board now for about 18 months and have had two successive pay increases, so that my present salary is \$5,600.

Now, do you want me to indicate what I have been doing in the Board?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; please.

Mr. WEYL. All right. Well, I came to the Board, in a sense, originally in July 1941; that is, to say, I was then working in the Federal Reserve Board, but the Office of the Administrator of Export Control, which later became the Board of Economic Warfare, borrowed my services half-time to direct a small staff that was estimating the steel requirements of Latin America for export-control purposes.

However, I remained for 6 months on the Federal Reserve Board pay roll.

Then moving into the Board, I was the liaison between our Import Section, our Shipping and Stock Pile Division of the War Production Board, which meant making studies with the War Production Board people on import materials, and shipping for the B. E. W.

When we got the powers under the Executive order of April 13, that is, giving the Board directive powers over imports, I was assigned to the Rubber Division, and was in charge of the Amazon Unit of that Division until approximately February, when Mr. Jeffers decided to turn the wild-rubber-procurement program over to the Rubber Development Corporation.

Then I was assigned to Mahogany.

Let me add for the record that the Mahogany program is not, of course, for furniture but for military purposes.

That, I think, brings the record up to date.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Weyl, have you any dissent that you would like to enter at this time to the remarks made by the Honorable Martin Dies?

Mr. WEYL. Yes; I would like to make a dissent on some of the details.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Take them point by point.

Mr. WEYL. Yes. Before doing so, you spoke of my making a statement about this. Is it your intention that I shall make a statement?

Mr. STARNES. Yes; that is what you are being asked for now. Any statement that you care to make of a dissenting nature about the allegations made by Mr. Dies, in connection with his speech.

Mr. WEYL. I will first make a few corrections on details which are of no importance.

My title is principal business economic analyst.

My salary is \$5,600.

Then, another dissenting detail is this: This statement says: "For several years Weyl was very prominent in Communist activities among the students."

I had the opportunity to check up these files in the Public Library of New York, and the dates, as near as I can recall it, are from approximately December 1932 until May of 1933. Of course, that does not affect the substance of it, but it is a correction of detail.

Mr. MASON. I want to get this clear. Instead of saying for several years, it should have been for several months; is that it?

Mr. WEYL. That is correct; yes.

Mr. STARNES. A part of 2 years?

Mr. WEYL. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Several months, but a part of 2 years?

Mr. WEYL. Yes; that is correct.

Then there is another dissent of detail. This states:

His writings in the Communist Party newspaper, the Daily Worker, also leave no doubt about his being a loyal Communist Party member.

I had forgotten that I ever wrote for the Daily Worker. As far as my research of the files in New York indicates, I wrote one article there. Isn't that correct, Mr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the only one we have.

Mr. WEYL. Well, I think describing one article as "writings" is a bit misleading.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the date of the article to which you refer?

Mr. WEYL. I think it was May 1, wasn't it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1933?

Mr. WEYL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was for a May Day supplement, but it appeared under the date of April 29, 1933.

Mr. WEYL. I see. This is a dissent of detail.

Now, your statement is that there is no doubt about my being a loyal Communist Party member. I would like to make two points about that.

The first is that while those articles show very clearly, I think, although I then espoused the Communist position, I was not a member of the Communist Party. That is perhaps not too significant, because whether a man carries a card or holds certain views is perhaps legalistic. The thing that is significant is the implication "his being a loyal Communist Party member" that I am now a member of the Communist Party.

And when the occasion arises here, I would like to try to submit to you pretty conclusive evidence that I am not only not a member of the Communist Party, but that I have written in opposition to the Communist Party over a period of a year or so prior to my present employment by the Government.

Mr. MASON. Well, would you say that it is correct that at that particular time, and in that particular writing, we will say, that you agreed with or espoused the Communist position at that time?

Mr. WEYL. Yes, sir. I will have to admit to that mistake.

Mr. MASON. I just want to get in my own mind how much truth there is in this.

Mr. WEYL. Yes.

Mr. MASON. But you, of course, would deny that you ever were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEYL. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Go ahead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you through with the dissents?

Mr. WEYL. I would like to ask your pleasure in this.

When I got my subpoena yesterday, I dug through a lot of newspaper writings of mine to show my points, at which I said things no Communist or Communist sympathizer could say. I would like to put those in the record. I don't care when I do so. That is entirely at your pleasure.

Mr. STARNES. That is all right. You can append those just like these publications. They are too lengthy, of course, to put in the record, but we will append them as exhibits, and go along with the testimony, and then the other members of the committee can examine them at length.

Mr. WEYL. Unless Dr. Matthews would like the opportunity of hearing them and cross-examining on them, in case he feels they do not indicate what I say they do.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Before we leave the substance of the matter contained in the speech of the Honorable Martin Dies, I would like to ask a few questions about the organizations involved there, for the record.

Mr. WEYL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you publicly associated with an organization known as the National Student League?

Mr. WEYL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you hold any official position in connection with that organization?

Mr. WEYL. Well, as I recall, I was associate editor of this magazine, Student Review, and that was, I think, the official organ of the National Student League.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know how long you were associate editor of the Student Review?

Mr. WEYL. I will have to make a guess on that. I should say 3 months.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is there any doubt whatever in your mind that the National Student League was a party organization?

Mr. WEYL. You mean controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. WEYL. No; there is no such doubt in my mind.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the publication, Student Review, as faithfully as possible, presented the Communist Party line in its columns, did it not?

Mr. WEYL. I think it did; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have here a photostatic copy of one of the articles which you contributed to the Student Review, in the issue of February 1933, entitled "Heywood Broun, An Analysis." As you recall the substance of that article, I take it that it reflects the view which you have yourself described as the Communist Party line of that particular period.

Mr. WEYL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So that it is not necessary to go into details.

Mr. WEYL. No. I think there is no point in debating about that, Dr. Matthews; that is a fact.

Mr. STARNES. I want to say that I think you are honest, and your sincerity is refreshing.

Mr. WEYL. Thank you.

Mr. STARNES. The Chair appreciates it, and I am sure the committee does.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is one other organization, the Student Congress Against War, which was held on the University of Chicago campus in December 1932. You recall that gathering, do you not?

Mr. WEYL. Yes; I recall something about it. Do you have a specific question?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am going to ask you specifically to establish the facts in the case.

Were you a member of the Committee of the Student Congress Against War?

Mr. WEYL. That was the committee that issued the call?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I would like to ask you if it is not your understanding that the Student Congress Against War, held in Chicago in December 1932, was a direct outgrowth of the Amsterdam World Congress Against War?

Mr. WEYL. Well, I really don't know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It might refresh your recollection if I told you that the Student Review carried a statement to the effect that the Honorable Henri Barbusse, representing the International Committee of the World Congress Against War, cabled to the National Student League, requesting that it hold such a congress against war.

Do you have any recollection that that was the general situation?

Mr. WEYL. No. If it was in the Student Review, I doubtless knew about it at the time. What was the date of that? Did you say September?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, September.

Mr. WEYL. May I make a brief explanation of how I got into this thing?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Certainly.

Mr. WEYL. In the fall and winter of 1932, I was a member of the Socialist Party. I had been studying in England, as I explained, and had taken one or two trips to Germany, had seen Hitler coming into power, and had come to the conclusion that the Socialist method was not going to do any good in stopping Hitler, so that I was, in the fall and winter of 1932, about ready to get out of the Socialist Party; I think you recall that.

Now, while I was still in the Socialist Party, a group of students and Communists asked me to lend my name to this committee which was issuing a call for the Student Antiwar Congress.

I said, "Of course, I understand that you want my name in this because I am a fairly prominent campus Socialist, but it seems to me that if such a congress is to be held, we ought to have the Socialist groups in as well as the Communist groups, and I am quite willing to do so."

It was some time later that I joined the National Student League.

So that coming back to your question, I may or may not have seen that item in the Student Review; I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not the so-called Amsterdam congress pledge was endorsed at the Student Congress Against War in Chicago?

Mr. WEYL. I should say I was never at that congress.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Didn't you attend?

Mr. WEYL. No, no. This committee was one of the committees that really had a letterhead. To my knowledge it never met. They did hold a congress in Chicago, but I never did attend that congress. The committee may have continued after Chicago, but I am not informed on that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have a particular date or period in mind when you would say that you broke with your espousal of the Communist Party line?

Mr. WEYL. That is a very difficult question. I would like to put it this way, that at the time of this student matter that we are discussing I was, to all intents, as far as my thoughts and my writings were concerned, a Communist. Then I gradually drifted away. The reason I didn't drift away more rapidly was because I have always believed in the necessity of beating the Axis; and the Communists, at a somewhat later date, participated in these popular-front groups or fellow-traveler groups, which were directed against German and Japanese aggression, so that I cannot recall the exact date. I should say 1935 or 1936.

I was fairly active in the American League for Peace and Democracy, which turned out to be communistic controlled.

Let me explain that. Of course, there was a good deal of Communist control, obviously, in that organization, right from the outset, and right along through, and as it turned out, I was very surprised when, with this Hitler-Stalin pact, the membership of the American League did not take over. I thought they would.

So I found out then it was in complete control, but during that whole period I was in favor of working with any group which held those views against fascism.

The thing that I think first really definitely made me opposed to communism was these Russian trials; but I felt that it was necessary to get all of these groups together behind this program. It was not the time to make any public attack on Communists.

I didn't. Of course, when the pact occurred and when the Communists started trying to get this country to espouse neutrality, and later on, interfering with defense production, I wrote against them.

Now, that is the date of the open break in the sense that I attacked them publicly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider yourself a collectivist of any variety, or may I say, a Socialist at the present time?

Mr. WEYL. I should say yes. But I would like to add a few sentences to that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. The purpose of my question is to bring out as clearly as possible the extent of the break that you say you have made.

I think it is fair that the record should show that having held the view which you described as the Communist Party line, that you indicate to what extent the break occurred.

Mr. WEYL. I would be glad to have an opportunity to do so. I think I can put my present philosophy pretty briefly this way: I believe that we are moving into a type of collectivist society, in which Government control of business and of economic enterprise is on the increase.

I do not today espouse the Socialist view, which is complete ownership and control of means of production in the hands of the State because that seems to me leads essentially to a one-way system; a dictatorship, a totalitarian state, and suppression of freedom.

But I believe in the minimum of social control which is necessary to keep full pace with freedom and democracy, and that implies that social control does not centralize all power in the State or in the hands of a small group of executives or managers of the State.

I don't know if that is specific enough.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would not wish to undertake to cross-examine the witness on the basis of his own prepared statement at this particular time; in fact, I don't know whether I would want to after I have had the time to study it.

I think it would be well to incorporate it in the record and let it speak for itself.

Mr. MASON. As I understand it, this prepared statement that you spoke of comprises excerpts of some writings that you have carried on since this break, which shows definitely that you now, at least, have reversed your position on and are directly opposed to communism.

Mr. WEYL. That is right.

Mr. MASON. I think all that is necessary is to authorize that it shall be included in the record as an exhibit, so that it will have its bearing on the case.

Mr. WEYL. Well, now, just put this off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all I have.

Mr. MASON. Then I shall declare the hearing adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 a. m., April 6, 1943, the hearing adjourned.)



INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., the Honorable Noah M. Mason presiding.

Present: Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator for the committee; and William H. Brophy, Department of the Interior.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Goldschmidt, will you be sworn, please?

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

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I do.

Mr. MASON. You understand, Mr. Goldschmidt, that the hearings that we are having before the subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities are for the purpose of completing our records, and also to furnish to this other committee that has been set up the complete records as we have them.

This, of course, is a follow-up of the charges or allegations that were made by Mr. Dies on the floor in connection with certain members on the Government pay roll.

Mr. Stripling, you will ask the questions, please.

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR E. GOLDSCHMIDT, ACTING DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF POWER, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you state your full name to the reporter, Mr. Goldschmidt, please?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Arthur E. Goldschmidt.

Mr. STRIPLING. What year were you born?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. 1910.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give your educational background?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I went to grammar school and high school in San Antonio, Tex., except for my first year in grammar school, which was in Fredericksburg, Tex.

I went to Columbia University and got my A. B. degree there.

Mr. STRIPLING. What year did you graduate from high school?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. In 1927.

Mr. STRIPLING. And you received your A. B. from Columbia in what year?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. 1932.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, will you give your professional experience and the various jobs you have held since your graduation?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I worked in college. I worked my way through college, and in college I worked for Dr. Joseph McGoldrick, who is now comptroller of the city of New York, as an assistant.

Then immediately after getting out of college and while I was still doing graduate work, I worked for the Emergency Exchange Association in New York City for a short period of time.

I then did some work for Dr. McGoldrick again on a study in connection with relief in New York City.

Shortly thereafter I was asked to come down here to work with the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, which was in 1933—in September 1933—and I worked there in that organization which, as you know, handled Federal emergency relief, and then C. W. A., and then was called Federal Emergency Relief Administration again in various capacities.

In C. W. A. I was assistant to the chief engineer; various administrative capacities.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall what your salary was?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. My closing salary was \$3,600.

In 1935 I was loaned to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, which was conducting an investigation in holding-company financing, and I worked with the Senate committee, with Senator Wheeler as chairman, on that subcommittee. He was chairman of the subcommittee for 2 years.

Mr. MASON. During these 2 years you were still on the pay roll of the Government?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Pardon me?

Mr. MASON. You were loaned to this committee, but you received your pay from the Federal Government?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes. After that I worked for the then Committee for Industrial Organization as an appointed vice president of the United Federal Workers of America.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was that during the period you were employed by the Government?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. No. I went off the Government pay roll at that time.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was that date again?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. That was July 1937, and I worked there through December of 1937.

Mr. STRIPLING. When was the United Federal Workers of America organized?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I think about 2 months before I joined the staff.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you the first vice president of the organization?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did you leave the United Federal Workers of America?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I left their employ in December of 1937.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were there from July until December of that year?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Then did you go back into the Government service?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. What position?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I went as a special agent in the Consumers Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission.

Mr. STRIPLING. At what salary?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. At \$4,000.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was your next Federal employment?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I then went to work for the Power Division of the Public Works Administration, as Assistant to the Director, at the same salary.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was that in 1938?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes, sir. In July 1938.

Mr. STRIPLING. Your next employment?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. In 1940 I went to work as special assistant to the chairman of the National Power Policy Committee in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was your salary there, Mr. Goldschmidt?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Five thousand two hundred dollars.

Mr. STRIPLING. Five thousand two hundred dollars?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Your next employment?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I was next employed as assistant to the Director in the Power Division, which was set up in 1941, in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present position?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I am now Acting Director of the Division of Power.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your salary at the present time?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Eight thousand dollars.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Goldschmidt, on February 1, this year, Congressman Dies, in a speech on the floor of the House, stated that you were a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy; is that true?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I have been a member of the American League; yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. During what period were you a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. In 1937; around 1937, I think.

Mr. STRIPLING. The League dissolved in 1940. Were you a member up until that time?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I was not an active member. I was on their list, I think.

Mr. STRIPLING. He also stated that you were a member of the Washington Book Shop; is that true?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes. May I explain the circumstances of that?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I never, myself, joined the Washington Book Shop. I didn't know I was a member of the Washington Book Shop until Mr. Dies revealed the list of members, and on inquiry I found that my wife had joined the Book Shop in order to buy some Victrola records.

I have never attended any meetings of the Washington Book Shop. I never have been active in it, and I am not a member.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, I believe you stated, or your previous testimony was, that you were a member of the Washington Book Shop. Now you state you were not a member. Didn't your wife join for you?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I stated that I had been a member of the Washington Book Shop, because my wife joined for me.

Mr. STRIPLING. But you resigned from the Book Shop.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. No; but I have never paid any dues.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you now, or have you ever been a member of the International Labor Defense?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I once gave International Labor Defense some money on their Christmas appeal. I don't know whether that constitutes membership. I am not an active member, nor have I ever attended any meetings sponsored by or of the International Labor Defense.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever attended or spoken before the National Negro Congress?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. In 1937, when I was with the United Federal Workers, I received an invitation in my official capacity as vice president of that organization to appear in a panel discussion with other people to discuss the Negro in the Federal service, and I did attend that meeting in Philadelphia, and appeared as a panel speaker.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. No, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. And are you aware that the Attorney General, through an interdepartmental committee set up by Executive order of the President, has found that the American League for Peace and Democracy, the National Negro Congress, and the Washington Book Shop are all Communist front organizations?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I read in the newspapers, and I have heard that the Attorney General had a study made of those organizations, and has made some findings. That study was made much after I was connected with any of those organizations, and I don't know what is in the study, except by the newspapers.

Mr. STRIPLING. You will find a copy of that memorandum in the Record of September 24, 1942; in the Congressional Record.

On October 5, 1939, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities made public a list of the membership of the American League for Peace and Democracy, as it pertained to Government employees, and on page 6404, under the Work Projects Administration, there is listed Arthur Goldschmidt, 3036 P Street NW., employed in Public Works as an architect at \$4,000 a year.

Are you the party referred to?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Mr. Stripling, I think I am. I have never been employed as an architect, and my middle initial is E, and not F.

Mr. STRIPLING. It is listed here as just "Arthur."

Now, what about the address, 3036 P Street?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. That was my address.

Mr. STRIPLING. That was your address?

Mr. GOLDSMITH. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you ever make any denial to the committee of your affiliation as set forth in these hearings and released to the public?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. No, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were a member at that time of the American League. That was October 25, 1939.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I never made any public denial of membership.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever been a sponsor of the Washington Friends of Spanish Democracy?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Mr. Stripling, I may have sponsored it at certain meetings. I don't think they had sponsors. I gave money to the Washington League or Washington Friends for Spanish Democracy.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, the letterhead, dated June 30, 1938, of the Washington Friends for Spanish Democracy, listed Arthur E. Goldschmidt as a sponsor.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Well, I may have been listed as a sponsor, but I was not active in the organization. I did attend open meetings that they held, and I was active in the sense that I contributed money to the organization, but I didn't know that I was a sponsor of it. I didn't do anything more than contribute money to it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever subscribed to the New Masses?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes, sir; I subscribed for a while.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you now a subscriber?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I am not.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are aware, of course, that it is an official publication of the Communist Party?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I think that is right, Mr. Stripling. But when I subscribed to see what it was like, I subscribed for a while and then dropped my subscription, because I found a certain sameness about it, and I wasn't interested in it. I wanted to see what they were saying.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, on June 13, 1941, you were interviewed by Investigator Robert B. Barker, Special Agent Rudolph Roth, and Special Agent Charles Moody, of the committee; isn't that true?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes, sir. I think the date is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. That was June 13, 1941, in room 6313, Eighteenth and C Streets NW.; the New Interior Building.

They questioned you concerning your affiliation with the American League for Peace and Democracy, the International Labor Defense, the National Negro Congress, the Washington Book Shop, and the Washington Committee for Democratic Action; also as to your subscription to the New Masses.

They also asked you this question, if you were a subscriber to the Daily Worker. Do you remember what your answer was?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. My answer was "No."

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you state to them, however, that you had read the Daily Worker quite a bit?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I didn't say that I had read it quite a bit. I had read the Daily Worker occasionally.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Goldschmidt, is your wife employed in the Government.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. At the moment she is not.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you state your wife's name, please.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Elizabeth Wickenden Goldschmidt.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall whether or not she was employed by the National Youth Administration from January 1, 1939, to June 12, 1940?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I believe those dates are correct, Mr. Stripling, if you have that from the record.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you give me her title in the National Youth Administration?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. She was assistant to the Administrator, I think.

Mr. STRIPLING. At what salary?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Well, I don't know whether during that time her salary changed. At the time she was leaving, she was making \$6,000 a year.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is there any relation between your wife and Mr. Aubrey Williams, the Director of the National Youth Administration?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. What do you mean, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. I mean kinship.

Mr. MASON. Blood relation.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. No.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Goldschmidt, who sponsored you for your present position as Director of the Power Division in the Interior Department?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I would say the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall whom you gave as references?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. To the Secretary?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I do not, Mr. Stripling, but I can furnish that for the record.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you want that information, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MASON. I think it would be pertinent to the inquiry.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right, sir. Those are the only questions I have to ask.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Goldschmidt, you received your B. A. degree from Columbia, and then you mentioned that you had done some graduate work there. How much?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Well, I was planning to go on to do graduate work, and I took courses in economics in 1932.

Mr. MASON. How much graduate work or college work did you do in addition to your bachelor's?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I did about a year's graduate work. I should say this, though, Mr. Chairman; I was working part of that time on a very heavy schedule. I worked my way through college, and I was taking courses on the side, as it were.

Mr. MASON. You stated in your testimony that you joined the American League for Peace and Democracy on or about 1937. Do you remember how you contacted that league and how you became a member, or who invited you to join, or anything like that?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I don't remember the exact circumstances of my joining the organization; that is to say, whether a friend came and talked to me about it, or whether I got something through the mail on it, but I do remember I joined it because it seemed to have, as its stated purposes, purposes that appealed to me particularly.

Mr. MASON. In connection with some of those other organizations you stated that you had not taken an active part nor been active as a member.

How active were you in the American League for Peace and Democracy about that time?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I was not active at all. I never attended any membership meetings or organization meeting of any sort.

Mr. MASON. You were not an official of the local unit?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. No, sir.

Mr. MASON. We have, Mr. Goldschmidt, in connection with the hearings of the other people whom Mr. Dies, on the floor of the House, charged with certain affiliations, and so forth, given them an opportunity to make statements of their own, after we were through with the questioning, which would give reasons, or clear up any certain points, and we will be glad to give you that opportunity at this time.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to state to the committee that the only party I have ever belonged to or have given any money to or voted for is the Democratic Party. I do not believe in the overthrow of this Government either by force or violence.

I have never been a member of, or affiliated with any group, Communist Party, or any other group that advocates the overthrow of this Government by force or violence.

I believe in this Government. I believe in its institutions. I am raising a family on that basis. I own my home. I own stocks and bonds, and I have worked all of my life.

As I stated to the committee, I was born and raised in Texas. I worked when I was in grammar school, and in high school, and then through college. And I have worked very hard for this Government, and I have a great many friends here, and associates in my work that can testify as to my loyalty and as to my integrity.

I mentioned that I have worked for the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. The members of that subcommittee for which I worked know me and could testify about me. My associates on that committee with whom I worked very closely for 2 years, as well as my associates in my present job, know me and I think would testify as to my loyalty and my integrity.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Goldschmidt, would you say by reason of the fact that you have been a member of some of these organizations that the Attorney General has determined are subversive organizations, and in becoming a member that you were what might be called an innocent member; that you didn't know the purposes behind the organizations which followed the Communist line, and so forth?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, if it had any purposes other than those that were stated and printed and that I read, I didn't know anything about it.

Mr. MASON. And in the contact you had at the time you were a member—and you said you were not very active—those subversive purposes did not come to your attention, and so forth?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. No, sir.

Mr. MASON. You did not associate with certain of the leaders of the American League for Peace and Democracy, we will say, that were known to have Communist affiliations, and so forth?

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. I didn't know that anyone in the organizations that I dealt with had Communist leanings. I think, to sum up my statement, Mr. Chairman—and I probably said this before, but I just want to make it crystal clear—that I am an American and am

proud of it; that I have never belonged to any organization that had as its purpose the overthrow of this Government.

Mr. MASON. Of course, when you make that statement that you have never belonged to an organization that had for its purpose the overthrow of the Government, and when you consider the fact that the American League for Peace and Democracy, for instance, has been designated as an organization, not only by our committee but by the Attorney General—and his designation was based upon facts that had been provided for him—that was a subversive organization, that it did have as its ulterior motives, not on the surface but below, the overthrow of the Government by force, you see, your statement conflicts.

You should say "I have never knowingly belonged." I think that probably would clarify it.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Well, if that helps to clarify the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. Well, it would clarify it in my mind, at least.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT. Yes, sir; but I have never knowingly belonged to any group or organization that had as its purpose the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. I think that is all.

(Witness excused.)

(Whereupon, at 10:30 a. m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., the Honorable Noah M. Mason presiding.

Present: Honorable Noah M. Mason and the Honorable J. Parnell Thomas.

Also present: J. B. Matthews, director of research for the committee, and Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator.

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

Mr. STRIPLING. Our first witness is Mr. Mins.

Mr. MASON. The witness will please stand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give at this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MINS. I do.

Mr. MASON. Be seated, sir.

You may proceed, Mr. Matthews.

TESTIMONY OF LEONARD E. MINS, RESEARCH ANALYST, OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please give your full name.

Mr. MINS. Leonard E.—E for Emil, but I don't use the full middle name—Mins.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. MINS. Yonkers, N. Y.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When?

Mr. MINS. January 14, 1900.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give an outline of your educational background?

Mr. MINS. Well, elementary schools in various cities around New York, Elizabeth, Elizabethport, Leonia, and Brooklyn. High school: Erasmus Hall High School in Brooklyn. College: I went to City College for about a year and a half until the war broke, the last war, then I went to a munitions factory making airplane motors, and later another one making airplanes, and then in 1921 I went across on my own on a cattle boat to Europe, expecting to matriculate in the Technische Hochschule, of Berlin. I matriculated there in 1925. I had 2 years of engineering training there.

I returned to the United States because I was financially a little hard up; I was supporting myself there, and entered Columbia University, from which institution I received two degrees in 1932, a bachelor of science and a graduate degree of electrical engineering.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what year was that?

Mr. MINS. 1932. It was rather late in one's life to do that, but I have been working my way through.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does that complete your educational statement?

Mr. MINS. Oh, no. I had 1 year of work in educational psychology and education at New York University in 1937-38.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your father's name?

Mr. MINS. Henry Felix Mins.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is he living?

Mr. MINS. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you last see him?

Mr. MINS. I last saw him on August 30 or 31, 1936. I am not sure about the exact date. I can check that, but I don't know it offhand.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you see him at that time?

Mr. MINS. I saw him on the railway platform in Warsaw, Poland.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you going at the time?

Mr. MINS. I was leaving Russia for the United States, together with my wife.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And where was he on his way to?

Mr. MINS. He was going nowhere. He was living and working in Warsaw at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long had he been living in Warsaw?

Mr. MINS. Since, I believe, February 1928.

Mr. MATTHEWS. About 8 years?

Mr. MINS. I am sorry.

Mr. MATTHEWS. About 8 years?

Mr. MINS. About 8 years with one exception. He had returned to the United States, I believe it was in December of 1930, to renew his passport once.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your father's business in the United States?

Mr. MINS. My father's business in the United States at first was, when I was born, a skilled tool maker and machinist, working for firms such as Otis, Bliss Manufacturing Co., Robert Hoe, Mergenthaler Linotype, and later on he had sort of a stationery-news store out in Leonia, N. J., and then he worked again for printing-press machinists, Mason & Moore, as a printing-press repair machinist.

In 1913 he purchased a machine shop and tool and die shop and from then on until he left the United States he was the owner of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From 1913 to 1928?

Mr. MINS. Yes; he was the owner of a tool and die and machine shop.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where was that machine shop?

Mr. MINS. It was at first at 240 West Twenty-seventh Street.

Mr. MATTHEWS. New York City?

Mr. MINS. That is right. And later on he formed a corporation with two or three other machinists under the name of Mins-Hamp Machine & Tool Corporation at 339 West Twenty-fourth. I am pulling those addresses out from away back.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the shop at 339 West Twenty-fourth Street operated until 1928 by Mins?

Mr. MINS. Let me see. I was abroad at that time, and I will have to give you the thing as best I remember. I think it was liquidated by dissolution of the corporation, or one or two men pulling out. Good grief! I think it was 1926 or 1927; I don't know exactly. I was not in the country at the time. I know, at any rate when I returned to the United States it was in liquidation or already liquidated or in the process of liquidation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you last hear from your father? I believe you stated that you last saw him on or about August 31, 1936. Have you heard from him since that time?

Mr. MINS. Yes. My brother had been in correspondence with him, and I had been. He just failed to get out of Poland back to the States before the war broke out. He had sent a cable asking that arrangements be made for one of these emergency visas since he had lived in the country so long that it was a presumption of his having lost his American citizenship. That cable arrived in New York in the middle of August 1939.

My brother was in Europe at the time and didn't get the cable until after the Germans had invaded Poland. At that time nothing could be done about it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your brother's name?

Mr. MINS. Henry Felix Mins, Jr. We tried to obtain a visa from the State Department, sort of emergency visa for Americans abroad, but his citizenship was clouded by his stay abroad, and the line of his birth, and we tried to arrange for passage but the Germans would not let my father out of Poland.

Nothing could be done there because the American Embassy no longer existed there.

The last time we heard from my father was a post card in 1940 to my brother, stating that he was still living in the same apartment and that he was getting along by slowly selling the things he had. We have been somewhat worried about him, because his apartment was in rather an exposed part of town. It faced the Polytechnic School, which newspaper reports had stated received raids by air bombardment.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you speak a little louder?

Mr. MINS. I am sorry.

His house was exactly opposite that house, and we didn't know whether he had been killed in an air bombardment. Since September 1940 we haven't been able to contact him. We have tried to, through the International Red Cross; the State Department tried to locate him, and we haven't heard from him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what business was your father engaged after he went to Warsaw?

Mr. MINS. He started manufacturing projection machinery, film-projection machinery; there wasn't much of that in Poland, apparently. And he manufactured this machinery, and these were devices for not projecting moving-picture films, but for projecting stills from moving-picture films as a part of an adult education—I won't say

"campaign"—but an adult educational program set up by the Polish Government.

He did this for the General Staff. He did this for the archbishop of Warsaw. He did this for the Minister of Education, and the like.

I was in his shop twice in 1933, when my wife and I were making just a summer tour of Europe, and then in 1934 on my way in to work in Russia, in 1934, I met several officers of the Polish Army in his shop. They would come in and out in connection with this work.

The work consisted, as I say, of a film about, as I remember 10 or 15 feet, regular motion-picture film with stills on it, and an accompanying lecture for it, drawn up in Polish, which I can't read, and it was written by various professors of the university or other authorities in the field, general films on geography, films on elementary education, on mathematics, and all sorts of things that would be used in a country with a very low level of education, to pull the educational level up.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think that is sufficient on that particular point.

Mr. MINS. If you will permit me, I want to make one more statement in that connection.

My father had been an old friend and associate of Pilsudski in the nineteenth century. He had been one of the members of the Polish patriotic organization fighting for Polish independence, and that was one of the reasons that motivated his return in 1923, because when I visited him there he was entitled to wear the highest Polish award, the Polonia Restituta, which went to the people who fought for Polish independence before the World War.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you personally know Nicholas Dozenberg?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever hear your father speak of Dozenberg?

Mr. MINS. No. I remember seeing his name in the newspapers several years ago but I never met him or heard my father ever speak of him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a frequent visitor to your father's machine shop on Twenty-seventh Street and Twenty-fourth Street in New York?

Mr. MINS. Well, that again has to be divided into two parts, I suppose. When I went to school I served my apprenticeship as machinist under my father, and from the age of 13 to the age of 17 I worked in my father's machine shop as an apprentice; in fact, I completed that apprenticeship well enough to get a card in the International Association of Machinists.

Later I was there every afternoon after school. I was there on Saturday and on Sunday. I never had a vacation. I was there all summer.

Later I went to work in the Standard Aircraft Corporation, Elizabeth, N. J., in the World War. Then I worked in the Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation, Long Island City, and that was toward the end of the war. That is not there any longer.

Then I went across to Europe in 1921. That was April of 1921. I worked my way across on a cattle boat from Baltimore to Liverpool. They would not let us off in Liverpool because of the general strike in England at the time. We continued on to Copenhagen on the boat,

and I stayed abroad from then until 1927, until July 1927, with two breaks—one, I returned to—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). Well, the question I asked you was: Did you frequent your father's machine shops?

Mr. MINS. I was practically never in Twenty-fourth Street because I was abroad most of that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, that will be enough in response to that question, then.

What is your present position?

Mr. MINS. My present position is research analyst with the Office of Strategic Services, P-4

Mr. MASON. What was that office?

Mr. MINS. Office of Strategic Services.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long have you been research analyst with the Office of Strategic Services?

Mr. MINS. Since April 1942.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever hold any other position with the Federal Government?

Mr. MINS. When I was a kid I was a clerk in the post office for some time at night, while I was going to school.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your adulthood, have you held any other position with the Federal Government?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your salary at present?

Mr. MINS. \$3,800. My grade is P-4.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you been receiving \$3,800 since your employment in April 1942?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of questions.

Mr. MASON. All right.

Mr. THOMAS. How did you happen to get this position?

Mr. MINS. I was recommended. Well, I was working as editor in a publishing house in New York, and I filled—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). What was the name of the publishing house?

Mr. MINS. Doubleday-Doran. I was working for Doubleday-Doran, for the Dryden Press, before that Simon & Schuster and the Dial Press. And I grew a bit annoyed with the slowness with which an application I had made for a commission in the Air Corps was coming through. I passed the physical for that.

Mr. THOMAS. When did you make that application for the Air Corps?

Mr. MINS. I made that application—I wanted to make it in October and I was working on a war book, but the author of that book—I am trying to remember—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Just a moment. When did you make the application?

Mr. MINS. I made the application in December 1941.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you make it in New York?

Mr. MINS. I came down to Washington. I made it in Washington.

Mr. THOMAS. You filled out the papers and everything here?

Mr. MINS. Oh, yes; I filled out the papers.

Mr. THOMAS. And you took the physical?

Mr. MINS. I took the physical back in New York. They at once gave me an order for a physical, because it seemed the technical training and knowledge of foreign countries is what they wanted. They wanted to send me to Persia or some other place.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, tell me how you got this job.

Mr. MINS. I grew tired of waiting for this thing to come through and came down again to Washington, and spoke to a friend of mine who is consultant to the Secretary Morgenthau.

Mr. THOMAS. Who was that?

Mr. MINS. Herbert Wollner. He is also chief of laboratories of the Bureau of Chemists, and he thought there were places in Washington I ought to fit in with my background; that people were needed with my background, and at first suggested that I might be sent overseas by the Treasury.

He apparently thought of this position where he felt men were needed. He got in touch with Mr. Lawrence Egbert, who was one of the executives of the Office of Strategic Services, and apparently a personal friend of his. I went to see Mr. Egbert. This was around Easter, 1942.

I went down to Charleston, with my wife, on vacation, and filled out some papers. I also sent the papers to Mr. Egbert. And I received a long-distance telephone call asking me to cut my vacation short and come back up here, which I did. And I met my present chief, Dr. Robinson, who is now abroad on Government service, but expected back, and he gave me some tests on my knowledge of the country, my knowledge of the Russian language, and asked me the sort of questions you ask me about my technical background and my stays abroad.

And I went back to New York and about a week later I received a telegram asking me to report.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all I have.

Mr. MASON. Go ahead, Dr. Matthews.

I suggest that you hold the witness to the exact statement in the question, because we have to hurry along.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know of your own knowledge whether or not your father's machine shop on Twenty-seventh Street or on Twenty-fourth Street was the secret meeting place of the Communist Party in the early years of the party in this country.

Mr. MINS. No. I have never seen anybody there who was identified to me as a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When I say "Communist Party," when I use those words I mean the name under which the party went at that time, it having been known as the Workers Communist Party and various other names during that period.

Mr. MINS. No. My answer to that must be "No."

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you heard that your father's shop was the secret headquarters of the Communist Party in this country during that period.

Mr. MINS. My attention was called—the first time I heard that statement made, my attention was called to an article or paragraph, it turned out to be, in a New York publication, called the New Leader. I forget who sent it to me or who told me about it. And the statement was made there, and I was rather furious about it, because my father was not in this country and he couldn't answer it himself.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the witness ought to answer the question.

Mr. MINS. I am sorry. I ignored it. That was the first time I heard of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever personally attend a Communist Party meeting in your father's machine shop at any time.

Mr. MINS. Never.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you say "no," do you mean that you did not hold a Communist Party membership card, or that you never had—

Mr. MINS (interposing). I mean that I never was a member of the Communist Party, with or without a card.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In any sense of the word?

Mr. MINS. In any sense of the word.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you teach a course at the Workers' School at any time?

Mr. MINS. Yes, I did. When I came back from Russia I taught a course in political economy. I was approached by them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, you taught a course in political economy. What year was that?

Mr. MINS. I don't remember. I think it was 1937, February, or the winter of '37-38.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you also teach a course in history in the international labor movement?

Mr. MINS. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you teach any other courses there?

Mr. MINS. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was in the year 1937-38?

Mr. MINS. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration in that position?

Mr. MINS. \$1 a night.

Mr. MATTHEWS. \$1 an hour?

Mr. MINS. \$1 an hour; \$1 for a class.

Mr. MATTHEWS. \$1 for a class?

Mr. MINS. A once-a-week sort of thing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who invited you to teach those courses at the Workers School?

Mr. MINS. A Mr. Markoff, I think it was Abraham Markoff.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Abraham Markoff?

Mr. MINS. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was the director of the Workers School at the time?

Mr. MINS. That is right. He wrote me—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Let us confine it to just a few words and not ramble along.

Mr. MINS. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You understood perfectly well at the time that the Workers School was the official school of the Communist Party; did you not?

Mr. MINS. I understood that it was run by the Communist Party; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you knew that Abraham Markoff was a Communist leader?

Mr. MINS. I took it for granted.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever associated in any capacity with the Daily Worker?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever foreign editor for the Daily Worker?

Mr. MINS. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever write any articles for the Daily Worker?

Mr. MINS. I don't remember. Let me think, now. I don't know. I have written letters to them in 1938 or 1939. I may have written to them in connection with the burning of the Reichstag, or the persecution of the Jews and the people in Germany. I felt very strongly on that at the time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, I didn't ask you if you wrote to the Daily Worker or if you have ever associated with the Daily Worker. I asked you if you have ever written for the Daily Worker.

Mr. MINS. I never received any compensation from the Daily Worker.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has your material ever been published in the Daily Worker?

Mr. MINS. I have not checked enough to know. I don't read it regularly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, surely you recall whether or not you wrote any article or articles for the Daily Worker.

Mr. MINS. Well, I can't say that I recall. If I did, it was at least 10 years ago; possibly, I may have.

Mr. THOMAS. Your memory is pretty good on most of these subjects.

Mr. MINS. I am trying to remember, sir. I am not trying to evade. I may have written for them or to them an article over my name, a contribution, in connection with persecutions in Germany.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you also write an article for the New York Times?

Mr. MINS. I have written to the New York Times.

Mr. THOMAS. You are sure you wrote to the New York Times?

Mr. MINS. I am sure I wrote to the New York Times; letters in that period, over my signature, in the New York Times.

Mr. THOMAS. On the same subject?

Mr. MINS. No. This was in connection with a similar subject.

Mr. THOMAS. So you are certain you wrote for the New York Times, but you are not certain you wrote for the Daily Worker?

Mr. MINS. My memory is about the same on that. My writing for the New York Times was about 8 or 9 years later; about 1939-40.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you ever write for the New York Herald Tribune?

Mr. MINS. No. It may, of course, be that some letters that were sent out by the secretary of the Exiled Writers Committee, over my signature, were sent to the New York Tribune; I don't remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you familiar with a publication known as the Communist International?

Mr. MINS. I have seen it; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever review it?

Mr. MINS. Review it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. MINS. Lord! No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever write for the Daily Worker with respect to the publication of the Communist International as follows:

At 10 cents per issue and \$2 for a year's subscription, the Communist International is indispensable for every class-conscious worker. It is imperative that every party organization beginning with the factory nucleus, that all workers' schools, that every workers' club, make the Communist International part of its regular periodical file for reading and study by its members.

Mr. MINS. May I see that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MINS. Thank you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall having written that? Will you answer that?

Mr. MINS. No. May I read that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Certainly, if you want to. The date is May 4, 1934.

Mr. MINS. [Perusing article.]

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me, if the witness had ever written an article of that character, that he would not have the slightest difficulty in recalling it, and I should like to press for an answer on that.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that that is perfectly proper.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The nature of the article and the place of its appearance are perfectly clear and the witness must be able to recall the facts of the matter.

Now, will you please state whether or not you wrote that for the Daily Worker?

Mr. MINS. I did not write that, and I don't know why they put my name in front of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your connection with the Daily Worker that would have caused them to forge an article under your name.

Mr. MINS. I don't know. I never saw this article. I didn't read the thing at the time; not that I remember. No; I didn't see this. I have seen this for the first time.

Will you let me finish it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. MINS. You asked me, I believe—you want this open, don't you?—You asked me, I believe, what made the Daily Worker forge my name or put my name at the head of that article?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. MINS. I can't tell you what made the Daily Worker do that. All I can say is this: At the time I had no connection with that paper. I didn't write for the Daily Worker. At the time I was editor of a literary journal called the Partisan Review, in which I discussed purely literary matters. I was interested in literature. And, if you want a speculative answer, which is of no value, because I don't know the motives of these people, it may be they put my name on that to screen other people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write this article?

Mr. MINS. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just a moment—or an article which approximates this one?

Mr. MINS. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For publication?

Mr. MINS. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For Partisan Review?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, the Partisan Review was a Communist publication, was it not?

Mr. MINS. No; it was not, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who were the editors of the Partisan Review? Who worked on that?

Mr. MINS. On the Partisan Review, the public editors were myself, Edwin Rolfe, Sol Funaroff, Wallace Phelps—there were about 10 of them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All members?

Mr. MINS. They were all members, or if they were not members they were interested in the work of the activities of the Literary Club and the John Reed Club.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This was in the year 1934, was it, that you were speaking of?

Mr. MINS. 1933-34; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the John Reed Club?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the John Reed Club concerned with the publication of the Partisan Review in any way?

Mr. MINS. Yes. The John Reed Club was concerned, but it had no financial responsibility for it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what way was it concerned with the publication of the Partisan Review?

Mr. MINS. It lent its name to the Partisan Review. The Partisan Review appeared—I don't know what happened after the first three issues, but in the first three issues of the Partisan Review, if I am not mistaken, the name of the John Reed Club appeared on the masthead. I don't know if it appeared later.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, when you testify that the Partisan Review was not a Communist publication, in what sense did you mean it was not a Communist publication? Did you just simply mean that it was not officially owned by the Communist Party?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that all you mean?

Mr. MINS. No. I mean more than that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What more did you mean than that?

Mr. MINS. I mean that the Partisan Review was a publication in the literary field and the field of the arts—it had some artists on the staff; I don't remember their names but you can find it in the printed material, on the editorial board—which was founded through money raised by a public lecture which served as a nest egg.

There was no question asked of anybody whether he was or not a Communist in joining the staff. All that was requested was, or what was expected was that the people be outstanding in their field, whether it was art or criticism or literature.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say this money was raised as the result of a public lecture?

Mr. MINS. Right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who gave the lecture?

Mr. MINS. The lecture was given by John Strachey.

Mr. MATTHEWS. John Strachey was, according to your best information, an English Communist, was he not?

Mr. MINS. No; I don't believe John Strachey was ever a member of the Communist Party in England.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I didn't ask you that; but didn't you know, of your own knowledge and information, that he was a Communist?

Mr. MINS. I knew he sympathized with the Communist ideas. I understood he differed with others.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You knew that his writings and lectures, at the time when he delivered the lecture in support of the Partisan Review, were strictly in accordance with the party's line at that time?

Mr. MINS. That is not so. I think there was a stenographic report of that lecture available. I think it was printed later. And whatever the Communist Party line was at the time, I think you can examine that lecture in vain for adherence to that line or any subversiveness. It was a lecture on literature, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the date of the delivery of that lecture, approximately?

Mr. MINS. I think it was December 1933.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was John Strachey in this country on a lecture tour at that time?

Mr. MINS. I believe he was; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where was the lecture delivered?

Mr. MINS. That lecture was delivered at the auditorium of the downtown building of the College of the City of New York. He was under the management of Colston Leigh. I remember we had to pay Colston Leigh a substantial fee, agency fee, for the lecture. It was a lecture arranged, not through Communist channels, but in ordinary business procedure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you hear the lecture?

Mr. MINS. Yes; I heard the lecture.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who presided at that meeting?

Mr. MINS. That is a point I don't remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it refresh your recollection if I told you that Michael Gold presided at the meeting?

Mr. MINS. Yes; he may have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Don't you recall?

Mr. MINS. Maybe Michael Gold or Joseph Freeman; I don't remember who.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know Michael Gold is a Communist, do you not?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And Joseph Freeman was, too, at that time?

Mr. MINS. I don't know what he was at that time. I know Michael Gold was, he was writing for the Daily Worker; that is, I believe Michael Gold was writing for the Daily Worker. He was on the staff. I assume he was a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Partisan Review, according to your best recollection, ever, in any of its issues, deviate by so much as a jot or tittle from the Communist Party line?

Mr. MINS. You are asking me a question I really am not competent to answer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were on the executive board; you knew the editors?

Mr. MINS. Well, the Communist Party line is a thing that I am not sufficiently a competent judge of; to tell you whether a publication ever deviated a jot or tittle from that line, I would have to know what the line was at any given time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your understanding that the John Reed clubs were strictly under the control of the Communist Party?

Mr. MINS. No. If there were Communists operating within it, they were operating within it under cover, and the control was not something that was apparent to a non-Communist Party member.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you dispute the statement that the John Reed clubs were Communist front organizations?

Mr. MINS. I don't know what you mean by that. You will have to define "Communist front organization."

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Attorney General, in his interdepartmental memorandum, Mr. Chairman, has pointed out that the League of American Writers was founded at a gathering known as the Congress of American Revolutionary Writers, which, in turn, was called primarily by members of John Reed clubs, and the Attorney General's memorandum, which I have already read into the record on this particular point, indicates the leaders of the John Reed clubs who participated in the signing of that call.

Mr. MASON. So that there is a direct connection already in the record concerning that matter?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is already in the record.

Mr. MASON. Very well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The John Reed Clubs have not only been described by the Attorney General as Communist-front organizations, but I think it would be perfectly fair and conservative to say that any man in the United States, of any political opinion with respect to political organizations, knows, and would not hesitate to state categorically, that the John Reed Clubs were Communist organizations.

Now, if you want to quibble about the exact degree of control here, there, or yonder, that is another matter.

Mr. MINS. Mr. Matthews, I did not come here to quibble. I came here to make responsive answers. I want to say merely this, that I am asked to answer questions very specifically and directly, in words which admit of no misunderstanding or shadowy interpretation, and words such as "Communist Party line" or "Communist front" can mean a lot of things.

If an organization is called a Communist-front organization, your strong leader repudiates the allegations. There are others which ignore it. There are others who welcome it.

For the John Reed Club I will say this: They took me in. I was no Communist. They took in other people who were not Communists. I didn't join the John Reed Club until long after it was established. There were people in that club that I absolutely know had not only no activity in politics, but no interest in it. I know from their conversation. People who were interested only in their particular arts.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is enough on that last question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. Did you ever hold any position in the John Reed Club?

Mr. MINS. Was I secretary? No. I may have been a member of the executive committee; I don't know. I was invited to a meeting of the

executive committee at the time plans for the Partisan Review were being discussed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever written for a German publication known as the Rote Fahne?

Mr. MINS. Never in my life.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have any of your articles, according to your information, ever appeared in the Rote Fahne?

Mr. MINS. I haven't read the Rote Fahne, so I can't tell. To my best knowledge, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you in Spain during the Spanish Civil War?

Mr. MINS. No; I was never in Spain.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were never in Spain in your life?

Mr. MINS. In my life.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long a time have you spent in Germany altogether, if you can make a rough estimate? I am not asking you to be too exact, but state the approximate number of months.

Mr. MINS. Well, it is more than that; it is years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All right. The approximate number of years you spent in Germany.

Mr. MINS. From 1921 until 1927, with the exception of 1 year and 3 months on two separate occasions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever had any professional relationships with the Soviet Military Intelligence? Have you ever worked for the Soviet?

Mr. MINS. Good Lord, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever worked for the Soviet?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever worked in Germany for what is popularly known as the Ogpu?

Mr. MINS. My God, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Earl Browder?

Mr. MINS. I have seen him; I don't know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever meet him personally?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know William Z. Foster?

Mr. MINS. I have seen him. I have never met him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know J. Lovestone?

Mr. MINS. J. Lovestone, if I am not mistaken, was a student at Columbia—at City College—when I was there. I don't know whether he graduated, but I left, I think, while he was still there. His name was Jacob Liebshtein then.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Jacob Liebshtein?

Mr. MINS. I think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. L-i-e-b-s-t-e-i-n?

Mr. MINS. I think so, if I am not mistaken.

I remember that because later when he became Lovestone, and a power in the Communist movement, somebody or other, I forgot whom, a classmate, pointed out to me the change in the name. He said, "Do you remember a student by the name of Liebshtein?" He said, "Well, he has changed his name to Lovestone."

Mr. MATTHEWS. "Lovestone" is a translation of the German "Liebshtein," isn't it?

Mr. MINS. That is right. I am not making any slighting reference to the change of name, but I knew him when he was Liebshtein.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know him when he was a power in the Communist Party, as you have described it?

Mr. MINS. No. I was not in the country at the time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Benjamin Mandel?

Mr. MINS. Benjamin Mandel? I never heard the name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you perhaps know him under the name of Bert Miller?

Mr. MINS. Bert Miller?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. MINS. I think Bert Miller was the friend of a man who ran a phonograph store and I think I was introduced to him by the man who ran that store, Moe Goldsmith. I was introduced to him. We met, rather, as mutual friends. I used to buy records there and have my radio repaired in Forty-second Street; Forty-second Street, corner of Ninth Avenue.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever write for the New Masses? By that I mean, did you ever contribute any article to the New Masses?

Mr. MINS. Yes; I contributed an article to the New Masses on that subject I referred to before, the persecutions in Germany, I think it was in 1933 or 1934—on the Reichstag fire, and the shooting and the pogroms and the things that followed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever write for Science and Society?

Mr. MINS. I have translated material. I was working on a research project, which I had applied at the time for a Guggenheim fellowship; a translation of letters which were in the New York Public Library; I found them there. I didn't write for them. I published two series. They asked me for a translation of those letters which I handed over to them, annotated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider the New Masses to be a Communist publication?

Mr. MINS. Yes; I think that is generally considered a Communist paper.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider the quarterly magazine, Science and Society, a Communist publication?

Mr. MINS. No; I wouldn't say so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever do any writing for the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in Moscow?

Mr. MINS. No; I didn't. I did research in that institute on two or three jobs that I did during my stay in Moscow, to earn more pay.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute of Moscow ever sponsor any of your writings?

Mr. MINS. They never sponsored any of my writings. They sponsored the translation I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. They sponsored your work, which was a translation?

Mr. MINS. No; that is not quite the right word. I was one of the few Americans in Moscow who had a knowledge, a literal knowledge, of German and a literal knowledge of English, and I was working in the Academy of Sciences, and those people were so much in demand to do translations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you stay in Moscow altogether?

Mr. MINS. Two years. And the publishing house asked me if I would do a translation of documents that they found. I said I would do it. I got paid very well for it.

Mr. MATHEWS. What was your remuneration?

Mr. MINS. My remuneration was by the job.

Mr. MATHEWS. You said you got paid pretty well for it. How much was it?

Mr. MINS. Well, it depended on the size of the job. I think for one I got paid about 1,200 rubles; for another, about 900 rubles. It depended what the job was. I did about two or three jobs of that sort. I also did translation of German prose for a magazine called International magazine. People did that in Moscow if they stayed on. It was pretty hard to live on rubles. I was not paid in dollars in Russia. I was paid in rubles. It was pretty hard living on rubles.

Mr. MATHEWS. Did you ever write an introduction for a publication known as the Communist Manifesto, which was brought out under the auspices of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute?

Mr. MINS. I translated part of that and translated two prefaces, which had been lost, it seems, or discovered. One was a photostat almost illegible from the print, then another photostat from the German, or two prefaces; and I translated them and collated the text of the Manifesto itself with an older previous text and was paid for that as a job. I was not an editor in the sense that—

Mr. MATHEWS (interposing). Do you know whether or not your name was carried on these editions of the Communist Manifesto as the editor?

Mr. MINS. It was. That is the method that was used over there for it. I was not on the staff of either of the organizations or had anything to do with it. The man who collated that text was called editor. I didn't sponsor that thing. That is a historical document; a document which everybody reads.

Mr. MATHEWS. What were your affiliations with the League of American Writers?

Mr. MINS. I was a member of the League of American Writers. I joined the League of American Writers, I believe, at the end of 1937 or the beginning of 1938. I don't remember when it was founded. It was founded long before. If I am not mistaken, it was founded when I was not in this country.

I came back from a summer trip to Europe with my wife in 1938, during which I met several German writers and mathematicians and scientists in the south of France, and I came back with the idea of the desirability of rescuing some—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Has this anything to do with the question that you asked?

Mr. MATHEWS. Yes. I asked him what his affiliations with the League of American Writers were. I think his first answer was that he was a member, and now I think he is leading up to the fact that he was very much interested—

Mr. MINS (interposing). I am coming to the chairmanship of the Exiled Writers Committee.

Mr. MATHEWS. Of the League of American Writers?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. MATHEWS. You were in that position?

Mr. MINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATHEWS. Do you consider the League of American Writers to be a Communist front organization?

Mr. MINS. No. It has been called that. I dispute that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you would dispute the Attorney General—

Mr. MINS (interposing). I will put it this way: Whatever it is called, I would not join an organization to further the aims of the Communist Party. I would join it for other reasons.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a photograph and ask you if you can identify yourself in that picture?

Mr. MINS. That is right. I am the man at the extreme left. It is not a very flattering photo.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the occasion on which this picture was taken?

Mr. MINS. Let me look at that again. That I can't tell you. That is a group of the League of American Writers. I see the secretary there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who is the secretary? Franklin Folsom?

Mr. MINS. Franklin Folsom. That is he; yes. I think this man is Henry Hart. I am not sure. And this man is a man who has joined the staff of Science and Society. I think this is Samuel Bernstein. I am not sure; and this is a writer on food, Fanny Engel. I don't remember any other faces.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But this is the parade of the League of American Writers?

Mr. MINS. That is right, of the League of American Writers, as part of a larger parade, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the parade?

Mr. MINS. I can't tell what that particular one was; I don't remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Wasn't it a May Day parade?

Mr. MINS. Very likely. The League of American Writers marched, I believe, in two May Day parades. It marched with slogans in that picture, protesting against what was happening to the writers in Europe, and demanding that they be rescued from there and brought to the Western Hemisphere.

Am I holding up one of those things or not? May I look at it? It seems I am holding something—"In defense of culture"—or something like that, the slogan under which we marched there. We wanted to bring it to the attention of the public.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You would not hesitate to say that the May Day parade in which the League of American Writers participated, and in which you also personally participated, was a Communist Party affair, would you?

Mr. MINS. No. I would use your own terminology. It was probably what you would call a Communist-front affair.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say that it was a Communist-front affair?

Mr. MINS. Probably; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you do know what a Communist front is.

Mr. MINS. I am using the doctor's terminology.

Mr. THOMAS. But before, in your testimony, you gave the impression you didn't know what a Communist front was.

Mr. MINS. No; I beg your pardon, sir. I wanted the thing defined, and Dr. Matthews then gave me the definition.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. MINS. I didn't want to speak of a thing which was very loose.

Mr. THOMAS. But you could have also defined it yourself.

Mr. MINS. I would define it possibly somewhat otherwise.

Mr. THOMAS. I mean, you could have defined it.

Mr. MINS. Yes; I could probably do that.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all. Go ahead.

Let me see the picture, please.

Mr. MINS. My definition might have been somewhat different from Dr. Matthews. You are referred to as Dr. Matthews, are you? It is correct to say "Dr. Matthews"?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; that is correct.

Did you ever know Leon Josephson?

Mr. MINS. Leon Josephson? Never. Matthew, but not Leon.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Barney Josephson?

Mr. MINS. No; who is he?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, if you don't know him, that will be sufficient. Did you know George Mink?

Mr. MINS. George Mink? No. These are all strange names to me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever hear of George Mink?

Mr. MINS. George Mink was in the press, or something or other. What was he? He was in the press. Is that in the Jan Valtin biography or story of a—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). Well, if you don't know, that will be sufficient.

Mr. MINS. Go ahead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Robert Gordon Switz?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever used any name other than the name Leonard E. Mins?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever traveled or worked or written under a pseudonym or alias?

Mr. MINS. No. I have been lucky to have saved my last two passports, which go back to 1938, and I think I have the numbers of the passports that go farther back than that. I have never traveled under any other name than my own; I want to make that very clear. I didn't bring them with me but they are available for the committee, if you like.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever do any work for the International Union of Revolutionary Writers in Moscow?

Mr. MINS. No. I translated, as I told you, one or two articles from the German for a publication, International Literature, which they put out, but I did that for the editor. I don't know who the officers are or anything about the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you considered yourself in the past, or at present, a Communist with a small "c"?

Mr. MINS. A Communist with a small "c"? No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By that I mean to differentiate that question from the one I asked you about membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. MINS. I understand. No. I get your interpretation of a Communist with a small "c" and a big "C". No. If you want me to describe my views, I shall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want your testimony to be clear on the point. Do you deny that you have been a Communist with a small "c"?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you also deny that you have ever been a member of the Communist Party, secret or open?

Mr. MINS. Right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or in any other understanding?

Mr. MINS. Alias or anything else.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all.

Mr. THOMAS. When was it you left Moscow?

Mr. MINS. I left Moscow 3 days—I can spot that—I left Moscow 3 days after the first shootings and the purges.

Mr. THOMAS. What was that date?

Mr. MINS. That was August 29 or August 28; the last week in August 1936.

Mr. THOMAS. Why did you leave Moscow?

Mr. MINS. I left Moscow because my contract was up. I had a 2-year contract—do you want me to go on?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. You had a 2-year contract with whom?

Mr. MINS. I had a 1-year contract with the Power Institute of the Academy of Sciences. We were working on superpower networks.

Mr. THOMAS. So that contract was up?

Mr. MINS. In 1935.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. MINS. But they asked me to continue or if I was willing to continue there, and spent the next year getting out a 500-page mimeograph on electrical power in the U. S. S. R. for the Third World Power Conference in Washington. I was the only man on the staff who knew American and Russian. That took about a year.

Mr. THOMAS. After your contract was up with them, how much longer did you stay in Moscow?

Mr. MINS. My contract with them was up on September 1, 1936. The contract was extended for another year. My contract started from September 1, 1934.

Mr. THOMAS. What I wanted to know is, after your contract was up—

Mr. MINS (interposing). I left before the contract was up.

Mr. THOMAS. You left before the contract was up?

Mr. MINS. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. Why did you leave before the contract was up, because before you said that you left because of the fact that the contract expired.

Mr. MINS. Yes. That sounds like a contradiction, but it is not. You are allowed 1 month's vacation in Russia, and because of the pressure of getting this book out in time for this conference, which took place in Washington in September 1936, I didn't take my vacation until the book was done. I took my vacation and I cut my vacation short to go back to the States.

Mr. THOMAS. Be specific.

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. What I want to know is, how long before your contract was up did you leave Russia?

Mr. MINS. Two or three days.

Mr. THOMAS. Two or three days?

Mr. MINS. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. And you went from Russia to where?

Mr. MINS. From Russia I went to London, to take a boat to the States. I took it at Southampton.

Mr. THOMAS. Where did you stop on the way from Russia to London?

Mr. MINS. I got off the train; I stopped only in Berlin to change trains.

Mr. THOMAS. You stopped in Berlin?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. How long were you in Berlin?

Mr. MINS. From 8 o'clock in the morning until 12:30 noon.

Mr. THOMAS. Who did you see while you were in Berlin?

Mr. MINS. The American Express Co.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you see anyone else?

Mr. MINS. My wife was with me; that is all.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you see anyone else?

Mr. MINS. No one; not a soul. I went to look at the Reichstag.

Mr. THOMAS. You went to look at the Reichstag?

Mr. MINS. Yes, sir. The Nazis have tours through that thing. I wanted to see what it was like. It is not far from the American Express Co.

Mr. THOMAS. But you saw no one in Berlin on this particular trip?

Mr. MINS. Not a soul.

Mr. THOMAS. Other than your wife?

Mr. MINS. Not a soul.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you went to London?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. How long did you stay in London?

Mr. MINS. I stayed in London—Good Lord!—2 or 3 days. I bought clothes.

Mr. THOMAS. Who did you visit in London?

Mr. MINS. Nobody. I kept in my hotel with my wife.

Mr. THOMAS. You didn't see anybody there you knew besides your wife?

Mr. MINS. I had a luncheon, too, with an English writer, Geoffrey Trease, a writer of children's books, who came to Moscow while I was there.

Mr. THOMAS. Anyone else?

Mr. MINS. No, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you arrived back in the United States what date?

Mr. MINS. The day before my wife had to report for school. That is why we left so soon. That is why we didn't wait.

Mr. THOMAS. Approximately what date?

Mr. MINS. Around September 6, 7, 8, or 9; I don't know.

Mr. THOMAS. What year?

Mr. MINS. 1936.

Mr. THOMAS. 1936?

Mr. MINS. Yes. We came back as fast as we possibly could.

Mr. THOMAS. I am going to go back a little bit now.

While you were over in Germany did you at any time have any conference with any of the Nazi officials?

Mr. MINS. No. The only time I have seen a Nazi in Germany was marching in the streets. That was in 1926 and 1927.

Mr. THOMAS. You never knew any of them?

Mr. MINS. I never did.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you know any persons who later became Nazi officials, prominent officials?

Mr. MINS. Not a one.

Mr. THOMAS. Not a one.

Mr. MINS. Not a one.

Mr. THOMAS. Just one or two more questions.

What do you do in your present job?

Mr. MINS. In my present job, I am a research analyst concerned with the collection and analysis of information from all sources on the Soviet Union. For the use of the United States Government. I specialize in that and do nothing else. I was hired because I worked in Moscow.

Mr. THOMAS. Just explain to the committee what kind of work that is. Give an illustration of some of the work.

Mr. MINS. Yes, I will do that. Well, for the last 2 or 3 or 4 days I have been assisting the acting chief in preparing the budget in my section of the Division, the section of which the chief is absent now; the Industrial and Military Supply Section. I, myself, am a specialist on fuel and power; that is to say, electric power, steam and hydro.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, let us see what you do for the Government on steam power.

Mr. MINS. All right. At the present time I am just about to complete, and it will be ready before this week is over, a section of a strategic survey—all this is confidential, I take it?

Mr. THOMAS. This is an executive meeting.

Mr. MINS. I am completing a section on oil resources and oil production in a part of Asia, for a strategic survey of that area, being prepared for Military Intelligence of the General Staff of the United States Army.

Mr. MASON. I think that that is enough on that.

Mr. MINS. I don't want to go any further, anyway, with it, unless you insist.

Other men work on railroads in that area. Other men will work on the copper mines. Other men will work on the manpower and the population and things of that sort. I will also participate in a so-called combat team, in what is called a combat team; a team sort of a task force that has to study a certain area, or another area of the country.

Mr. MASON. Each one studies his particular problem?

Mr. MINS. My subject is power, for the potential of the whole country, in coal, oil, and peat.

Mr. THOMAS. Why do you call it a combat team?

Mr. MINS. I don't call it a combat team. That is what the office calls it. We call it combat team because we work on such things so as to get an estimate.

Mr. THOMAS. This information that you get, you get that from your own knowledge gained as the result of your visits over there, or do you get that from reading books and periodicals and papers here in this country?

Mr. MINS. I couldn't read the material unless I knew Russian. Much of the material is Russian, and I learned the Russian when I went over there.

I worked with an interpreter at the academy when I first started. I got the material from reading the Russian periodicals, Russian newspapers, and standard Russian statistical compilations.

I get it from reading reports made to our Government in English, by its representatives abroad. I get it from other confidential sources which come into the hands of the United States Government. My access is exclusive, too—it is complete in this field. I can see anything in this field, no matter whether it is confidential or printed matter, but only in this field.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Matthews, do you have exhibits you wish to file?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. As exhibit No. 1, I should like to offer a photostatic copy of the catalog of the Workers School, in which there is a record on page 15 of a course of instruction given by the witness, Leonard E. Mins.

Mr. MASON. All right.

(The photostat referred to was marked "Mins' Exhibit No. 1.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer in evidence as exhibit No. 2 a photograph of a portion of the May Day parade of 1940, in which the witness is participating in the section under the auspices of the League of American Writers and stands at the extreme left of the photograph.

(The photograph referred to was marked "Mins' Exhibit No. 2.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer a reproduction of the table of contents of a magazine, Science and Society, for its spring issue of 1938, in which there is an announcement of a contribution made by the witness, Leonard E. Mins, under the title "Unpublished Letters of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels to Americans." That will be exhibit No. 3.

(The article referred to was marked "Mins' Exhibit No. 3.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as exhibit No. 4 a photostatic copy of the Communist Manifesto, published under the auspices of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in Moscow, which lists L. E. Mins as the editor of the publication.

(The photostat referred to was marked "Mins' Exhibit No. 4.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then I offer as exhibit 5, to be photostated, a copy of an article which appeared in the Daily Worker of May 4, 1934, on page 5, which was reviewed by Leonard Mins.

(The article referred to was marked "Mins' Exhibit No. 5.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then I offer in evidence a copy of Labor Defender for January 1937, on the book cover page of which there appears greetings to the publication from S. Mins and L. Mins.

(The article referred to was marked "Mins' Exhibit No. 6.")

Mr. MINS. May I see that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In connection with that I should like to ask the witness if you and your wife signed these greetings to the Labor Defender?

Mr. MINS. Will you point it out to me?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. S. and L. Mins.

Mr. MINS. No; my wife is not named S.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Isn't your wife's name Sophie?

Mr. MINS. That is my sister.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is your sister?

Mr. MINS. Yes. My sister's maiden name was Sophie.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, could this have been you and your sister?

Mr. MINS. I don't remember taking part in any such thing. I may have put money in for the tour of Russia. I don't know anything about that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your wife's first name?

Mr. MINS. Anne G. Mins.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you sign the call to the Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers held in New York City June 1941?

Mr. MINS. Yes. I was a member of the league at the time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer in evidence as another exhibit a copy of that call which the witness signed, as it appears in New Masses, issue of April 22, 1941.

(The document referred to was marked "Mins' Exhibit No. 7.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make a speech at a meeting of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign when that organization was having something of a sharp controversy in it?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In March?

Mr. MINS. I made a speech which, as I remember, was misquoted in the Daily Worker, and when it was called to my attention I wrote a letter to the Daily Worker protesting against the misquotation of that speech. I think I have a copy of that letter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Daily Worker publish the letter?

Mr. MINS. I don't remember. I don't think they did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In that controversy in the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, did you associate yourself with David McKelvy White?

Mr. MINS. I think that David McKelvy White was present there. I don't remember associating.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, the controversy, primarily, Mr. Mins, was between Herman Reissig, on the one hand, and David McKelvy White, on the other hand, wasn't it?

Mr. MINS. I don't know the protagonists. I remember Reissig was on one side.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were against the Reissig faction?

Mr. MINS. I, as a person? I was not there as a person. I was there in my capacity as representative of the Exiled Writers Committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In that capacity, did you take a position contrary to Herman Reissig?

Mr. MINS. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that the position that Reissig himself opposed was the Communist Party's position in the organization, do you not?

Mr. MINS. In that organization? I was not in that organization. I don't know. There were Communists there who took that position, as well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer in evidence a copy of the Daily Worker for March 31, 1940, which contains an article discussing at some length this controversy in the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, in which the witness, Leonard E. Mins, is alleged to have participated.

(The document referred to was marked "Mins' Exhibit No. 8.")

Mr. MINS. Let me see. You say: Did participate? There is no allegation about that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the witness said he believed he had a copy of the letter which he sent to the Daily Worker.

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Protesting the manner in which they quoted him.

Mr. MINS. Yes. May I look at the article?

I may be able to tell you what that thing was. I haven't the letter with me.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you have a copy of that?

Mr. MINS. Not with me.

Mr. THOMAS. I mean, do you have it in your possession?

Mr. MINS. It is in my files.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you supply a copy for the committee?

Mr. MINS. I will look for it. I certainly will.

Now, if you will let me look at it—

Mr. MATTHEWS. All it says with reference to you in the nature of anything like a quotation is that Leonard E. Mins gave many instances of this group's sabotage—referring to the Reissig group.

Mr. MINS. I would have to look at the letter. That is not enough, if that is all it says.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all.

Then I offer in evidence, Mr. Chairman, a copy of the New Masses for January 2, 1934, on the back cover of which there appears an advertisement of the Partisan Review, which is described as a monthly magazine of revolutionary literature, and criticism, published by the John Reed Clubs of New York.

And then follows this language on the nature of Partisan Review:

Writers who have taken their stand with the Revolutionary Movement, contributed—

and so on, and so on.

The witness has already testified that he was on the staff of the publication concerned.

(The article referred to was marked "Mins' Exhibit No. 9.")

Mr. MINS. I may add, I did not write that advertisement.

Mr. MASON. Oh, no; no. The advertisement is an exhibit which shows the nature of the publication.

Mr. MINS. I see.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And it confirms the witness' testimony that it was published by the John Reed Club of New York.

Mr. MASON. I see.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all.

Mr. MASON. Then this hearing will be adjourned and we will take the next witness.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Our next witness is Mr. Wahl.

Mr. MASON. Will you be sworn, please, Mr. Wahl?

You do solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WAHL. I do.

Mr. MASON. Be seated.

Mr. Wahl, for your information, I just simply want to say that your name was cited on the floor of the House by Mr. Martin Dies in connection with the incorporation of the Washington Book Shop and which, of course, the Attorney General has designated as a subversive group.

In his statement he also called the attention to the fact that the Washington Book Shop had been expelled from the Cooperative League of Washington because it was Communist-controlled; and it is further testimony along that line that the committee is desirous of securing, and particularly your sworn testimony as to your part in those movements.

The committee will appreciate, sir, if you will answer questions as categorically as you can, yes or no, and then if the "Yes" or the "No" needs further explanation, you are at perfect liberty to give further explanation.

Go ahead.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, for the record, will the gentleman who is the observer here give his full name and address?

Mr. LOWRIE. John M. Lowrie. I am on the general counsel staff of the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. THOMAS. All right; proceed.

TESTIMONY OF DAVID R. WAHL, BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please give your full name.

Mr. WAHL. David R. Wahl.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. WAHL. Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When?

Mr. WAHL. July 4, 1909.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please give a brief outline of your educational background.

Mr. WAHL. I was educated in the elementary and public high schools of the city of Cleveland, and after completion of high school in 1927 I matriculated at Oberlin College, in Oberlin, Ohio, where I attended for 4 years. I spent the summer of 1931 at Ohio State University and enrolled for a graduate year in the School of Library Science at Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, will you please give your professional experience, the places where you have been employed, and the approximate dates and the remuneration received?

Mr. WAHL. I performed minor duties while I was at school, in various occupations. Upon the completion of my graduate year at Western Reserve University, which trained me for librarianship as a profession, I was immediately employed by the New York Public Library. I remained there for 4½ years, after which time I left the New York Public Library in 1927, to come to work in the Library of Congress. I was with the Library of Congress from 1927 until September of this last year, 1942.

At that time I left the Library of Congress to go to work at the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your present salary?

Mr. WAHL. My present salary is \$3,200 per year, plus the amount given in overtime pay by the recent act of Congress.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you been drawing that pay since the beginning of your employment by the Board of Economic Warfare?

Mr. WAHL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What pay did you draw at the Library of Congress?

Mr. WAHL. When I left the Library of Congress I was receiving

\$2,600 per annum, although my position was in the process of being reclassified by the Civil Service Commission, and I understand it has now been raised to \$3,200.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you state the amount of your salary at the New York Public Library?

Mr. WAHL. No; I did not. I entered the New York Public Library at a salary of \$1,500 a year and raised to \$1,980 per year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, if I understand approximately your periods of employment, they were 5 years with the New York Public Library—

Mr. WAHL. Four and one-half.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Four and one-half years with the New York Public Library.

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then 4 years in the Library of Congress?

Mr. WAHL. A little over 5 years with the Library of Congress, and now since September of 1942 with the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your connection with the organization known as the Book Shop Association, or the Co-Operative Book Shop, or the Washington Book Shop, as it was variously designated from time to time?

Mr. WAHL. I joined that book shop as a member about a year or two after its formation. And if I may at this point clear up one fact, I actually was not involved in the incorporation of the Book Shop. I happened to be, at the time of its reincorporation, chairman of the board of trustees, and the reincorporation took place because the District of Columbia had passed a new law concerning the incorporation of cooperative organizations. It was simply a matter of formality.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I understand that you were president of the Book Shop Association at the time it changed its name to the Washington Co-Operative Book Shop.

Mr. WAHL. Yes. That was the time of the reincorporation to meet the new regulations of the District.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that reincorporation took place on the 10th day of June 1941, did it?

Mr. WAHL. I believe that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your name and signature appear on this certificate of consent to reincorporation and change of name, with the name of Marcus I. Goldman. Who is Marcus I. Goldman?

Mr. WAHL. Marcus I. Goldman was at that time the secretary of the board of the Book Shop, and is an employee of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether he is still employed at the Department of the Interior?

Mr. WAHL. He is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what capacity?

Mr. WAHL. He is a geologist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Albert Stanley Youngman?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he associated with this reincorporation of the Washington Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. I don't remember his having any connection with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The reincorporation papers contained his signature as a witness to the transaction. You recall him as a member of the Washington Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. He was a member of the Washington Book Shop; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know where he is employed?

Mr. WAHL. He is now in private business; self-employed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Donald Wheeler's name also appears as one of the witnesses to this transaction. Do you know Donald Wheeler?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where is he employed?

Mr. WAHL. He, when last I heard, was employed in the Office of Strategic Services.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he employed at the Library of Congress when you were there?

Mr. WAHL. No. So far as I know, he was not a member of the staff.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The name of Robert Davenport also appears. Do you know Davenport?

Mr. WAHL. Yes, I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where is he employed?

Mr. WAHL. I think he is with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The name of Bertram Edisis also appears as a witness to this transaction. Do you know Bertram Edisis?

Mr. WAHL. He is now in California.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is in California, you say?

Mr. WAHL. I know him, and he is in California.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what he is doing in California?

Mr. WAHL. He is practicing law.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Private, independent?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he employed by the Federal Government in Washington when you knew him here?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where was he employed? In the Library of Congress?

Mr. WAHL. No. He was employed by the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Eugene Holmes?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. His name also appears as a witness to this transaction. Where is Holmes employed?

Mr. WAHL. I understand that he is on the faculty of Howard University.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not he is working for the Board of Economic Warfare?

Mr. WAHL. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then the name of Jay Deiss appears here. Do you know Jay Deiss?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where is he employed?

Mr. WAHL. He is employed in the Office of Education.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Thelma M. Dale is the last of the signatures appearing on the document. Do you know Thelma Dale?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where is she employed?

Mr. WAHL. I don't know where she is now employed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know where she was employed at the time of the incorporation of the Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. I am not sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know any position that she has held in the Federal Government in Washington?

Mr. WAHL. I have a feeling that she was employed with the District of Columbia Employment Service, but I am not sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were all of the persons whose signatures appear on this document members of the Washington Co-Operative Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have read all the names that appear here. Mr. Chairman, at this time I offer as an exhibit a photostatic copy of the certificate of consent to reincorporation and change of name of the Book Shop Association and the Washington Co-Operative Book Shop, as exhibit No. 1.

Mr. MASON. It will be accepted and made a part of the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Wahl Exhibit No. 1.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the exact date of the beginning of your association with the Washington Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. No. I would not recall the exact date, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Can you recall the month?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the year?

Mr. WAHL. I would put it at early 1940 or late 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then how long was it before you were elected president of the organization?

Mr. WAHL. I must have been a member for some months or possibly close to a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the date of your election to the presidency of the Washington Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. It must have taken place during the month of June 1940.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the Washington Book Shop an affiliate or member of the Co-Operative League of Washington, or Co-Operative League of the District of Columbia?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it an affiliate of that central body at the time of your presidency?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

For a part of that time, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the Washington Book Shop expelled from the Co-Operative League of the District of Columbia?

Mr. WAHL. That is not true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I asked you if it was expelled.

You can say yes or no.

Mr. WAHL. No; it was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was not?

Mr. WAHL. It was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How did the relationship come to be severed?

Mr. WAHL. Do you want me to sketch my impression of the developments of that period?

Mr. MATTHES. Well, as briefly as possible, if you can state how the relationship was severed.

Mr. WAHL. Precisely in this way: By the Book Shop Association giving notice to the Co-Operative League that they intended severing from that body and by the laws of the Co-Operative League a notice of 60 days was required and was given.

Mr. MASON. Then your statement would indicate that it was the Book Shop that took the initiative in severing its connection with the Co-Operative League?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was there any political controversy which arose between the Washington Book Shop and the Co-Operative League?

Mr. WAHL. I would not consider it a political controversy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the publication of the Co-Operative League indicate that it considered it a political controversy?

Mr. WAHL. That is not my impression.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Co-Operative League members at the meetings of the Co-Operative League specifically charge that the Washington Book Shop was under the domination of Communists?

Mr. WAHL. I never heard such a charge made at the meetings of the Co-Operative League.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have heard individuals of the Co-Operative League make the charge.

Mr. WAHL. I heard one such individual make such a charge.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you read the memorandum circulated by the Attorney General to the departmental heads of the Federal Government, for their guidance in dealing with subversive activities; the memorandum dealing with the Washington Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. I don't remember having read that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has it been brought to your attention?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know that the text of it appeared in the Congressional Record in September of last year?

Mr. WAHL. I did hear about it and read mention of it in the newspapers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you apprised of the fact that the Attorney General's memorandum criticized the Washington Book Shop as a subversive organization?

Mr. WAHL. I understand that it was so reported on the floor of the House, but it was my understanding that the Attorney General did not regard it as a subversive organization, on the basis of correspondence between the Attorney General's Assistant and the Washington Book Shop.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Attorney General's report to the House of Representatives specifically stated that he had designated as subversive some 12 organizations, and had circulated a memorandum dealing with those 12 organizations to the departmental heads. One of the memoranda dealt with the Washington Book Shop.

Now, did you know that that was the situation?

Mr. WAHL. Well, I did not feel too conclusively that the Washington Book Shop had been declared subversive. If I may read a sentence from a letter received from Ugo Carusi, executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, which he wrote to the Co-Operative League on November 1, 1941.

I find upon inquiry that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has not conducted an investigation of the Book Shop, nor are any of the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation authorized or permitted to inquire of Government employees whether they belong to or are associated with it.

Now, that statement was requested by the Book Shop so that they could understand whether there was or was not any such feeling about it, and this has more or less been the guide of the Book Shop, and certainly of myself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you understand that that letter by Carusi was a refutation of the Attorney General's characterization of the Book Shop being subversive?

Mr. WAHL. No. As a matter of fact, it was written before the Attorney General's statement was reported on the floor of the House, so that it could not have been a refutation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, it was also written some time before the memorandum was prepared; was it not?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then would it be your understanding that investigations by the Department of Justice, subsequent to the writing by Mr. Carusi—subsequent to the writing of his letter, convinced the Attorney General that the Book Shop was a subversive organization?

Mr. WAHL. Would you mind restating that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your understanding that subsequent investigations of the Book Shop, subsequent to the writing of Carusi's letter, convinced the Attorney General that the Book Shop was subversive?

Mr. WAHL. I can't have any answer on that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All right.

Did the Washington Book Shop specialize in the sale of Communist Party literature?

Mr. WAHL. By no means.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it carry a full line of Communist Party publications?

Mr. WAHL. No. Not a full line.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it carry a substantial line or stock of Communist Party publications?

Mr. WAHL. No. I would say that it carried a very small amount of any such publications.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it feature books dealing with communism?

Mr. WAHL. It certainly did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In any of its advertisements, did it feature the writings of Marx or Engels or Lenin?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the exhibits are already in the record of the committee's hearings as exhibits, which will give the advertisements of the Book Shop itself, touching this point.

I would like to have that noted at this time.

How long were you president of the Washington Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. One year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Mrs. Fernando Reed?

Mr. WAHL. Yes. I met her many years ago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under what circumstances did you meet her?

Mr. WAHL. I met her in the home of a friend; I cannot remember where, at that time. I didn't know her, and at the moment she was

involved in trying to find someone who could give blood to a friend of hers who was ill in the hospital.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What year was that, approximately?

Mr. WAHL. Approximately 1934.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And where did you meet her—in New York?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At the home of a friend?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you try to recollect the name of the friend?

Mr. WAHL. I am not sure at this moment whether it was the home of her daughter or whether her daughter was visiting a friend.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the daughter's name?

Mr. WAHL. Nancy Reed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Nancy Reed?

Mr. WAHL. I had met her in the same week.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever go to Nancy Reed's home or apartment?

Mr. WAHL. Very infrequently.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, did you go?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. About how many times did you go to Nancy Reed's apartment?

Mr. WAHL. I might have gone five times during the 4 years that I lived in New York.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you attend a Communist Party meeting at the home of Nancy Reed?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever organize any Communist Party meetings in New York?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Garret Fielstra?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Fielstra an associate of yours on the staff of the New York Public Library?

Mr. WAHL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever invite Fielstra to join the Communist Party?

Mr. WAHL. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever take him into a secret Communist Party meeting?

Mr. WAHL. I did not take him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever take him to any meeting of Communists where he could easily have understood the situation to be that of a secret Communist Party meeting?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the Kerr committee is going to look over these records. In that case, I would suggest that Mr. Matthews put something in right at this point of the record about Nancy Reed and her mother.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. The hearings of this committee include the testimony of Nancy Reed herself, with respect to her acquaintance with the witness.

Who introduced you to Nancy Reed?

Mr. WAHL. It must have come about through my wife, who was employed in the same office for a while with Nancy Reed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And is it your recollection that Nancy Reed introduced her to her mother, Mrs. Fernando Reed?

Mr. WAHL. Yes. It is not clear, but I suspect that is the way it happened.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you meet Mrs. Fernando Reed in Washington at any time?

Mr. WAHL. Yes; one time when she was passing through town, she called my home.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What year was that?

Mr. WAHL. That might have been 1938.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Matthews, the point I want to make is, Why do you make any mention of Nancy Reed? Who was Nancy Reed, in a couple of sentences.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, this committee obtained a very large volume of documents that related to Nancy Reed; documents which were in her possession, written by her, written to her; a general assortment of documents. A large number of those have been incorporated in the published testimony of this committee in volume 14.

A committee in New York City held extensive hearings on the question of Nancy Reed's affiliation with the Communist Party.

Mr. THOMAS. That is just what I wanted to know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that official agency removed her from her position. There was a threat on her part of fighting the case, but apparently she decided not to fight the case and accepted the decision of the committee that she was, in effect, a secret agent of the Communist Party, with ramifications extending abroad, and so on.

In the course of her testimony, she acknowledged acquaintanceship with the witness.

Mr. THOMAS. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were there other persons present at the apartment of Nancy Reed when you visited there?

Mr. WAHL. Well, for a brief moment a neighbor stepped in, and probably Nancy Reed's brother, whom I knew, whom I met, who has since been killed in action in the Pacific.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who invited you to Nancy Reed's apartment?

Mr. WAHL. A woman who lived not far from my home in New York, who had a puppy to give to a friend of Nancy Reed's and whom I accompanied, helping her carry the puppy to the home of Nancy Reed, so that she could deliver it to the person who was going to adopt it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was the first occasion that you went?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then you spoke of a number of other occasions when you went to her apartment. Were they social calls made at her invitation?

Mr. WAHL. That is all, mainly calls, calls paid while my wife and I happened to be passing nearby, and paying our respects. We thought her mother was a charming lady. We had great respect for her family; her father, Reverend Reed, was a fine old alumnus of Harvard University.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know him?

Mr. WAHL. I had never met him, but I studied under a professor at Oberlin, whom I revered very much, who was a friend of his, and that was just a point in common.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you met Mrs. Fernando Reed here in Washington, was she at that time one of the alleged owners of the Daily Worker?

Mr. WAHL. I cannot remember whether she was at that time, although I read in the newspapers about that time that she had become such.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said when she came to Washington she called you up at your home.

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you visit with you?

Mr. WAHL. She did come out one night to spend the night with us and see our new child who had been born since.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you take her to the Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. No, I didn't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether she visited the Book Shop while she was here or not?

Mr. WAHL. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Joseph North?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In New York?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who Joseph North is?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You never heard the name?

Mr. WAHL. I have heard the name but I can't place it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your connection with the publication known as Class Mark which was distributed at the New York Public Library?

Mr. WAHL. None whatsoever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever recommend the Class Mark?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not write any part of it?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have anything to do with its appearance at all?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the fact that the Class Mark appeared mysteriously in circulation at the Public Library about the time you went to the library, and its appearance terminated exactly at the time you left the New York Public Library to come to Washington? Are you acquainted with that strange coincidence?

Mr. WAHL. That is not true, sir. I was a member of the staff of the library for a considerable period before its mysterious appearance, and I know that it continued to appear for some time after I left the New York Public Library.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you dispute, say, a dozen witnesses of the staff of the New York Public Library that it ceased to appear at the library exactly at the time of your departure?

Mr. WAHL. I would dispute that and I would commend to your perusal the records of the New York Public Library, which has

catalogued that publication, and in its serial catalogue record will give you the exact dates of its appearance and termination and the exact date of my coming to the New York Public Library and my separation from the staff also, which is a matter of record.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Class Mark bear on its own pages the statement that it was published by the Communist Party unit of the New York Public Library?

Mr. WAHL. I can't remember it in such detail. I do remember that it stated openly that it was published by the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And it was the rule, was it not, that the Communist Party units, at various institutions, like the public library, made up its own shop paper, so called?

Mr. WAHL. I don't know what the facts are on their operations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever read any copies of the Class Mark?

Mr. WAHL. Did I ever read it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever read it, yes.

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever circulate any copies by passing them on when they came into your possession?

Mr. WAHL. No. As I remember it, they were usually distributed to everyone who entered the building.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know any of the persons who distributed them?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. They were total strangers to you?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you participate in the organization of any discussion groups at the New York Public Library?

Mr. WAHL. I participated in the staff association of the New York Public Library, which at one time had a group of its members which called themselves the discussion group of the staff association of the New York Public Library.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you organize any counter group to that group in the staff association?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or did you participate in the organization of any counter group?

Mr. WAHL. No; I did not participate in the organization of any counter group.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever take Garret Fielstra to any meeting of any kind outside of the library?

Mr. WAHL. Garret Fielstra often took me to meetings of the discussion group.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the discussion group he took you to?

Mr. WAHL. The one I just referred to. It was part of the staff association of the New York Public Library.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you connected with the News Letter, published by Local 28 of the United Federal Workers of America, in the Library of Congress?

Mr. WAHL. I was a member of the local.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever listed as a member of the editorial board or the body which got out the News Letter itself?

Mr. WAHL. I may have been listed as an officer of the local, but I don't recollect being an officer of the publication.

I might state in that connection that I was a member of Local 28 while I was a member of the staff of the Library of Congress, until I achieved administrative status, at which time the local asked me to resign, according to the rules of the union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You contributed articles to the News Letter; did you not?

Mr. WAHL. I believe I may have contributed some.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who the editor of the News Letter was?

Mr. WAHL. There was no single editor. There was an editorial committee, which consisted of members of the local.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the United Federal Workers, of which you were a member at the Congressional Library, support the American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it support the policy in international affairs that was also supported by the American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. WAHL. I am not quite sure what that policy was, but I do know that it did not support the policy of any other organization other than the United Federal Workers of America.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Eleanor Nelson?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is she secretary-treasurer of the United Federal Workers?

Mr. WAHL. I knew her in that capacity.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is her present relationship to the United Federal Workers?

Mr. WAHL. I understand that she is not associated with them now, and recently did, or is about to have a child.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Eleanor Nelson as a Communist?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any reason to believe she was a Communist?

Mr. WAHL. I have no reason whatsoever to believe that she is a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you heard the allegation that she is a Communist?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever join the Communist Party?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever repudiated the Communist Party publicly?

Mr. WAHL. I have never had an opportunity or occasion to do so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The News Letter of Local 28 at the Library of Congress, which appeared in June 1940, on page 4, has an article headed, Sane Thinking Amid General Hysteria.

Do you happen to recall whether you wrote that article?

Mr. WAHL. I don't recall the article itself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The first paragraph reads as follows:

The June 21 issue of Friday, the new magazine that is the current newsstand sensation, contains two articles that should be read by everyone sincerely anxious to keep sane in the midst of the prevalent national defense hysteria.

Do you recall whether or not you wrote the article, from hearing it?

Mr. WAHL. I didn't write it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your opinion that in June 1940 this country was in the midst of a national defense hysteria?

Mr. WAHL. That is not my opinion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it your opinion at the time this article appeared?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever state in meetings that you disagreed with that viewpoint in June 1940?

Mr. WAHL. Yes; I did make such a statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your view on the national defense in 1940?

Mr. WAHL. I felt always that the country should be very well defended at all times.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever hear of the American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. WAHL. Yes; I have heard of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you associated in any capacity whatsoever with the American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. WAHL. None whatsoever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know of the organization which was called Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. WAHL. Yes; I have heard of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever associated in any capacity whatsoever with the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you live when you first came to Washington?

Mr. WAHL. My first residence in Washington was in Takoma Park on Elm Avenue.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Elm Avenue?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you live there?

Mr. WAHL. I lived there just shortly—just short of a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then where did you go?

Mr. WAHL. I moved to Maple Avenue in Takoma Park.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you live there.

Mr. WAHL. I lived there just about a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What year was that; in 1939?

Mr. WAHL. That must have been 1939 or part of 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And then where did you go? Where did you move?

Mr. WAHL. Then we moved to Chapin Street.

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1462, was it?

Mr. WAHL. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Northwest?

Mr. WAHL. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever visit the apartment house next door to 1462 Chapin Street, toward the corner of Fourteenth?

Mr. WAHL. I never stepped foot in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know any of the occupants of the apartment?

Mr. WAHL. I didn't know any of them to speak to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever heard that that apartment, next door to which you lived, was the general Communist Party headquarters for the District of Columbia?

Mr. WAHL. I never heard such a thing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is your testimony that you never stepped a foot inside of the building on any occasion whatsoever; is that correct?

Mr. WAHL. That is true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you live at 1462 Chapin Street?

Mr. WAHL. It must have been somewhat over a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Until about 1940, or 1941, was it?

Mr. WAHL. It was until 1940.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it ever suggested to you by anyone in Washington, or from outside, that it would be a good idea for certain persons to move out of that area where you were living, 1462 Chapin Street?

Mr. WAHL. No; I can tell you precisely why we moved from that address. It is because the neighborhood was infested with rats, and my wife could not stand it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you teach at the Federal Workers School on Seventeenth Street?

Mr. WAHL. Yes; I gave one course there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you taught there, did you know Margaret Wallace?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was she the head of the school at that time?

Mr. WAHL. Yes. That is my impression.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were your relationships with the head of the school, Margaret Wallace, cordial?

Mr. WAHL. Extremely cordial.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever have any political discussions with her?

Mr. WAHL. I never had any discussion with her.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did she ever call you a Communist to your face?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether she ever called you a Communist to your back?

Mr. WAHL. I see no reason why she should have. The course I taught, incidentally, was a course in library technique, for the education of people in the Government who were working in libraries or in research work.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, I read to you a moment ago from the issue of the News Letter, which was dated June 1940, having to do with the magazine Friday.

Did you read the Friday magazine?

Mr. WAHL. I read a couple of issues of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did your reading of the magazine Friday convince you that it was a Communist Party line publication?

Mr. WAHL. Not particularly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever think so, incidentally or actually? I don't know what you mean by "particularly."

Mr. WAHL. I thought that certain parts of it might be so interpreted.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any objection to your local recommending the magazine Friday on that ground?

Mr. WAHL. Well, it was not for me to say at that time whether they should or should not recommend it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever meet Ted Lewis?

Mr. WAHL. I don't recollect.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In connection with your acquaintance with Nancy Reed?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever discuss communism or the Communist Party with Nancy Reed?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Sarah V. Montgomery?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever meet her?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have any idea who she was?

Mr. WAHL. I don't have any idea at the moment.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Mrs. Putnam, who was active in the Cooperative League in Washington?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever have any controversy with her on the subject of communism?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Mr. Putnam?

Mr. WAHL. I met him briefly once.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not he considered you a Communist?

Mr. WAHL. I see no reason why he should have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He never told you that he thought so?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you lead a discussion on a book entitled "Native Son", written by Richard Wright?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that a round-table discussion held at the library?

Mr. WAHL. No; that was a discussion held at the Book Shop, I believe, or it might have been at the library. It was simply a book review.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The News Letter of May 1940 says that David R. Wahl led a round-table discussion on the current best seller Native Son, by Richard Wright.

As you recall it, that was at the Book Shop?

Mr. WAHL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever meet Richard Wright?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that he is a Communist, don't you?

Mr. WAHL. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever hear that he was a Communist; a publicly avowed Communist?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A functionary of the Communist party?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that he was in charge of the Daily Worker distribution in Harlem for a period for the Communist Party?

Mr. WAHL. I never heard any such thing; in fact, I never heard much about Richard Wright other than reading his book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you recommend the book?

Mr. WAHL. I thought it was a very interesting book, as a book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say that the net result of your leading of this discussion was to recommend the book, the viewpoint of the book?

Mr. WAHL. I have no way of knowing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it your own feeling that the viewpoint of the book was sound?

Mr. WAHL. I didn't speak about the book so far as its viewpoint was concerned. I simply spoke about it as an interesting piece of literature.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did the discussion group last?

Mr. WAHL. You mean how long did the discussion last?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. WAHL. Well, probably 20 minutes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the September 1940 issue of the News Letter, your name is listed as a member of the editorial board.

Mr. WAHL. That is because I happened to be one of the officers of the local. It was a rather loosely organized board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the Book Shop sell the Daily Worker?

Mr. WAHL. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it sell the New Masses?

Mr. WAHL. Yes; as does every book shop and newsstand.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it sell the Communist?

Mr. WAHL. I don't remember seeing it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it sell Soviet Russia Today?

Mr. WAHL. Yes; which is also true with most newsstands in the city.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it sell all of the books of Earl Browder?

Mr. WAHL. I have no way of knowing whether it sold all of them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it ever feature any of Earl Browder's books in its announcements?

Mr. WAHL. No; it did not feature them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did it ever feature any of Lenin's works in its announcements?

Mr. WAHL. It did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Wahl, other witnesses have been given an opportunity at the close of the questioning to make any further statements or clarifications that they might want to make and we will be glad to give you that opportunity at this time.

Mr. WAHL. I appreciate the opportunity, and I should like to make a few simple remarks about myself.

I was brought up in Cleveland, as I have noted before, in a rather pious home. And my families—both mine and those related—are rather substantial people of property. My father has been for many years the secretary of an Employers Plumbers Association, and has always employed a fairly large number of workers; always had to meet a pay roll.

My brother is likewise in business, in a partnership, involving the selling of hardware and auto supplies.

I happen to be the member of the family who decided to go into the scholarly life. While at college I majored in language, literature, and the sciences. I want to say that I myself own some bonds. I would like to own more. I hope to, some time.

And I want to be on record as saying that this form of government under which we live is the one which I want to live under, and I would not want to live under any other.

I have been always a very loyal citizen. I think my life has been exemplary. I have been married 10 years. I have two children. And through hard work, or rather, because of hard work, and because of my family obligations, there has been very little time for me to participate in anything but the most necessary loyal duties of a citizen.

In spite of my rather limited income and expenses in maintaining a family, I still manage to contribute to such things as the Red Cross, the community chest, Montgomery Tuberculosis Association, United Jewish Appeal, and I contribute and have, for many years, to the Cleveland Educational League which gave me a scholarship through college, which was given to me in competition with other students.

And I should like to insert in the record, if it is so desired, certain letters of character, of various people, under whom I have worked in the past.

Mr. MASON. I think that that is permissible and it is so ordered.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to ask the witness if he considers that the Communist Party is a loyal American organization?

Mr. WAHL. I have not thought on the subject other than what the Constitution of the United States provides and that Congress rules in that regard.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which would be what? With respect to the Communist Party.

Mr. WAHL. Well, it seems to be functioning as a legal party; as a minority party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I didn't ask you if you considered it a legal organization, but loyal. You have no opinion on that?

Mr. WAHL. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all.

Mr. MASON. That is all, then, Mr. Wahl.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. MASON. We will next take up Mr. Fahy.

Mr. Fahy, will you raise your right hand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony that you will give at this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. FAHY. I do.

Mr. MASON. You may proceed, Mr. Matthews.

TESTIMONY OF JACK BRADLEY FAHY, BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please give your full name.

Mr. FAHY. Jack Bradley Fahy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. FAHY. Washington, D. C.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When?

Mr. FAHY. November 5, 1908.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please outline briefly your educational background.

Mr. FAHY. New York University, where I majored in economics; Montana State College of Agriculture, animal husbandry. I studied at Geneva, at the Institute of International Relations, Geneva, Switzerland. I took courses at San Marco University, Lima, Peru, a Catholic university; and finally, Black Mountain College, North Carolina.

My secondary education was largely in Catholic schools; St. Francis Xavier University, Newman School, a Catholic preparatory school in Lakewood, N. J.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a student at Black Mountain?

Mr. FAHY. I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What years?

Mr. FAHY. One term in 1936. They had a professor at the college who was a Cuban, who was a specialist in Latin-American economics, and that was my field, and I was very much interested in taking his course.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How are you presently employed?

Mr. FAHY. I am on the pay roll of the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your title?

Mr. FAHY. I am on loan to the Department of the Interior, and, in detail, to work in the Division of Territories and Island Possessions; more in particular my Division covers Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your salary?

Mr. FAHY. My salary is \$5,600 per annum.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it paid by the Department of the Interior or by the Board of Economic Warfare?

Mr. FAHY. Well, it is paid by the Board of Economic Warfare, but it is reimbursed by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long have you been working at the Board of Economic Warfare?

Mr. FAHY. Since June 1, 1942.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your appointment immediately prior to June 1, 1942?

Mr. FAHY. From February 1941 to May 15, 1942, I was employed by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. The first part of that 14 months was a contractual arrangement between the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and the American Association of Advertising Agencies, and I was the representative in Colombia and Central America for 1 year, and had my headquarters in Bogota, Colombia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your salary when you worked for the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs?

Mr. FAHY. Well, as I say, it was a contractual arrangement with the American Association of Advertising Agencies.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who paid your salary?

Mr. FAHY. They paid me \$7,500 a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The advertisers paid you \$7,500 a year?

Mr. FAHY. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What did you do immediately prior to the holding of that position?

Mr. FAHY. I was copublisher and coeditor of a publication called the Hemisphere. It was a publication put out by the Hemisphere Corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, as a profit-making corporation.

The corporation was founded about October 1, 1939, and publication started about January 5, 1940, and continued in publication until August 1941.

The files and all of the material of that, that was the property of that corporation, is now at the service of the Government, without compensation, in the Coordinator's office.

The publication itself was a weekly news letter for American exporters, businessmen in general, bankers, manufacturers, educationalists, and anyone interested in Latin America.

It consisted of economic and political events on a week-to-week basis without editorial comment of any kind.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Prior to the establishment of the Hemisphere on or about October 1, 1939, what were you doing?

Mr. FAHY. I had had at least 6 or 8 months preparing the material for the publication. Probably 6 months of that time were spent in traveling from country to country at my own personal expense in almost all of the 20 republics of Latin-America, gathering material, pointing correspondence, and so on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Prior to that 6 months' period of travel, what were you doing?

Mr. FAHY. I returned home from Spain late in September 1938. I had been in Spain for—or, rather, I had left for Spain in April 1937.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were in Spain approximately a year and a half, were you?

Mr. FAHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you in combat service in Spain?

Mr. FAHY. I was part of the Regular Loyalist Army of Spain, but swore no allegiance to a foreign flag; took no oath to any foreign country whatsoever, and signed no paper to that effect at any time. I drove a truck. I was finally in charge of a transportation unit consisting of trucks.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you attached to the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, as it was called?

Mr. FAHY. There was no Abraham Lincoln Brigade. There was a Fifteenth Brigade. In that there were four battalions, made up of one battalion of Spaniards, one of Americans, one of Canadians, and one of English. The American one was known as the Abraham Lincoln Battalion. I was never in it or connected with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which one of the outfits were you connected with?

Mr. FAHY. I had a transportation unit which was not a battalion, not a combat battalion, but it was attached to the Fifteenth International Brigade.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say that the designation which was widely used in this country was false or correct, that is, Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. FAHY. Well, it is very natural; I mean, I remember it because I was there. It was not a brigade. There never was an Abraham Lincoln Brigade. It was a battalion, which was a smaller unit of men.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you use the designation yourself, Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. FAHY. No; I was not much interested in the name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write a letter of resignation to the Socialist Party on your return from Spain in 1938?

Mr. FAHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And was that letter published in the Daily Worker of October 17, 1938?

Mr. FAHY. Yes, it was. An excerpt from it was published.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will show you a copy of it and ask you if that is the letter which you wrote to the Socialist Party.

Mr. FAHY. Well, I would not know it down to the last comma. I don't know if there are any changes in it, but in general, it certainly is, except the letter was addressed to the Socialist Party and started out, "Dear Mr. Thomas," or something like that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The letter makes that clear, I think, that it is addressed to the Socialist Party. It says:

Please accept this letter as my official resignation from the party.

It is a matter of no particular significance, I take it, but in the letter I notice you have called the organization the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Mr. FAHY. I am sorry. I got more technical since then, I guess.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer this letter in evidence as an exhibit, but inasmuch as there may have been some intimation on the part of the witness that the letter is not exactly as he wrote it, I shall later have him read it over and state if the letter has, in any way, been altered, according to his recollection.

Mr. MASON. We will be glad to accept the letter as an exhibit. I think he has already stated in substance it is the same.

Mr. FAHY. Yes.

(The letter referred to was marked "Fahy Exhibit No. 1.")

Mr. MASON. You would not know whether there had been any changes in the wording or punctuation?

Mr. FAHY. That is right.

Mr. MASON. But in substance it is the same?

Mr. FAHY. In substance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you a member of the Socialist Party?

Mr. FAHY. That is pretty hard for me to define. If it means paying dues, I think all together I must have paid dues about 2 months, in my time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, when did you join the party?

Mr. FAHY. In 1931, but I could hardly be considered an active member.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you join the Socialist Party?

Mr. FAHY. In New York. I was living in New York City at the time, 29 Fifth Avenue, at my father's home.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you resigned in 1938?

Mr. FAHY. 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So you would at least consider yourself a member for about 7 years?

Mr. FAHY. I did, for the purpose of this letter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, wasn't the letter written in good faith?

Mr. FAHY. It was written because I was very annoyed and angry about something, and very emotional about something, that I just came home and had seen several people who had been sent to Spain by the Socialist Party, and there were no funds to bring them home, and I had gone to talk to Norman Thomas to see if there wasn't some way to get those people home. I simply myself had the good fortune to have had a trust fund set up for me by my father and was able to finance myself and had no financial problems, but I couldn't help remembering those other lads who were not so fortunate, and I wanted something done about it, and apparently nothing could be done about it and I got mad and wrote the letter.

Mr. MASON. That letter, you would say, then, was your reaction, or your resentment to conditions that had come under observation in Spain, and it was your method of serving notice about those conditions and your resentment toward them.

Mr. FAHY. Yes.

Mr. MASON. Would you say that was a fair statement?

Mr. FAHY. Yes; I certainly would.

Mr. MASON. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I should like to ask the witness further questions on that point: If it is not, on the contrary, an attack on the Socialist Party for things which did not exist in Spain and to support what did exist in Spain under the control and domination of the Communist Party? Isn't that a much fairer statement than the one you said "Yes" to, when the Congressman questioned you?

Mr. FAHY. I am afraid I didn't get that clear. I didn't get the connection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All right. The first point in the letter is an attack on the Socialist Party, isn't that correct?

Mr. FAHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the implication is clear that in attacking the Socialist Party you are supporting or defending the Communist Party.

Mr. FAHY. Not at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Wouldn't you say so? Is there any criticism of the Communist Party in here?

Mr. FAHY. I was not talking about the Communist Party in here.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Communist Party is not mentioned in here?

Mr. FAHY. The letter was written to the Socialist Party. I must say that I have got to rest on the fact that I was angry and mad about one point, and however this letter sounds, I can only say that I wrote it for the purpose stated in the next to the last paragraph, or wherever it is, in which I told them I was wanting to do something about getting these people home.

Mr. MASON. Well, let us put it this way: The letter, in substance, condemns the Socialist Party for what they failed to do, and does it commend the Communist Party for what they have been doing in Spain?

Mr. FAHY. Only by omitting them.

Mr. MASON. That is what I would gather from Dr. Matthews' statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let us read some of the letter, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The witness stated that the Communist Party is not involved in the letter. I think he should probably modify that on second thought. Here, for example:

Having no positive approach the Socialist Party has, in self-defense, developed a negative approach in an attempt to check its complete dissolution. Thus, the two points which have received most discussion during the past 2 years have been vitriolic attacks on the Communist Party and a slanderous campaign against Loyalist Spain.

Now, take the next sentence:

The attacks on the Communist Party undoubtedly have been inspired by fear.

Now, I will ask the witness again if the Communist Party is involved in the letter.

Mr. FAHY. On through the letter?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. FAHY. Is it ever mentioned again? I don't see the word "Communist" or any reference to that in any further paragraph.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your reference to Sam Baron, who testified before this committee at about that time, is as follows:

Suffice it to say that the Socialist Party was gullible enough to make a front-page story of Sam Baron's criminal lies. Baron was determined to make a name for himself in Spain and he took the quickest road to fame.

Now, Baron's statements which you call criminal lies were almost exclusively in condemnation of the Communist Party's tactics in Spain, were they not?

Mr. FAHY. I am referring to his discussion of Spain. To me, this—well, I simply have to tell you that I came home from Spain, and I don't think anybody could go through 18 months of that kind of experience without being somewhat emotional. Of those, I must have spent at least 15 months at the front. I was upset about something that I thought was unjust; that these boys who had done this thing could not be brought home.

I wrote the letter for that purpose. The letter has never been followed up in any way by any action or word of mine; anywhere, at any time. I wrote this letter when I was angry and when I was annoyed.

I immediately went back to what my field of interest and work had been for 10 years, Latin America, and I have never followed it up since. It was a thing that I did. I can't analyze it now. I can't tell you what each sentence means.

All I know is that I wanted to make a point and the point was that these boys were not having their way paid home by the people who had sent them. I couldn't do anything. I wrote the letter. I lost interest in the thing because I couldn't do anything.

Mr. MASON. Well, you would acknowledge, however, that in reading the letter and analyzing it, that a person who knows nothing about your emotional reaction, would judge that you were attacking the Socialists, because they had failed to do certain things, and you were condemning the Socialists' attack upon the Communist leaders, shall we say, who were doing some of the things that you thought ought to have been done by the Socialist Party; would that be a fair summary of the situation?

Mr. FAHY. I am not terribly good at—I mean, really, this is so much out of the past that I just don't know enough about it now.

I believe sincerely that what I was doing, I was simply stating a fact. I was stating what I thought was a fact at the time, that that is why the Socialist Party was doing these things. I was not condemning them for their attacks on the Communists.

I certainly criticized them for the attack on Spain.

To me this situation is much like the one in north Africa. I was at the front. People were bickering about politics in the rear and it gave you a terrific feeling of, frankly "Why" when you feel that the whole political scene behind you is going to collapse when you are up near the front, and that is what it seemed to me the Socialists had been doing. I never had enough contact with these people to know the final shadowings. I simply tried to implement with everything I could this final point about these boys. I did that by getting out some back copies of the Socialist Call and writing into this letter all the language I thought would hurt, to make my point. I gave up and went my way and went back to my field, which has been Latin-America, and have never returned to any of this.

Mr. MASON. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write the letter yourself, Mr. Fahy?

Mr. FAHY. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I ask that, because you must know enough about party tactics to know that such letters may easily be composed and offered to you for your signature.

Mr. FAHY. I would never sign one.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you supply the Daily Worker with a copy of the letter,

Mr. FAHY. I sent this letter to every newspaper in New York City, every single one. Yes; I did. I sent it to the New York Times, the Sun, Herald Tribune; every single paper in New York City.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not any of the other papers published it, or parts of it?

Mr. FAHY. I understand New Republic magazine published an excerpt from it. And, reading it over later, it was quite easy to understand why the New York Times was not interested.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the last paragraph of the letter you wrote:

I intend to devote my time to aiding the efforts of the Friends of Abraham Lincoln Brigade—

Mr. FAHY. Well, it was a good intention, and nothing more, I guess.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied that the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade was a Communist front organization?

Mr. FAHY. I don't know enough about them. I never went to a meeting of theirs and I really couldn't say. If they are, it would not surprise me, and on the other hand, I just don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know that Earl Browder has stated that 60 percent of the members of what he called the Abraham Lincoln Brigade were party members. Communist Party members?

Mr. FAHY. You are speaking of the Friends?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. I am speaking of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade itself, as it actually fought in Spain.

Mr. FAHY. Well, I was never in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I didn't ask you if you were. I understand your testimony to be that you were not. I asked you if you knew that

Earl Browder has stated that the majority of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade were of the Communist Party, or the Young Communist League.

Mr. FAHY. I don't follow his writings or speeches. I know that some were; I know that a good many were. I had no contact with the Communist Party, or any of their organizations in any way whatsoever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who recruited you to go to Spain?

Mr. FAHY. No one recruited me to go to Spain.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any discussion with anyone in this country prior to your departure for Spain?

Mr. FAHY. Yes; I had some discussion with some Socialists and I asked to go and went with one other Socialist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the other Socialist that you went with?

Mr. FAHY. I can't remember his name. He was a young lad from the University of Chicago, and he and I went together in April 1936. We simply went together.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you say you discussed the matter with some Socialists, did you discuss it with some of the leaders of the Socialist Party?

Mr. FAHY. Well, I never had met Norman Thomas or any important leader of the Socialist Party at that time. I was just talking to a couple of them that I did know, and asked them how to go, and so on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know Clarence Senior.

Mr. FAHY. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know who Clarence Senior was?

Mr. FAHY. Yes. I met him for the first time at the Board of Economic Warfare in June 1942. I never met him previously.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is employed at the Board of Economic Warfare; is that your understanding?

Mr. FAHY. He was a few months ago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, did you attend the Montevideo congress several years ago?

Mr. FAHY. I was there; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you go as a delegate for any particular organization?

Mr. FAHY. None whatsoever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you apprised of the fact that you were listed as a delegate from the United Students Peace Committee?

Mr. FAHY. Yes; and I am also aware from the editor of the New York Times who is a friend of mine, that 3 or 4 days later, they published a retraction of that and said that it was an error.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you go representing any group whatsoever to the Montevideo congress?

Mr. FAHY. No group of any kind.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many delegates were there from the United States at the Montevideo congress?

Mr. FAHY. I was not a delegate. I simply went there in my 6-month trip around South America. There were other Americans there. Luigi Antonini from the American Labor Party was there, and Kathryn Lewis was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The daughter of John L. Lewis?

Mr. FAHY. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the other woman there?

Mr. FAHY. There was a Brazilian woman who went down on the same train, but she is a Brazilian.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Marina Lopez?

Mr. FAHY. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know that Marina Lopez is the wife of John Little, secretary of the Communist Party of New York?

Mr. FAHY. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know that at the time?

Mr. FAHY. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever have any connection with the Council for Pan-American Democracy?

Mr. FAHY. I didn't belong to it. The only possible connection I could have had was I went to a meeting that they called to hear George Fielding Eliot and Senator Mead and a whole list of speakers, and a man named David O. Efron, and others. I never had any connection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever listed publicly as a sponsor or other participant in its affairs?

Mr. FAHY. I am quite sure I was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the Council for Pan-American Democracy in any way interested in this Montevideo congress which you attended?

Mr. FAHY. I don't know. They all have a main person, and I think at their meeting here in Washington they had Hugo Fernandez Artussio, who was trying to arouse interest in the Montevideo congress.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever have any discussion with Miss Lewis on the way down to South America?

Mr. FAHY. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you discuss anything with her?

Mr. FAHY. Not that I know of.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know her?

Mr. FAHY. Yes; surely.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you discuss any politics with her?

Mr. FAHY. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the date of the Montevideo congress?

Mr. FAHY. It would be hard for me to give you the exact date. I think it was in March 1939; March or early in April.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, it was about 6 months after you had come back from Spain?

Mr. FAHY. That is right, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Had you cooled off from what you called your indignation in the meantime?

Mr. FAHY. Yes, sir. My trip was to get correspondents for my publication.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You think you cooled off to the point where you could have dispassionately viewed the congress?

Mr. FAHY. I guess so. I must say that I was there pretty much for my own purposes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did your observations of the Montevideo congress lead you to believe that it was a Communist-dominated organization?

Mr. FAHY. They were trying, but they were not dominant. They were in there trying, but I would not say they were dominant.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you meet Harry Gannes on that trip?

Mr. FAHY. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether Harry Gannes was there at the congress or not?

Mr. FAHY. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether Clarence Senior was there or not?

Mr. FAHY. I do not. I didn't know him and didn't hear his name mentioned.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not Marina Lopez was accompanying Kathryn Lewis as sort of a personal escort to help her out of her language difficulties and otherwise escort her around South America?

Mr. FAHY. Yes; I would say that she certainly helped with the language difficulty; helped Kathryn Lewis with the language difficulty. Whether she went there for that purpose or not, I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that the State Department records show that Marina Lopez is the wife of the State secretary of the Communist Party, John Little. The State Department has also informed the committee that Marina Lopez did go on this journey through South America as the personal escort to Kathryn Lewis, which included this visit to the Montevideo congress.

Mr. FAHY. May I say at this point that the cotraveling stopped at Montevideo; that I did not continue either with Kathryn Lewis or anyone else on the rest of the journey of 6 months.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I introduced that to identify Marina Lopez' connection with the Montevideo congress.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. This will conclude the hearing, then, for today, and you are excused.

Mr. FAHY. Do I have an opportunity to say anything else?

Mr. MASON. Oh, yes; I am sorry. I overlooked that.

All of our witnesses are given an opportunity at the close of the hearing to clarify any point they desire.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And I am not sure whether I specifically introduced this letter as an exhibit or not. If not, I would like to ask that it be received.

Mr. MASON. We would be glad to have you make any clarification or statement that you care to make at this particular time.

Mr. FAHY. Well, it is very difficult for me to try and sum up anything. All I can say is, my field has been Latin America for 10 years, and I have earned my living in this field. Starting out from school my first job was as secretary to Senator George H. Moses of New Hampshire.

My next job was for my father, Walter J. Fahy & Co., members of the New York Stock Exchange.

I started a chain of book shops in New Orleans, and those still exist and are called Fahy Book Shops, and were quite successful. I have worked on ranches in Montana, and I went to South America late in 1933 and did newspaper work in Lima, Peru, and finally started an ice cream specialty manufacturing concern in Peru, and that business is still going.

I started that with capital of several young American who were employees of American corporations operating in Peru.

We needed additional capital, and I borrowed money against my personal note from W. R. Grose & Co., and that business is still there, and I think that some of these things ought to be considered, simply because they are the events that led to my having gone to Spain.

I knew what was happening to the American businessman in Peru because of the determined German effort to compete with American business on a basis that American business could not meet. It may be of interest to the committee to have this publication submitted. We published a story on November 29, 1940, which I wrote myself, which simply states the work of this committee in Latin America. It gives facts as given us by one of the committee's reports. I think it is also important. I wrote the article myself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By "this committee" you refer to the one you spoke of before?

Mr. FAHY. I do, yes.

Mr. MASON. If that article is your reaction to this committee and its work at that time, I shall rule that it shall be included in the record as an exhibit.

(The article referred to was marked as "Fahy Exhibit No. 2.")

Mr. FAHY. It is not an editorial comment, as all our articles were factual, in simply stating facts. I think it is also important that what I have done since I came home from Spain should be considered. I have a letter from the Chaplain of Foreign Catholics in Colombia, who was my own priest, as well as the man I worked with very closely in Colombia for 1 year. When my name appeared among those named by the committee a short time ago, a monsignor, or rather, a priest here in Washington, on his own initiative, wrote to the chaplain of foreign Catholics in Colombia, South America, and asked for an opinion of me. I did not write the letter or ask that it be written.

The reply has come back, addressed to this priest in Washington, and I think in fairness it ought to be put into the record.

Mr. MASON. We shall be glad to include it as an exhibit, on the basis of a kind of character reference, if you want to call it that.

(The letter referred to was marked "Fahy Exhibit No. 3.")

Mr. FAHY. Yes. There are, of course, other letters which have come in on these various subjects.

Mr. MASON. Now, Mr. Fahy, I would like to ask one question in connection with this. What was your prevailing motive for going to Spain and going through all of that experience that you did go through? You went on your own account, according to your testimony, and you financed your return, at least, and I suppose you financed your trip across.

Mr. FAHY. No; I didn't, but I would have. That is immaterial.

Mr. MASON. May I ask who financed your trip?

Mr. FAHY. The Socialist Organization.

Mr. MASON. What was your prevailing motive?

Mr. FAHY. I lived in Peru for about 3 years, and I knew the members of the American colony, the French colony, the German colony, and so on.

And as you know, in South American countries, those colonies are very cliquish, and I knew them well.

Then, a new German Consul General came to Lima; that was about 1934 or 1935, and immediately an entirely new atmosphere began to appear in that German colony. They were called in to a meeting, and the Nazi political theory, or whatever it is called, was pointed out to them, and they were told that they would have to begin to fight for Germany right there on a political and economic basis and begin to influence the Peruvians.

Most of them objected violently and said they would not do it, but one by one, they had their firm representation cut off, their bank credit cut off, their children put out of German schools—an educational system which was far superior to the local schools. They were expelled from the German social clubs, and so on.

So, one by one, these Germans capitulated and went into this movement, and it didn't make any difference whether they went in willingly or unwillingly; in effect, they all became propagandists, out to influence the Peruvians.

Mr. MASON. Would you say that your knowledge that you gained at that time, of the German purposes in South America, caused you to resent it so much that you went over to Spain as a volunteer to oppose the German attitude there?

Mr. FAHY. That was my only interest, that I thought. Perhaps it is idealistic; perhaps it was venturesome. I don't know.

Mr. MASON. Well, it would certainly have some of those qualities in it.

Mr. FAHY. That is right. But I felt it was tremendously important. I had no interest in the Spanish Civil War as such, and didn't make any move to go back after the first 6 months, because I just thought it was a civil war. I didn't care on which side the Spaniards won.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you did go under political and ideological auspices when you went under the auspices of the Socialist Party?

Mr. FAHY. Well, I suppose so; I mean, I didn't have to sit down and subscribe to all the Socialist principles in order to go.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who prevailed upon you to join the Socialist Party in 1931?

Mr. FAHY. I don't think anyone did. I think I was curious and looking for an answer to a lot of these things that I was seeing every day in my father's firm, to the depression, to the break, and to the market, and I thought perhaps the Socialists had the answer to it. If they did, I never found out what it was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have acquaintances who were in the Socialist Party already?

Mr. FAHY. No. I lived at 29 Fifth Avenue, and Great Neck, Long Island, and I think I must have been the only Socialist in Great Neck, Long Island.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you go out cold and look up some Socialists and ask if you could join?

Mr. FAHY. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you go through the Rand School?

Mr. FAHY. I lived at 29 Fifth Avenue, and I own a house around the corner on Twelfth Street. They were holding meetings in somebody's apartment—you know, one of those old brownstone-front houses on Twelfth Street, near Fifth Avenue and University Place.

Mr. MASON. Well—

Mr. FAHY (interposing). Could I say one more thing?

I have my induction notice and I requested it myself, and I am reporting to the Army, to an induction center, for induction into the armed forces tomorrow morning. I thought you would like to have that in the record.

Mr. MASON. That will be made a part of the record.

If there is nothing further at this time, the subcommittee will adjourn.

(Whereupon, at 1:05 p. m., the subcommittee adjourned.)



INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., the Honorable Noah M. Mason presiding.

Also present: J. B. Matthews, director of research, and Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator for the committee; and John M. Lowrie, of the general counsel staff, Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. MASON. The hearing will come to order, please. Mr. Bisson, will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BISSON. I do.

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS ARTHUR BISSON, BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

Mr. MASON. Will you give your full name and address, please?

Mr. BISSON. Thomas Arthur Bisson, 353 Willard Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

Mr. MASON. Where were you born, Mr. Bisson?

Mr. BISSON. I was born in New York City.

Mr. MASON. What date?

Mr. BISSON. November 8, 1900.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Bisson, will you give us briefly your professional training; your schooling?

Mr. BISSON. I was educated in the high schools of Englewood, N. J. From there, with a scholarship, I went to Rutgers University; graduated B. A. in 1923. Then I went to Columbia University; graduated M. A. in 1924. Then I spent 4 years as a missionary for the Presbyterian Church in China, 1924 to 1928.

I returned to this country in the summer of 1928, where I pursued postgraduate studies at Columbia in the Chinese department. In 1929 I joined the staff of the Foreign Policy Association in New York City, where I stayed for some 12 years until January 1942, when I joined the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Bisson, will you give your salary in the various positions that you have held?

Mr. BISSON. As a missionary my salary began at \$780 a year. Of course, there were some supplementary allowances. In the Foreign Policy Association the salary began at \$3,000 and ended at \$4,000, but during the later years, particularly, I had considerable income from outside writing, speaking, publications, books, which brought that up to nearly \$5,000.

Mr. MASON. When you entered the Board of Economic Warfare, what was your salary at the beginning?

Mr. BISSON. \$5,600.

Mr. MASON. And what is it now?

Mr. BISSON. \$5,600.

Mr. MASON. I think, Dr. Matthews, you may proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Bisson, were you ever publicly associated with the American Student Union?

Mr. BISSON. I think I spoke at one convention of that union shortly after I returned from China in 1937, where I had spent a sabbatical year in studies under a Rockefeller Foundation grant.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the date of your return from China?

Mr. BISSON. I returned from China in January 1938. It might have ended at the end of December. It was at the turn of the year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The annual convention of the American Student Union to which you refer was held on December 26 to 30, 1938, was it not? Is that your recollection?

Mr. BISSON. That would probably be right; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were one of the convention speakers there; is that correct?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your understanding that the American Student Union was and is a Communist front organization?

Mr. BISSON. I had no specific understanding to that effect.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you familiar in a general way with what is a Communist front organization?

Mr. BISSON. In a general way; yes. May I add here that speaking at a convention of the American Student Union is not an isolated event. I was speaking on platforms in many different places, including organizations such as the Women's Republican League of New York, Rotary clubs, and other organizations of that type.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean to say even if you had been assured in your own mind that it was a Communist front organization, you would have considered it quite proper to deliver a public address under the auspices of the organization?

Mr. BISSON. No. What I mean is, when I spoke before a Republican Women's National League meeting, I was not necessarily identifying myself as a Republican, or when I spoke before a Rotary club, as a Rotarian, nor would it necessarily mean that I was identifying myself with communism because I spoke before the American Student Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you receive any remuneration for addressing the American Student Union?

Mr. BISSON. Not that I know of. However, it should be noted that the speakers of the Foreign Policy Association, perhaps half of the time they spoke, gave their services free. The Foreign Policy Association, it should be recognized, is an organization which is set up or which was set up originally to interpret foreign conditions and international

relations to the American public, and we on the research staff considered it part of our regular duties to contribute our services as speakers on many occasions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you contribute an article or articles to a publication known as Soviet Russia Today?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many articles did you contribute to that magazine?

Mr. BISSON. Oh, I think I may have contributed as many as two; one or two.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were those articles solicited from you or did you offer them without solicitation to the publication?

Mr. BISSON. I was under solicitation for articles almost every week in New York City.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; but in this particular case, do you recall whether or not you were solicited for the articles?

Mr. BISSON. Yes; these articles were solicited.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the person who solicited the articles?

Mr. BISSON. As I remember, it was the editor at that time. It was a woman, I think.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Jessica Smith?

Mr. BISSON. Probably; yes. But here again I think it is important to note, in the first place, that professionally I was known as a student and interpreter of the Far East. In my writings for publications I was almost entirely and exclusively concerned with developments in the Far East, which was my field on the research staff of the Foreign Policy Association; therefore you will find that in these articles I was discussing problems connected with the Far East; relations between, let us say, Russia and Japan, as well as the United States and China or Russia and Japan in the Far East.

The fact that Russia is a very important member of the group of nations that has important interests in the Far East made it necessary for me to cover Russia also in my work. And I should also add that, as in the case of the speaking engagements, my writings for periodicals outside of the Foreign Policy Association periodicals covered a wide scope. I contributed articles to magazines as diverse, let us say, as this one, as the Magazine of Wall Street, which is the best-known magazine of Wall Street businessmen also on the Far East. I contributed articles to the Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Sciences; to the American Economic Review; to other professional publications of that kind.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you mean to imply that the magazine Soviet Russia Today and the Wall Street publication to which you referred are, in your mind, at opposite political poles?

Mr. BISSON. Well, it is, I think, recognized that Soviet Russia Today was a publication dedicated to improving the American relations with Russia and to induce Americans to adopt a sympathetic attitude toward Russia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your understanding that Soviet Russia Today was primarily a medium of Communist propaganda, controlled by Communists?

Mr. BISSON. No; I have no understanding that extends that far.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the political affiliations of Jessica Smith?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Theodore Bayer?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Alexander Lev?

Mr. BISSON. I know none of these persons.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Jessica Smith was editor and Theodore Bayer managing editor, and Alexander Lev business manager of the publication at the time of your contributions.

Mr. Chairman, the Communist records of these three individuals are matters of public knowledge; public profession.

Were you publicly associated with a committee set up for the release from prison of Thaelmann, the German Communist leader?

Mr. BISSON. I may have been. I don't recollect that I was a member of any such committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the publication known as the International Press Correspondence?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. An official publication of the Communist International?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever seen copies of it?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The International Press Correspondents, No. 50, states that Bisson, of the committee on foreign relations, was a member of the International Release Committee for Thaelmann. Does that refresh your recollection at all?

Mr. BISSON. I have no recollection of that. That is an inaccurate statement in the first place. There is no committee on foreign relations that I know of.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would be a very natural mistake for a foreign publication to make, or an easy one for it to make, in speaking before the Foreign Policy Association?

Mr. BISSON. I don't know. It seems to me that those names are rather different. It is not impossible for a periodical of that nature to pick up names rather haphazardly without particular authorization from the individual concerned.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you serve on the reception committee to welcome Branting when he came to the United States? Did you ever serve on such a reception committee?

Mr. BISSON. I have no recollection of that. It should be recognized that that is far outside of the field of my normal activities, which were connected mainly with the Far East, and that in itself calls this documentary evidence into question in my mind.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know who Thaelmann is or was?

Mr. BISSON. Thaelmann was a German Communist, so far as I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A member of the Communist group?

Mr. BISSON. A member of the Communist group in Germany.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you publicly associate yourself with the signing of an open letter which appeared in the magazine Soviet Russia Today in September 1939?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited your signature to that open letter?

Mr. BISSON. I do not remember. I imagine it was just a letter that came through in the ordinary course of the mail.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the substance of the open letter?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The one which you signed?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What would be your interpretation of the purpose of this open letter?

Mr. BISSON. Well, I think the purpose of it was to call attention to the fact that it was important for the United States to have a close and friendly relation with Russia in order to curb the advance of German fascism in Europe, and I would naturally associate myself with that stand, because I had for at least 6 or 8 years both said and wrote that it was important for the United States, particularly in its far eastern relations, to establish relations with the Soviet Union that would help to curb the advance of Japan.

It should be pointed out that although that letter may have appeared in the September issue, which is after the Soviet-German pact, the signatures on that letter, and I am not sure but what its original publication occurred before the signing of the Soviet-German pact, which I did not favor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had occasion to look over the other published signers of the open letter?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever examined the list at any time?

Mr. BISSON. I have not examined it in detail.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have an opinion on whether the list is composed primarily of persons with Communist political orientation?

Mr. BISSON. I would not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If that were true, would that have made any difference to you in signing the document?

Mr. BISSON. It probably would have; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Maxwell Stewart?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it possible that Maxwell Stewart solicited your signature to this letter?

Mr. BISSON. Yes; it is possible.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not recall exactly whether that is the case or not?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Bernhard J. Stern?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At Columbia University?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Ella Winter?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who she is?

Mr. BISSON. I think she was the wife of the man who died.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Lincoln Steffens.

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should like to read to you two paragraphs from the open letter and then ask you a question or two about them.

Point 8 and point 9 in the letter state, and this refers to the Soviet Union:

8. It has replaced the myths and superstitions of old Russia with the truths and techniques of experimental science, extending scientific procedures to every field, from economics to public health. And it has made science and scientific study available to the mass of the people.

9. The Soviet Union considers political dictatorship a transitional form and has shown a steadily expanding democracy in every sphere.

Do you consider those sentences propagandistic in their nature?

Mr. BISSON. Well, there are two separate ideas involved there. One is the question of development of science and technique in Russia. I would certainly have proof that it was, and I think it has been demonstrated since in their ability to conduct mechanized warfare.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let us take them separately:

The Soviet Union considers political dictatorship a transitional form and has shown a steadily expanding democracy in every sphere.

Do you consider that of a propagandistic nature?

Mr. BISSON. Well, I think perhaps it covers a broader field, and I would be willing, if I were pinned down 100 percent on that. Let me point out in this connection that the points that interested me in this declaration were mainly the points concerning the type of foreign policy which the United States should pursue, and I want to stress the point that I originally made, that I had felt and advocated that it was important for the United States to participate in international cooperation to stop both Italian fascism and German nazi-ism in Europe, and particularly the Japanese in the Far East, and I was interested in helping along public opinion in support of a policy which would further that end. It should be noted that in the Far East we have a situation which is very clear today; that only Russia has adequate force to restrain Japan; that the United States, due to the trend of geography, is far removed from the battlefield of the Far East. And it was a very important point always maintained by our military and naval men that were under a group handicap because we were so far removed from that far eastern theater of operations, and it was, therefore, the opinion of most informed students of far eastern affairs that it was very essential that the only other strong power in the Far East, which was the Soviet Union, and the United States should establish some form of international cooperation in order to restrain Japan.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to ask you if you consider that the Soviet Union, with its system of communism, has trade-unions which are properly so called and as the words "trade-unions" are understood by American readers?

Mr. BISSON. I suppose they would not be as are normally understood in this country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For example, when the article says "It has built the trade-unions, in which almost 24,000,000 workers are organized, into the very fabric of its society," don't you consider that a misleading and highly propagandistic statement?

Mr. BISSON. (No response.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, don't you know? You should not have to wait to answer that question.

Mr. BISSON. I would not necessarily indicate that that means that these unions are completely alien to American trade-union practices. And, besides, I want to emphasize the point that here I was not primarily concerned with the internal conditions in Russia. It seems to me that so far as we are concerned, it is not our primary interest to be concerned about internal questions in Russia.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Bisson, pardon me. Wouldn't you say that in subscribing to that document, that in your desire to establish closer and better relations between Russia and the United States, because of the necessity for it as you saw it, that you were willing to subscribe to a fairly highly colored and favorable expression about the conditions in Russia?

Mr. BISSON. I think that would be a fair statement.

Mr. MASON. That is, in your anxiety to bring about better relations, and so forth, you were willing to accept things that some of us, at least, believe was a pretty highly colored, favorable expression as to the conditions in Russia?

Mr. BISSON. Yes. I was willing to overlook those things.

Mr. MASON. Go ahead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There follows this statement which appears in the document: "Its epoch-making new constitution guarantees Soviet citizens universal suffrage." Do you consider that a proagandistic statement?

Mr. BISSON. No. I think it does guarantee them suffrage, so far as I understand it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you mean the wording of the document guarantees them or that under the constitution there is an actual realization of universal suffrage, as it would be understood in America?

Mr. BISSON. Well, I should say probably the wording of the constitution certainly makes that clear, which is what is primarily referred to here.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your understanding that the Soviet Union is a totalitarian state?

Mr. BISSON. The definition of "totalitarian" is not an easy one. If you mean totalitarian in the sense that there is some form of over-all control from the top, I should think that that might be true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, when you signed this document, what did you understand the word to mean? The word is used throughout the document. What did you understand it to mean there, the word "totalitarian," in the sense in which you understand it?

Mr. BISSON. I interpret a totalitarian state as one like the German, Fascist systems, which completely deny the workers any voting powers or any organization of their own type.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Don't they have elections in Nazi Germany?

Mr. BISSON. They have not had an election there for a number of years, I don't think.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, they have had numerous elections in Nazi Germany, have they not?

Mr. BISSON. I suppose so; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, isn't it your understanding that they have had?

Mr. BISSON. Yes; in that sense.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say then in the corresponding periods there have been more elections in Nazi Germany or in Soviet Russia?

Mr. BISSON. I don't know. I am not qualified to answer exactly how many elections they have had.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I understand your testimony is that you do not consider the Soviet Union a totalitarian state?

Mr. BISSON. I do not consider it a totalitarian state in the sense that Germany and Italy and today Japan are.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you think it proper to describe the assertion that Soviet Russia is a totalitarian state as a "fantastic falsehood"?

Mr. BISSON. I would not necessarily say it is a fantastic falsehood. I would say it is a very different type of totalitarian state from Germany, Italy, or Japan, with much more possibility for expression of public opinion than in those countries.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are aware of the fact, of course, that the expression "fantastic falsehood" is used in the open letter.

Mr. BISSON. (No response.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the organization known as the Friends of the Chinese People?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever had any public association with it?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider it a Communist front organization?

Mr. BISSON. Not necessarily; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, couldn't you be a little more explicit than saying "not necessarily"? Do you consider it a Communist front organization or don't you?

Mr. BISSON. No; I don't know that it is a Communist front organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not it was organized by such leading Communists as Clarence Hathaway?

Mr. BISSON. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the origin of the organization?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with its publication, China Today?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever written for China Today?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you consider China Today a publication which has adhered pretty strictly to the Communist Party line?

Mr. BISSON. I have never thought that it was a strict adherent in that sense.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you spoken under the auspices of China Today?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall any particular occasion when you have done so?

Mr. BISSON. No. We were always trying to raise money for the magazine. I was particularly interested in the magazine, which was the only magazine in this country when I returned from China that

was in my opinion attempting any of this work to bring the United States to a realization that help to China was absolutely necessary and that the Japanese attack on China could not be allowed to be pursued indefinitely.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not you spoke under the auspices of the magazine, China Today, on or about November 10, 1934, at Irving Plaza, in New York?

Mr. BISSON. I don't remember speaking as early as that; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The magazine, China Today, for November 1934 announces a meeting on November 10 at Irving Plaza under the auspices of China Today and the Friends of the Chinese People and states that the following speakers will be on the program: T. A. Bisson, Earl Browder, Malcolm Cowley, General Yakhontoff, Frederick Field, Hanshu Chan. Do you recall that meeting now?

Mr. BISSON. I do not, no; but it should be noted that again I spoke on many occasions in New York City, on many different platforms. Can you tell me what the purpose of this meeting was? Did it have specific reference to the Far East?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. It was to celebrate the appearance of China Today, the magazine.

Mr. BISSON. Oh.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know, of course, that Earl Browder is head of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the alleged General Yakhontoff; Victor Yakhontoff?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Hasn't he been very active in the Far East?

Mr. BISSON. He has written some books on far eastern subjects; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; that is what I mean.

Mr. BISSON. I knew him as a writer on far eastern subjects; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't know him personally?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From his writings you would say that he is a Communist, would you not?

Mr. BISSON. I would not be in a position to judge from that. He has many different writings.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Hanshu Chan?

Mr. BISSON. No. He was a Chinese that may have been there. There were many Chinese in New York whom I met.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Frederick Vanderbilt Field?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider Frederick Vanderbilt Field a Communist sympathizer or fellow traveler?

Mr. BISSON. Not necessarily, except in one phase of his career when he was connected with the American Peace Mobilization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Hasn't his public record for the past few years, going back considerably before the days of the American Peace Mobilization, been consistently that of a supporter of the Communist Party line?

Mr. BISSON. I wouldn't know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At least, you know that he was identified with the American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. BISSON. I know that; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are satisfied that the American Peace Mobilization was an out and out Communist Party front, aren't you?

Mr. BISSON. I expect that it was, and it should be noted in this connection that I never supported the American Peace Mobilization and was never connected in any way with the organization or did any speaking in its behalf. That was an organization which was again formed after the Soviet-German pact.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever publicly affiliated yourself with the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BISSON. No. Well, in this respect: I was never a member of that organization and never a sponsor of that organization, if that is what you mean by publicly affiliating myself with it, or do you mean something different from that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. I mean did you ever in any way whatever publicly associate your name with that of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BISSON. Oh, that is a broader question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. BISSON. I mean, that is not the question of membership or sponsoring the organization as an organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I mean publicly associating?

Mr. BISSON. The American League, along with other organizations, held meetings on far eastern subjects. It may well have been that I participated in one of those meetings in New York City, because, as I say, I spoke on very many platforms dealing with the Far East.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Daily Worker for July 15, 1938, has a news item concerning a parade held by the American League for Peace and Democracy and then states: "Among the prominent personages who are sponsoring the parade are T. A. Bisson and others." Did you associate yourself with the organization in that respect?

Mr. BISSON. I should doubt it very much. Was this in no sense connected with the Far East; I mean, is there nothing about this parade than that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is nothing in the news item that indicates that there was any connection with the Far East. On the contrary, it seems to have been entirely an occasion dealing with war and peace. For example, the statement is made that the parade is to commemorate the twenty-fourth anniversary of the beginning of the World War.

Mr. BISSON. I don't remember ever authorizing my name to be used in that connection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you speak under the auspices of the American League on or about July 7, 1938?

Mr. BISSON. What was the occasion of that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That appears to have been a celebration of the first anniversary of the war in China. I don't know why the organization celebrates anniversaries of wars, but that is the way the news item reads.

Mr. BISSON. Well, I don't distinctly recall that, but since it was connected with the Far East, it may well have been that I spoke on that platform.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not hesitate to include in your speaking engagements the American League for Peace and Democracy if you considered that the subject matter pertained to your own field?

Mr. BISSON. I should doubt whether there would be more than two or three examples of such speaking engagements over a period of a dozen years in New York City, with the American League, and I should like to emphasize again that the speaking engagements that are referred to here are only a small fraction of the speaking which I was constantly called upon to do, which embraced platforms of all types.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, would you consider that the American League for Peace and Democracy was a Communist front organization?

Mr. BISSON. It has been so designated in recent years and almost become unalterably fixed as that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied that that is a correct description of what the organization was?

Mr. BISSON. It may well have been, although that does not necessarily mean that in the years when these activities were being carried on, that I would have necessarily recognized it as such; I mean, not all people who were participating in the American League during these years would have recognized it as a Communist organization or thought themselves even as associating with Communists necessarily.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, did you at the time, as your recollection is of the present moment, consider it a Communist front organization?

Mr. BISSON. At the time I probably had no clear idea of that connection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On or about May 4, 1938, you were listed in the Daily Worker as participating in a meeting under the auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the Yorkville Casino.

Mr. BISSON. What was the subject of that meeting?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is difficult to determine just what the subject was. It is not announced in so many words in the article.

Mr. BISSON. Well, I don't recall that meeting specifically.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall any meeting at the Yorkville Casino when you spoke?

Mr. BISSON. No; I do not. If that was a meeting of the Far East, I may well have participated in it, but I should like to emphasize again that for American League meetings of this kind, it could not possibly number more than three or four during this whole period.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the Daily Worker of June 7, 1938, you are reported to have spoken under the auspices of a Chinese dinner with Langston Hughes, the Negro poet. Do you recall whether or not you did participate on that occasion at the Aegean Club?

Mr. BISSON. I think very likely, as it indicates it was on China.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you ever recall having spoken with Langston Hughes?

Mr. BISSON. Not specifically; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know him?

Mr. BISSON. I know him as a Negro poet.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know him as a publicly avowed Communist?

Mr. BISSON. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That concludes the questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. Very well. That will conclude the hearing.

Mr. BISSON. May I make one more statement in conclusion on this testimony?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISSON. I should like to point out certain things that haven't been touched on in the course of this discussion.

Mr. MASON. Go ahead.

Mr. BISSON. In the first place, I don't think the brief sketch at the beginning of this meeting, of my biography, fully brings out the general pattern of my professional career. This professional career of mine was one which has kept me in close touch with the far eastern affairs for nearly 20 years. I think you will find when you speak to people who have knowledge of students of the Far East, they will list me among 1 of the 12 or 15 best informed Americans on contemporary political and economic conditions in the Far East.

I should also like to state that during this period, particularly after I joined the Foreign Policy Association, which, it should be noted is an organization supported in large part by Mr. Rockefeller and which I was connected with for some dozen years—that during this career I performed a useful service to the American public in continually emphasizing the fact that the Japanese attack on China, beginning in Manchuria in 1931 and extending down through the next decade, was a danger to the United States; that it was necessary for us to do two things: That we should give stronger support to China in the face of this attack and that we should make efforts to associate ourselves with other powers to curb Japan by international action.

Mr. MASON. May I interrupt there?

Mr. BISSON. Yes.

Mr. MASON. I was going to inject there that your warnings in this connection have not been very well observed or taken seriously by the Federal Government during those years as evidenced by the fact that they continued to supply Japan with the sinews of war, without which Japan could not have been so aggressive in its attitude toward China.

Mr. BISSON. That is quite true.

One other thing I want to speak of in connection with my professional career, that during this period I have held only three positions: One as a missionary for the Presbyterian Church, one as a member of the research staff of the Foreign Policy Association, and one as a member of the Board of Economic Warfare. The president of the Foreign Policy Association at this time is Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy, who is probably known to some of you; one of our most distinguished soldiers.

I should like also to indicate that my reputation in this field is somewhat manifest by the fact that the War Department, at the outbreak of war in the Pacific, purchased 15,000 copies of my headline book published under the auspices of the Foreign Policy Association for distribution to the Army camps throughout the United States.

Finally, as to my personal status, I should like to point out that I have been married for nearly 15 years; that I have two children which are 10 and 12; that those children are growing up, I think, as loyal American citizens. They have their War Savings stamp books along with other children in the United States; that we own our home in Port Washington, Long Island; that it was a considerable sacrifice for us to move to Washington, and that we are at the present moment financially worse off than we would have been if we had maintained our status in our own home in New York City; and finally, that in making this step to enter the Government service, I considered it as a part of my duty as a loyal American citizen, which I represent myself to be, and it was taken in order to put my abilities, such as they were, at the full disposal of the Government in its war enterprise.

Mr. MASON. Very well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Bisson, on February 1, 1943, Mr. Dies, of Texas, delivered an address before the House of Representatives and in the course of his remarks made several statements concerning you. He stated that you were principal economic analyst in the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of \$5,600.

Mr. BISSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that statement correct?

Mr. BISSON. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He stated that you had been affiliated with the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BISSON. That is not correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, you have testified this morning that you spoke frequently or on a number of occasions under its auspices.

Mr. BISSON. I do not consider that affiliation. I consider affiliation with an organization to be a dues-paying member or an actual sponsor of an organization as such. The fact that I appeared on platforms that may have been sponsored by them in my particular far eastern sphere does not, in my opinion, mean that I was affiliated with that organization. As I already said, I spoke before the Women's Republican League, but that does not mean that I was a woman Republican.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all right. The dictionary gives a perfectly clear definition of the word "affiliation" and the committee may take that to be the correct meaning of the word "affiliation." Mr. Dies also stated that you had contributed articles to Soviet Russia Today, and you have testified that that is correct?

Mr. BISSON. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He stated that you were a speaker for the American Student Union, and that is correct?

Mr. BISSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The only dissent you have to make whatever about the facts is the use of the word "affiliation."

Mr. BISSON. Well, the general dissent that I have to enter here is that those connections do not indicate that I was thereby a Communist or even necessarily a Communist sympathizer. I could have spoken at those platforms as I did without being either one or the other.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. That is all then, Mr. Bisson. Thank you for coming. (Witness excused.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe our next witness is Mr. Goldman.

Mr. MASON. Will you stand and be sworn? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give at this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I do.

Mr. MASON. Be seated. Let the record show Mr. William A. Brophy as being present.

**TESTIMONY OF MARCUS ISAAC GOLDMAN, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

Mr. MASON. Mr. Goldman, will you give us for the record your full name and address?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Marcus Isaac Goldman, 707 Twentieth Street NW.

Mr. MASON. And where were you born?

Mr. GOLDMAN. New York City.

Mr. MASON. What was the date of your birth?

Mr. GOLDMAN. January 11, 1881.

Mr. MASON. Now, Mr. Goldman, will you give us briefly your professional training, schooling, and so forth?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I had my undergraduate work at Harvard, and in the last year I became interested in geology, and I spent 2 years studying geology there. Then I was advised to get more practical work, so I took a course in mining engineering at Columbia University, and got my degree there, I think in 1905.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Goldman, will you give us your experience, practical experience, in the shape of a list of positions that you have held at various times, and the salaries?

Mr. GOLDMAN. In 1906 I graduated from Columbia, and I got a job with the American Smelting & Refining Co., doing geological work in Mexico, and I had that for about 10 months.

Mr. MASON. At what salary?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I really haven't the least recollection; I am sorry.

Mr. MASON. Go ahead.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Probably it was something like \$150; I don't know. Then, in the spring of 1907, I entered the Geological Survey, and I have been there ever since.

Mr. MASON. What salaries have you had in that branch since that time?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I guess I started in those days at the beginning salary, which was pretty low. I think I probably started at \$1,200, and I am now getting \$4,200.

Mr. MASON. And those are the only two active positions that you have held during the course of your career?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes; practically.

Mr. MASON. Essentially?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I took my degree at Johns Hopkins later, an advanced degree, and while there I was employed by the Maryland Geological Survey at a nominal salary.

Mr. MASON. In your work for the Government, did you always work in that department; Geological Survey?

Mr. GOLDMAN. That is right.

Mr. MASON. All right, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. GOLDMAN. No; not as far as I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is there any reason why you should not know if you were a member of the organization?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Oh, no; just that it isn't my impression that I was. I was aware of it, but I don't believe I belonged to it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you attend its meetings?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Not that I recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you deny ever having attended any of its meetings?

Mr. GOLDMAN. No; I wouldn't deny it, but I don't recall attending any.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Harry C. Lamberton?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes; I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall ever having been present at any meeting with Harry C. Lamberton, which might have been under the auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. GOLDMAN. No. I remember meeting him personally, but I don't remember being at a meeting with him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you an official of the Washington Cooperative Book Shop?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes; I was on the board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What title did you hold with respect to that organization?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I was secretary of the board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Secretary of the board?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes. That is while I had a special appointment. For awhile I was just a member of the board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What year was it that you were secretary?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I think the Book Shop was organized in 1938, and I was secretary for 2 years, as I recall it; 1938-40.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware that the membership files of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which the organization turned over to this committee, had a card indicating that you were a member of the organization?

Mr. GOLDMAN. No; I am not aware of that. It is possible.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do I understand that you are not prepared to deny that you were a member of the American League?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I am not prepared to deny it, but I don't remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So that the record will be perfectly clear as to what your statement is on the matter.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Also not that I recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again, is it your testimony that you are not prepared to deny that you were a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. GOLDMAN. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever contribute any substantial sum of money to a defense fund for Angelo Herndon?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How much did you contribute for the defense fund of Angelo Herndon?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, as I remember, what I mainly did was put up a bail. I don't know whether I contributed, just made a contribution.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How much money did you put up?

Mr. GOLDMAN. As bail I put up a \$500 bond.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Angelo Herndon a Communist leader who was arrested and convicted in the State of Georgia?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, he was arrested, I understand. I don't think he was convicted, because he was released. And, as far as being a Communist leader, I have no knowledge that he was, nor was it my impression that he was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited the money from you for his bail?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I guess I just read about it. I don't remember where.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To whom did you turn the money over?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I think it was the International Labor Defense, that was carrying his case.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Didn't someone from the International Labor Defense solicit the money from you?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I don't think so. As I recall, there was no special solicitation made. I just heard about it and I was interested. I felt that he should have a chance to a hearing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To what person in the International Labor Defense did you turn over this money?

Mr. GOLDMAN. No individual; whoever would be the right party. I probably just sent the bond to the International Labor Defense.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where did you send it; to their New York office?

Mr. GOLDMAN. To their New York office.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has the money been returned to you?

Mr. GOLDMAN. After the trial I told them they could keep it for their bail fund.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then it did become a contribution to the International Labor Defense?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes; but it was not a cash contribution to the Herndon defense.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But it did become a cash contribution to the International Labor Defense?

Mr. GOLDMAN. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What year was that, approximately?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, that I really don't know. It was quite soon after Herndon was acquitted or released. When the bail was no longer needed, I told them they might as well keep it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Goldman, we have always given the witnesses, after the questions have been answered, an opportunity to make any statement they might want to make to clarify the situation from their standpoint. Do you care to make such a statement now?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I think I can make in a general way the statement that my activities have been in connection with the danger that I felt, the threat of fascism, I realized that fascism was spreading, and was a threat to us, and I think my activities have been mainly in connection with that, and with the defense of specially legal rights

of people who did not have much resources to exercise their full legal rights; getting their full benefit of legal defense.

Mr. MASON. Very well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When this committee published a list of the members of the American League for Peace and Democracy, did you hear of that fact in 1939?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I remember the names that were published in 1939, but I don't recall their being published as members of the league. My name was published, I thought, in connection with the Book Shop and various organizations. The names that were published then were connected with various organizations, but I don't recall that my specific connection was mentioned.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the hearings of this committee on page 6412 your name was listed as a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Did you deny membership at that time? Did you deny membership in the organization at that time?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I didn't have any particular opportunity to admit or deny it, did I?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you or have you been a member of the National Federation of Constitutional Liberties?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I have contributed to it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How much?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I have made contributions in various amounts, mostly \$10 a month; at one time when they had some special—when specially it was needed, I contributed for a while \$25.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To whom did you turn over the money?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Oh, to the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were its headquarters when you turned over the money to it?

Mr. GOLDMAN. In Washington.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether you sent it by mail or delivered it in person?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mail. I mailed the check.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the address of the organization when you mailed the money to it?

Mr. GOLDMAN. No; that I don't. At least, the last address that I remember was on H Street somewhere, between Fourteenth and Fifteenth.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you subscribe to the New Masses?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you subscribe to the Daily Worker?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you own any Soviet bonds?

Mr. GOLDMAN. They have all been reclaimed—redeemed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you at one time own Soviet bonds?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what amount?

Mr. GOLDMAN. As I recall, it was about \$5,000.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was your investment in Soviet bonds a matter of sympathy with the purposes for which the Soviet bonds were to be used in the Soviet Union?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, it was not a lack of sympathy. It was a good investment, however.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. That is all then, Mr. Goldman. Thank you.
(Witness excused.)

Mr. MASON. Dr. Sapooss, will you stand and be sworn, please? Do you solemnly swear the testimony you will give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?
Mr. SAPOSS. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF DAVID J. SAPOSS, LABOR PRODUCTION DIVISION,
WAR PRODUCTION BOARD**

Mr. MASON. Doctor, I will ask you the preliminary questions for the record. Will you please give your full name and address?

Mr. SAPOSS. David J. Sapooss, 1928 Belmont Road NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. MASON. Doctor, where were you born?

Mr. SAPOSS. I was born in what was then Russia; Ukranian Russia.

Mr. MASON. In the Russian Ukraine?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. The date of your birth, please?

Mr. SAPOSS. February 22, 1886.

Mr. MASON. Now, Mr. Sapooss, will you give us your schooling and professional training, just briefly?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes. Well, I did my undergraduate work at the University of Wisconsin, and then part-time, postgraduate work at the University of Wisconsin, and then the remainder of my postgraduate work at Columbia University, specializing in economics, with emphasis on labor economics.

Mr. MASON. What degrees have you received from Columbia?

Mr. SAPOSS. No; I haven't any.

Mr. MASON. Dr. Sapooss, when did you come to this country?

Mr. SAPOSS. I was brought to this country by my parents when I was 9 years old, which was 1895, and we landed in Milwaukee, Wis., where I was educated and brought up, and that is why I went to the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. MASON. Now, Dr. Sapooss, will you give a brief summary of the different positions you have held in your active life?

Mr. SAPOSS. Since I left the university?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. While doing graduate work I was assistant to Prof. John R. Commons, who was the leading authority in the field of labor economics in the United States. Then in 1913 I was a field investigator for the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, which was popularly known as the Walsh commission.

Mr. MASON. And what salary did you get in that position?

Mr. SAPOSS. As far as I recall, it was about \$70 a week; but, you see it was 1913, and I would not want to say that that is exact.

Mr. MASON. That is near enough.

Mr. SAPOSS. It is approximately that.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. Then I returned again to the University of Wisconsin and was assistant to Prof. John R. Commons, helping him in his research work as well as in his graduate seminars and classes, up to 1917, when I was made expert in industrial relations by the New York

State Department of Labor, based on the usual civil-service examination.

Mr. MASON. And what salary did you get in that position, approximately?

Mr. SAPOSS. About \$1,800 or \$2,000, as I remember.

Mr. MASON. All right. Go on.

Mr. SAPOSS. Then I went with the Carnegie Corporation's Americanization Study in 1918, some time in 1918. That was an organization financed by the Carnegie Fund—you know he bequeathed large sums of money—that made an extensive study of all phases of immigration problems. I did field work in connection with immigrant labor.

Mr. MASON. And your remuneration at that time was what?

Mr. SAPOSS. I believe it was probably around \$2,500 or \$2,600. Then, from there I went with the Inter-Church World Movement, which was an organization founded immediately after the war with the idea of coordinating the Protestant denominations in the United States, as well as bringing them into closer relationship with the Protestant denominations in other countries. I was with them on several studies; one of them was the steel strike which occurred in 1919, and then the other one was a study of labor legislation and its administration in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. MASON. You were paid in that position what?

Mr. SAPOSS. About \$3,000, I would say. I have a paper here, if you don't mind my referring to it.

Mr. MASON. You may refer to your paper; yes, sir. This is just to give a brief history.

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, sir. I appreciate it, and I just want to make sure that I am right. Then I was hired by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, which is a labor organization, to be the educational director for their New York and vicinity area, and I think my pay was probably around \$3,500 a year; something around \$70 or \$75 a week, as I recall.

Then a group of us organized a professional business agency, known as Labor Bureau, Inc., which acted as economic consultant to labor organizations. Some of the outstanding labor organizations in the American Federation of Labor, for instance, engaged our services, like the International Typographical Union, the Railway Clerks, the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, the firemen and oilers union, and a long, long line of organizations, and our job was primarily to help them in wage negotiations as well as in arbitrations. There was a set-up in the last war somewhat analogous to the present, where workers resorted to arbitration, so that we represented these unions in preparing whatever economic data they needed, as well as in handling the case before the Arbitration Board, arguing it, presenting data, and so on.

Then, from there I went to Brookwood Labor College. That brings us to about 1922, by the way. I didn't give the exact dates. From there I went to Brookwood Labor College, where I was instructor in trade-union and labor organization problems. I stayed there on and off about 10 years, so I will have to inject other positions that I held in between.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. By the way, my pay there, as far as I recall, ran, when I left there, about \$4,500. Now, while there I also did some teaching. For instance, Brookwood was located at Katonah, N. Y., which was about 40 miles from New York City. I was teaching in the extension division of Columbia University, late afternoon classes.

Then, in 1926 Columbia University embarked upon an extensive study of post-war social and economic conditions of France. The university hired a corps of scholars, somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 to 30, I think, and I was engaged to head up the labor division of that study which meant, of course, residence in France. It meant doing research work in the French libraries. It meant doing field work in important industrial areas in France. And, I wrote one of the volumes; the final result of the study appeared in seven volumes. I wrote one of these volumes called Labor Movement of Post-War France. I returned in 1927.

Mr. MASON. How long were you in France making this study?

Mr. SAPOSS. Well, I was there over a year.

Mr. MASON. Something over a year?

Mr. SAPOSS. Something over a year, and then I returned to do teaching. I returned back to Brookwood, teaching, and also teaching in the extension division of Columbia University. I made two other trips to France, one of them in order to check on my material after I had it written up, which was, I think, in 1929, the summer of 1929, and then I made another trip to France in the summer of 1931 on a grant from the Social Science Research Council, which is an agency that receives its funds primarily from such funds as the Rockefeller Fund, Carnegie Fund, and so on. On that trip, by the way, I not only lived in France, but I traveled. I was in Italy, Spain, Austria, and Switzerland in connection with that trip.

Then I returned again and stayed at Brookwood until the spring of 1934 when I joined the Twentieth Century Fund, or popularly known as the Filene Fund, again a research fund, financed mostly by the late Mr. Filene. They were interested in making a study of the relation of the Government to labor matters. And I was engaged as research associate and worked on the study that appeared in a volume called Labor and the Government. By the way, I forgot to mention that my pay by the Twentieth Century Fund was \$6,000, and whatever expenses were involved, because I had to travel a great deal on investigation work.

Mr. MASON. How long were you with that fund, may I ask?

Mr. SAPOSS. About a year; long enough to finish this book.

Mr. MASON. All right.

Mr. SAPOSS. Then, from the Twentieth Century Fund I came to the Department of Labor, United States Department of Labor, which was in April 1935. I was engaged to make a special study of what was then known as company unions, which appeared in a large volume under that title.

Mr. MASON. Now, you were engaged by the Department of Labor specifically to make this study and do this work?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MASON. You did not consider yourself as a permanent employee of the Department of Labor?

Mr. SAPOSS. No, sir.

Mr. MASON. Just for this particular work?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. I see.

Mr. SAPOSS. It was just for that work.

Mr. MASON: What were you paid by the Department of Labor for that?

Mr. SAPOSS. I think it was at the rate of \$5,500 or \$5,600, I think is the schedule.

Mr. MASON. How long were you there?

Mr. SAPOSS. I was there from April through November 1935.

Mr. MASON. The best part of a year.

Mr. SAPOSS. Then, in 1935 I became the chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board, on the basis of a civil-service examination. The compensation was \$6,500, or P-7. My functions were to set up a Division of Economic Research, assemble a staff of technically trained economists and to direct them. In addition to that, since the National Labor Relations Board had to hold hearings, I was the Board's expert witness in what might be considered the key cases which went to the Supreme Court for determination as to the jurisdiction of the Board. I stayed there until October 1940; I guess that is right.

Mr. MASON. During that period your salary was \$6,500?

Mr. SAPOSS. Six thousand five hundred dollars per annum; yes, sir. My services were discontinued by the National Labor Relations Board because the funds were refused for the Division by Congress, and so that that terminated October 1940, and I was doing some free-lance lecturing and things, writing, up to July 1, 1941, when I was engaged as labor consultant by Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of the Office of Inter-American Affairs.

My job there was to familiarize myself with labor matters in the Latin-American countries and to write whatever necessary reports may be necessary and needed, or whatever kind of information or advice that Office would need on labor matters. In addition thereto I made a special study of the problems of the Spanish-speaking elements along our border, from Texas right to the Pacific coast and into some of the Rocky Mountain regions, like around Colorado, because certain difficulties arose there that made it possible for some of the enemies of our country to cast reflections as to the sincerity of our country in its relations with the Latin-American nations, and so I was sent out to make a study, which was then presented to the Department of State, and which the Department of State accepted, and on the basis of that study and my recommendations, certain activities were initiated with the idea of perhaps trying to improve the situation.

Another responsibility that I had was to interest labor groups in this country in Latin-American affairs so that they would understand what the problems were. And, we had an exhibit at the American Federation of Labor convention; we had an exhibit at the C. I. O. convention. Then, when the International Labor Office, of which this country is a member, had its sessions here, in November, there was a very large delegation from the Latin-American countries, including employers, including labor people, including Government representatives. It was decided that it might be a good idea to give them an opportunity to visit important areas in the United States in order to see what we were doing in what we then called the defense effort.

Mr. MASON. This was in November 1942?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes. It was my job to organize that tour; to make all the contacts. You see, in every city we went, we there visited some plant, and then they met with the people of the local chamber of commerce; they met with the people of local labor organizations, and so on, and I had to handle all of that organizing, and so on. My pay, by the way, was also \$6,500 in this position.

On January 7 I became chief economic adviser to Mr. Wendel Lund, Director of the Labor Production Division of the War Production Board, where I am at the present time.

Mr. MASON. At what salary?

Mr. SAPOSS. Eight thousand dollars; P-8.

Mr. MASON. Now, Dr. Saposs, you have given a very clear description of the various positions that you have held, both as teacher and in the Government service. From now on I will have Dr. Matthews ask the questions particularly bearing on this situation.

Mr. SAPOSS. By the way, may I just add that all these later positions, of course, were all civil service positions.

Mr. MASON. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Saposs, on February 1, 1943, Mr. Dies, of Texas, speaking in his capacity as an individual Member of the House, and not as chairman of this committee, inasmuch as the committee was not at that time constituted, spoke and made reference to you. Have you read the remarks that Mr. Dies made at that time, inasmuch as they pertain to you?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The statement reads as follows:

Take the case of David J. Saposs. Several years ago our committee received testimony in which it was established that Saposs had been a leader in a revolutionary organization whose avowed objective was for the "workers to take control of industry and Government and build a workers' republic." At that time Saposs was chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board. As the result of our exposure Saposs was removed from the National Labor Relations Board. Now we find that Saposs has recently been made assistant to the chief of the labor division of the War Production Board at a salary of \$8 000 a year.

In Labor Age, a magazine of the revolutionary group with which Saposs was prominently identified, he gave expression to the following un-American and revolutionary position:

"But bourgeois democracy is a sham. When it is evident that socialism is the only remedy, it is not worth saving a democracy in which Socialist parties only collaborate with capitalism * * *. If in the attempt to carry out such a program political action fails, then the workers must unhesitatingly resort to organized force. The (Socialist) International must take the position that if another war occurs the workers will destroy capitalism. With that end in view the workers must be prepared to stretch arms across the frontiers in case of war and definitely win power for themselves."

At no time did we charge that Saposs was a Communist or a member of the Communist Party. It will, however, be perfectly clear to any student of the revolutionary ideologies, that the foregoing statement by Saposs was couched in the strictest Marxian terms.

Have you any comment or dissent to make on this?

Mr. SAPOSS. My comment is that those are not my views; that I never held such views, and that anybody who does hold such views ought to stand condemned. I have here documentary evidence to indicate why they are not my views.

I should like to explain how I came to write that article in the first place. As I have already mentioned, in giving a description of my positions that I held, I was in Europe in 1931, and that I was being financed by a grant of the Social Science Research Council. The funds that I got enabled me to travel. One of the places that I visited was Vienna, Austria, at a time when there was a convention there of what is known as the Socialist and Labor International, which is an organization of Socialist and labor groups of the world, including, for instance, the British Labor Party, which, of course, at the present time is represented in the British War Cabinet, including the Social Democratic Party of Germany and of Austria, including the Socialist Party of France, including the labor parties of the Australian countries, and so on down the line.

Now I, as a student of labor matters, was present at that convention, and since it was a crucial convention, because of the wide differences that existed, in not only the labor groups, but I suppose in all groups in their time, in view of what was going on in Europe, I felt that I ought to write it up. So, I wrote an article which was entitled "The World Socialist Congress," and I have here a photostatic copy which I should like to leave with this committee.

Mr. MASON. We will be glad to have it.

Mr. SAPOSS. The article runs into nine pages, which would make it somewhere around 4,000 or perhaps over 4,000 words. Would you like to see a copy?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. You can have that, by the way, and I can supply you with others if you desire it. By the way, what I did, I wrote it up, and then after that I waited. I knew I couldn't sell it to a magazine that would pay any money. I just waited for any opportunity to present itself.

I received a request from an organization known as the Philadelphia Labor Institute, which is an organization of labor groups of a Socialist complexion in Philadelphia. They were getting out an annual, so they wrote and asked me if I would contribute, and having this manuscript, I sent it on. And, they ran it. They wrote back to me and they said that they were astounded that anybody could present such a fair picture of such a controversial gathering. Of course, they were in the heart of the fight, and it is understandable.

Now, this article, the introductory part of it, particularly, I just want to call your attention to, beginning with the seventh line of the first page. Just read a few passages in order to give you an idea that this was an objective article, attempting to merely describe a situation. It was no attempt to foster my own views:

Twenty-six countries were represented by delegates sent by 31 labor and Socialist parties, with a membership of 7,000,000, and a voting strength of 28,000,000. The most powerful parties represented at this Congress function in the leading European countries, as Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Spain and so on. The outstanding delegates were practically all present or former office holders as members of Parliament, or other minor legislative or governmental bodies of their respective countries. A goodly number could boast of holding or having held cabinet portfolios,

And so on.

Now, I am just quoting that in order to indicate my approach in that article. Now, on page 5, I want to quote just two sentences to indicate again what my whole approach was; away down at the bottom, the fifteenth line from the bottom, and the reason I am quoting this, by the way, is to indicate why I am quoting the view of the majority group; so you see, if I am giving here the view of the majority group and they are giving the view of the minority group, I can't hold both views. So, in contradistinction of what Mr. Matthews has quoted, I am quoting another section to indicate how I tried to get a true picture:

In the final analysis, Central Europe is threatened by fascism which would destroy democracy, and without democracy socialism cannot function. In order to maintain democracy it becomes the duty of Socialists to combat fascism. And it is this need to maintain democracy and prevent the Fascist control that justifies Socialist participation in coalition governments with bourgeoisie parties.

Mr. MASON. That, you say, is an expression of the majority of opinion at that meeting?

Mr. SAPOSS. At that convention; yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. That, you might say, is a summary of the conclusion they arrived at?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, sir. And, you see what they do? They constantly stress democracy as contrasted with the other quotation which constantly stresses, of course, revolutionary, violent overthrow of governments. And, this is the way I describe it.

Now, I also want to call further attention to the fact that the article as quoted by Congressman Dies was taken from a publication known as the Labor Age, and is headed "Left Opposition in the Labor and Socialist Internationale."

Now, on page 7 is that part of the article which was taken for the Labor Age from the complete article. Now, here is the heading I gave it. I am quoting now from the article on page 7: "Opposition Demands Uncompromising and Energetic Action." That was my own heading and indicates, of course, that what I was doing was just voicing, or just picturing a situation. There is no expression here of any cause. It is describing a situation.

Now, I also want to take the liberty of reading the first three sentences of that article as it appeared in this one which is the one, of course, that I wrote and which is the one that I arranged for publication.

Mr. MASON. How long thereafter did Labor Age cull out part of this and use it?

Mr. SAPOSS. Here it is dated "Yearbook 1931" which, I take it, probably appeared toward the beginning of the year.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. The Labor Age article is December 1931.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Toward the beginning of what year?

Mr. SAPOSS. Of 1931, the beginning of 1931, I should say, in January, I should say, although I am not certain. I have not checked, but it is dated Yearbook 1931.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. Whereas the Labor Age article is December 1931, appearing practically at the end of the year.

Mr. MASON. Go ahead, Doctor.

Mr. SAPOSS. If I may then quote these three sentences of the introduction of this, what might be called the Philadelphia Labor Institute version of the article, which I sent them:

A small minority led by the British Independent Labor Party took issue with the overwhelming majority. The differences were not so much over fundamental principles as over the mode of procedure. The minority demanded more positive, energetic, and uncompromising action in the attempts of the Socialists to cope with the present world ailments. Its spokesmen maintained that economic conditions are ripe for socialism, and that the Internationale should therefore direct its forces for the immediate overthrow of capitalism.

Now, it is my contention that this introductory phrase indicates that what I am doing is picturing what people said at a convention, just like a reporter, rather than expressing my views. This quotation that I have just given is the introduction to the paragraph from which Mr. Dies took two sentences for the five sentences that were quoted in the Congressional Record.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, at this point I would like to ask the witness a question.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the language which you have just read and which you speak of as the introduction, appear in the article in *Labor Age*?

Mr. SAPOSS. Well, I am not sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have the article before you, haven't you?

Mr. SAPOSS. I have the article right here.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, aren't you sure that it does not appear there?

Mr. SAPOSS. Well, all but the first sentences. All but the first sentence. You are talking of that part I quoted?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. The first sentence was altered.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, isn't it clear in your own mind that this section of your longer article appearing by itself, without being preceded by a discussion of the majority view, would lead to the conclusion that this was your position, in a way that it would not if you had the entire piece before you?

Mr. SAPOSS. That is possible.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I mean——

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes; that is possible.

Mr. MASON. Well, isn't it probably so that without that preceding discussion, which expresses the majority view, and this being given by itself, would lead anyone to believe that this is an expression of your views?

Mr. SAPOSS. It might have been. I am in no position to debate that.

Mr. MASON. I would say, Doctor, that that would be a fair statement of it, and that it can be illustrated by taking certain parts of the Bible, and you can prove almost anything by certain parts of the Bible. But, if you take it as a whole, in its content, and interpret it properly, then there is no question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As I understand the witness, he is objecting to Mr. Dies' quotation on the ground that it is taken out of a context, but the article as it appears in *Labor Age* is even more emphatically taken out of its context, is it not?

Mr. SAPOSS. Oh, yes, absolutely; I would agree to that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, if there is any misrepresentation by removing what Mr. Dies quoted from its context, there would be the same kind of misrepresentation by removing this section from its context.

Mr. SAPOSS. That is possibly so; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you give your consent for the use of this portion of your longer article in *Labor Age*?

Mr. SAPOSS. I couldn't tell you; I don't remember. I remember this very clearly, because you see, you know how it is, when a fellow writes an article and it is published, he is through, because then he is working on other things. And, I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were in close touch, however, with the persons who were publishing *Labor Age*.

Mr. SAPOSS. Well, at that time there was quite a bit of friction and I wasn't in as close touch as I had been earlier. There was a good deal of friction, and I wasn't in sympathy with a lot of things that were going on.

Mr. MASON. Go ahead, Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I just interrupted him. He was going to give some further quotations.

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes. Then I wanted to quote on page 8, if you please, where the other three sentences were taken. The first paragraph says:

In similar terms the minority attacked the attitude of the majority on war and disarmament. It asserted that the dangers of war were greater now than at any time since the peace treaties were signed.

My contention is that that indicates again that the introduction was voicing the views of others rather than my own opinion. That would be my answer to the question as asked by Dr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you go to Europe, on that occasion when you went to France?

Mr. SAPOSS. The first time, you mean?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. You see, I was there three times.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I mean the year when you went to make the study under the Research Council auspices.

Mr. SAPOSS. The Social Science and Research Council?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. I left in the latter part of May, I think, or maybe the beginning of June, as I recall.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of what year?

Mr. SAPOSS. Of 1931, wasn't it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes; of 1931.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And while there in the summer, you attended the Socialist and Labor International Congress?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, you see, that makes it clear that you are a little confused as to when this article appeared. It could not have appeared 6 months before the Congress was held.

Mr. SAPOSS. No. Did I say it appeared in the beginning?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said it appeared in January 1931.

Mr. SAPOSS. Then it must have appeared in January—

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1932, because the Socialist Labor Congress was held in the summer of 1931.

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes; that is right. It must have appeared at the end, then. When I came back, I came back in September. You see, school started, and I came back to teach school. I had the article finished. What does it say here? The convention was in July. And, I wrote the article while there and I sent it to Abraham Epstein, Secretary of the American Association for Social Security, and asked him if he could place it. Now, it is quite possible it must have appeared some time in the fall then, I would say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. On the contrary, isn't it quite clear that it must have appeared early in 1932? You know, it is quite common for yearbooks to be listed as covering the preceding year and appear at the beginning of the following year.

Mr. MASON. That is the usual custom.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And it is not likely that this would have appeared in September or October and be called the Year Book for 1931.

Mr. SAPOSS. Usually you do these things when you open up for fall, is my understanding. By the way, I have the copy at home. It is so precious. It took me 6 to 8 months to locate it, so I don't want to leave it out of my hands. I have the copy of the whole issue.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the original manuscript?

Mr. SAPOSS. Oh, no; of the whole issue of this. I only made a photostatic copy. You know how these things appear.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is there any date on the publication?

Mr. SAPOSS. I would be inclined to think that there is not, because that is what a research person is trained in doing, is to get the date, and the fact that I didn't get it—well, I could check. My inclination would be to say that there would not be any more date than that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is possible, of course, that the article appeared in Labor Age before this was published.

Mr. SAPOSS. It may be. I would doubt it. I would doubt it.

Mr. MASON. Isn't there a possibility of checking when this Year Book was published by the organization?

Mr. SAPOSS. I have a copy of it at home. And, of course, I could write to those people. I think that they may still be in existence. I could check that and be very glad to do that; yes.

Mr. MASON. Because it is pertinent for the record, Doctor.

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MASON. The date is pertinent, whether it came out in Labor Age first, this segment of it, or whether it came out completely as a Year Book.

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes; I could easily do that, and I will be very glad to do that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated that you were at Brookwood off and on for approximately 10 years. What was the termination of the period of your work at Brookwood Labor College, was it 1931 or 1932 or later?

Mr. SAPOSS. No; it was 1933.

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1933?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From about 1922 or 1923?

Mr. SAPOSS. I came there in the fall of 1922, that I remember quite distinctly, and I left there to go to the Twentieth Century Fund, so that it must have been in 1933.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you attend the conference known as the eighth annual conference of teachers and workers education held in Brookwood in February 1931?

Mr. SAPOSS. I imagine I must have. I attended practically all of them except when I was out of the country, and I should think I did attend that one. I don't remember. If my name appears there, of course I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of local 189 of the American Federation of Teachers, which was the local at Brookwood?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not you were on the editorial committee which published the volume reporting the eight annual conference? It states that there was an editorial committee from local 189.

Mr. SAPOSS. I couldn't tell you. Do you have a list of names in here?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Some of the volumes carry the list. Yes; here is the list.

Mr. SAPOSS. There is my name. That would indicate that I was there. You see, my job at Brookwood was to teach and to devote most of my other time to research and writing, which meant, as far as administrative responsibilities were concerned, I did not participate. I couldn't tell whether I was on the editorial board or not. And I was very seldom on any of that type of administrative work, that much I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Writing would not be administrative, would it? It would be more in line with your function.

Mr. SAPOSS. Well, you see, we have a teacher in journalism. She did that. It was her job.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was that, do you recall?

Mr. SAPOSS. Helen Norton.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you hear Helen Norton give her report of the history of Brookwood at that conference?

Mr. SAPOSS. That is 1931, you say?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. You recall her report?

Mr. SAPOSS. Well, we had annual conferences. You see, there were annual conferences. We called them the Washington birthday conferences. They were around the 22d of February. We had annual conferences beginning with 1924, as I recall. Now, I may have. I am sorry to say that I don't remember, but I may have. You know how people do; they go in and out, especially when you live there, but I don't recall particularly that she made—this was the History of Brookwood, you say?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; summary outline of history of Brookwood from its beginning. Well, at any rate, in the course of her report she stated that there had been 13 graduates in the 1923-26 group and 30 in the 1927-30 group who had gone into labor political activity, and then states:

Out of 43 persons engaged in labor political activity, 31 are Communists. Be it said that Brookwood's credit that it has not manufactured any Republicans or Democrats.

Does that refresh your recollection as to whether or not you heard the report?

Mr. SAPOSS. She said 31 were Communists in 1931?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; out of 43 graduates who had gone into labor political activity from 1923 to 1930, 31 are Communists.

Mr. SAPOSS. Is that so? Well, that is news to me, because of some documentary things that I have got here. Now, I would not challenge that she said it, but it sounds—you see, in 1929, you know, we voted that we would not accept any known Communists as students at Brookwood, because we discovered one year that they had laid a plot to disrupt the institution. This was a small school of 40 people, located 2 miles from a village, which had probably a couple of hundred population, and five or six or eight people could easily create a lot of disorder, and we discovered it, and so we voted in 1929, and I have here some of the documentary material, not to admit known Communists, that is, nobody that we suspected or knew as Communists, as students at Brookwood.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It states:

Be it said to Brookwood's credit that it has not manufactured any Republicans or Democrats.

Did that statement pretty accurately reflect the feeling at Brookwood, wholly apart from the question of communism?

Mr. SAPOSS. Well, there is no doubt that most of the people at Brookwood belonged in the Labor Party, something like the British Labor Party, and so on. I suppose, if you take it in that sense, it would; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you on the official board of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. SAPOSS. I was one of the founders.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were on the national executive committee, were you?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes; on the national executive committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were, of course, familiar with the statement of the objective of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, as it appeared on the letterhead? You have seen that on many occasions?

Mr. SAPOSS. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The statement states that it aims to inspire the workers to take control of industry and government and build a workers' republic?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You recall that statement?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did that express your view personally?

Mr. SAPOSS. No; it didn't express my views. I think I will have to tell a little about the history of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action. The people that were interested in workers' education in those days, which would include, of course, Brookwood Labor College, were regarded as the elements that were the opposition group in the American Federation of Labor. The majority group in the American Federation of Labor attacked us, and we felt that one of the ways in which we would be in a better position to hold our own was by organizing a conference, which we called the Conference for Pro-

gressive Labor Action, and bring together the elements in the labor movement who would be in sympathy with our views, so that we would have our constituency and our backing.

Now, that went on for some time and, as often happens, particularly in small groups of that kind, a considerable difference of opinion developed. Mr. A. J. Muste, who was the director of Brookwood, began getting certain—well, I was going to say illusions of grandeur, but, it is a long time ago, and there is no use being vehement about it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Sometimes called Messianic complex?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes; that is better. And, he got the idea that he was going to be the Lenin of the American labor movement, and permitted himself to be described that way by his pupils and admirers. Well, the majority of us on the faculty in Brookwood had an entirely different conception of what it should be. We were opposed to it, and we tried to get him to see the error of his ways, as one does with people you have associated with a long time. And, as a result of that, the thing dragged out for about 2 years.

Now, Mr. Muste had certain qualities that were very indispensable to the running of any educational institution. Personally I would say he had the kind of qualities that would make an ideal dean of men in an institution. He was the dynamic, inspirational type of person. In addition to that, he had an excellent quality for raising money, as, of course, no institution can operate without that. So, we felt he was quite an indispensable resident, and we tried to convince him of the error of his ways. We felt as educators he was deluded as a man who was going to build a new labor movement, and he was not the type. In addition, of course, we differed entirely with his notion that it ought to be a revolutionary labor movement that would advocate the violent overthrow of the capitalist system which, of course, would mean the Government, too.

Now, on that we disagreed with him, and this difference of opinion was debated back and forth for several years, until we realized that the parting of the ways had come. We realized we just couldn't win him back with those ideas. So then, as the result of that, we focused the issue by calling the board of directors of Brookwood Labor College to a meeting and putting it up to them to decide. Now, the board of directors were people who came from some rather important unions. And, I desire to quote here from a copy of a letter of one who will be recognized as a person who is outstanding in the labor movement at the present time in the American Federation of Labor. It is Phil E. Ziegler, who is the grand secretary-treasurer of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, Cincinnati, Ohio, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Now, Mr. Ziegler was a member of the board of directors, and I desire to quote from his letter. Here is a copy of the letter, by the way, Mr. Matthews. This is a letter that he sent dated April 19, 1940, to the Hon. Kenneth McKellar, in connection with the controversy that was going on at that time against the attacks that were made against me. And, I desire to call your attention to the fourth paragraph on page 1.

Now, this, I believe, was written by a man, you see, who knew the thing; who was regarded as one of the outstanding and responsible

labor leaders in the American Federation of Labor, substantiating my contention that when I joined the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, it stood for one thing, and that later on it metamorphosed into another thing which I and others repudiated.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By the way, was Ziegler one of the labor directors of Brookwood?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is what I understood you to say in the beginning.

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he also associated in connection with the Conference for Progressive Labor Action?

Mr. SAPOSS. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he attend the meeting where Muste was removed?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, he was present. Now, that is the board of directors of Brookwood Labor College.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is right.

Mr. SAPOSS. Ziegler was there and presided at the session. James Maurer was there too, formerly president of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, but Ziegler was the more active person and he was present at the meeting which lasted, I think, 3 or 4 days.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to read you an excerpt of a letter written in September, 1934, and signed "A. J.", with a notation in the left-hand bottom of the letter, that it is "A. J. M.", which is obviously A. J. Muste, and the letter refers to the possibility of Mr. Muste being sued for some of his financial obligations, and he is writing to his successor, the director of Brookwood Labor College, Mr. Tucker Smith, in an effort to collect some of his back salary due him from Tucker Smith. Then he says:

If I am summoned, I shall have to answer questions about income, past and present. Obviously, this may involve Brookwood.

Now, I would like to know if you have any understanding as to what that means? Was there any source of income at Brookwood that would embarrass the school if it were revealed?

Mr. SAPOSS. That is news to me. That is the first time I ever heard of that. I can't understand what he meant except that, of course, Brookwood owed me a lot of money, which I just waived, because I knew there wasn't any chance of collecting it. I don't quite understand what he could have meant. I am sorry. I wish I knew.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not sure whether it was exertion of some pressure on Tucker Smith to pay his back salary or else—

Mr. SAPOSS. That is no doubt his initials.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. SAPOSS. Oh, yes; I would acknowledge that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He speaks of having to go into court and—

if I am summoned I shall have to answer questions about income, past and present. Obviously, this may involve Brookwood.

Well, did you know of any income whatever received by the school that would embarrass the institution if it were known?

Mr. SAPOSS. I can't think of any. It came mostly, you see, from well-to-do people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you, for example, ever hear Muste speak of receiving contributions or money or any other form of assistance from Communists or the Communist Party.

Mr. SAPOSS. No; never. I would, of course, propose not accepting it if he had mentioned it, but I would have remembered it, I am positive.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, were you a sponsor of the Washington Friends of Spanish Democracy, the local affiliate of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, of which Leon Henderson was the local chairman?

Mr. SAPOSS. I might have been. I know that I was in sympathy with the Loyalist cause, if that is what you mean.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your name is listed as a sponsor of the Washington unit.

Mr. SAPOSS. It is possible. I made it a very consistent policy not to support Communist-front organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied that the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy was a Communist-front organization?

Mr. SAPOSS. I am inclined to think it was; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you put under any official pressure to contribute to the Washington chapter of the organization or to serve as a sponsor, by anyone in an official position in the Government?

Mr. SAPOSS. Well, I was solicited by people like Edwin S. Smith, for instance, of the National Labor Relations Board. I don't know whether I would consider that pressure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, isn't it usually understood when a man's superior, as Edwin Smith was in your case, makes direct solicitation of money, that that is a form of pressure?

Mr. SAPOSS. It might be considered in many cases. I don't remember having reacted that way at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever personally solicited by Leon Henderson for contributions?

Mr. SAPOSS. I think I once received a note from him in his handwriting asking me for a contribution for what I considered was a Communist front organization. I don't remember which one.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think that that memorandum was for the Spanish Aid organization.

Mr. SAPOSS. Was it? Well, I know I once received a note from him in his own handwriting, and I ignored it, by the way; at least, that is my recollection of it, that I ignored it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you publicly affiliated with, sponsor, or supporter of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy, which later became the Council for Pan-American Democracy?

Mr. SAPOSS. No. That was definitely a Communist front organization, and I remember writing them a letter. I do not, unfortunately, have a copy. I think my name appeared on some of their literature.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your name appears as sponsor on their letterhead.

Mr. SAPOSS. I remember writing them a letter and asking them to remove my name. As a matter of fact, to the best of my recollection, I received a request for a donation and then discovered that my name was on the letterhead; that is the way I recollect it. So,

I wrote and told them to take my name off, and, of course, I didn't send any donation, because I regarded it definitely as a Communist front organization. And I think its actions following that demonstrated it conclusively. At that time I wasn't so certain, because it was just coming in, but I didn't like the names of a lot of people on their list.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever know Marina Lopez?

Mr. SAPOSS. Is that a man or woman?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is a woman. She was an active leader in the Conference in the Council for Pan-American Democracy, and the Montevideo Congress of the organization, and also personally escorted Kathryn Lewis on one or two trips through South America.

Mr. SAPOSS. No. I know the name, of course, but I have never met her and I have never seen her, but I know the name, because I followed the literature. And, don't forget, when I was with the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs I had to review all that literature again in order to get myself reoriented.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thought possibly in your work with the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs you might have encountered some memorandum on Marina Lopez which would indicate whether or not she was a Communist.

Mr. SAPOSS. No; I didn't, but I think if you look through the files of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs you will find some memos from me warning them against the Council of Pan-American Democracy and telling them that they were a Communist front organization, but I don't know anything specifically about this Lopez woman's activities.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever been incorrectly listed as a member or sponsor or supporter of any other Communist fronts that you can recall?

Mr. SAPOSS. I remember my name, or my attention being called to some things when the Civil Service Commission investigated me. They had quite a dossier in which they showed my name on several front organizations, and, of course, I was absolutely confident that I was falsely recorded, but I don't remember the names. I am sorry to say. You see, the Civil Service Commission investigated me in 1940.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you ever associated in any way with the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. SAPOSS. Oh my, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. With the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. SAPOSS. No; definitely not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. With the American Youth Congress?

Mr. SAPOSS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. With the American Student Union?

Mr. SAPOSS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. With the International Labor Defense?

Mr. SAPOSS. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. Dr. Saposs, we have given each witness the opportunity to make any further statement that they might want to make after the questioning has been completed. We will give you that oppor-

tunity now if you want to summarize or make any further statement. It seems to me your testimony has been quite complete.

Mr. SAPOSS. No; I don't believe I have anything to add except what I have said; that I have been unfortunate enough to have been misunderstood, and it is very peculiar that I, who have been viciously attacked by the Communists and other ultra-revolutionary groups, should be the one that should be accused of being a revolutionist, if not a Communist, and one who believes in the violent overthrow of the Government, which I never did believe in.

I have all kinds of documentary evidence here, and I don't know whether your committee wants to bother about it. I will be very glad to give you a list of documents, copies of documents, which show that people like, for instance, Benjamin Stolberg, who has known me since 1920—we met in Chicago; I was then with the Labor Bureau, Inc., and he was living in Chicago. Benjamin Stolberg has known me since 1920. Now, I have a letter from him, and I will be glad to give you that.

Mr. MASON. You may enter the letter as an exhibit. As I understand it, this annual that was issued in Philadelphia by this labor organization is also to be an exhibit in the record, to show the complete picture of where that statement came from originally.

Mr. SAPOSS. I will make a special effort to do it. I have here a copy of this letter by Benjamin Stolberg. Of course, Benjamin Stolberg, as you know, was an authority on the subject of communism. He has written extensively. I remember he wrote back in 1926 a series of articles in the New York Times and yet, I have got here a review of his, of a book of mine which has, by the way, been attacked a great deal, and Benjamin Stolberg praises it very highly.

Now, the same thing is true of Eugene Lyons. Eugene Lyons has written a book called The Red Decade. He has done more, I would say, than anybody else recently, except perhaps Mr. Stolberg, in attacking the Communists, and keeping Communists out, wherever he could, and he, too, absolves me completely. Now, these people, of course, would not absolve me if I were a revolutionary who believed in the violent overthrow of the Government.

Mr. MASON. We will be glad to append those.

Mr. SAPOSS. I have here a photostatic copy of the United States Civil Service Commission investigation. They investigated my case. They gave me the most thorough investigation.

Mr. MASON. All right, Doctor.

Mr. SAPOSS. I am very much obliged to you.

Mr. MASON. Very well. That concludes the hearing.

(Witness excused.)

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p. m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., the Honorable Noah M. Mason presiding.

Present: Hon. Noah M. Mason and Hon. J. Parnell Thomas.

Also present: Dr. J. B. Matthews, director of research; Mr. Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator for the committee; and Warner W. Gardner, Solicitor, Department of the Interior.

Mr. MASON. The committee will please come to order. Mr. Lovett, will you stand and be sworn, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give at this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LOVETT. I do.

Mr. MASON. All right, Dr. Matthews.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT MORSS LOVETT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARY, VIRGIN ISLANDS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give your full name?

Mr. LOVETT. Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. LOVETT. Boston, Mass.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When?

Mr. LOVETT. December 25, 1870.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you educated, Dr. Lovett?

Mr. LOVETT. I was educated at the high school in Boston and at Harvard University. I graduated in 1892.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please outline briefly the positions you have held.

Mr. LOVETT. I was instructor for a year at Harvard University, and for 45 years instructor, assistant professor and professor at the University of Chicago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did you begin work at the University of Chicago; what year?

Mr. LOVETT. In 1893.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you taught there for 45 years?

Mr. LOVETT. I taught there—yes—until—well, my last year was 1938; yes, 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your department at the University of Chicago?

Mr. LOVETT. English; English literature.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And where have you been since you left the University of Chicago?

Mr. LOVETT. I was appointed to a position in the Virgin Islands in 1939. From my retirement from the University of Chicago in 1938 I was in the Southwest, Arizona, visiting colleges, speaking, and finally teaching at Northwestern University in the summer of 1939, and I took up my office in the Virgin Islands July 25, 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your position in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. LOVETT. Government secretary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you held that position continuously from July 1939 down to the present?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your remuneration in that position?

Mr. LOVETT. \$5,800 a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you lectured early in 1939, were you doing that under your own private auspices, or was it under the auspices of some agency?

Mr. LOVETT. No. I spoke for the League for Industrial Democracy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your connection with the so-called Garland fund, correctly known as the American Fund for Public Service?

Mr. LOVETT. I was a trustee for a number of years. I resigned before the organization, or before the fund was extinguished.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you one of the original trustees?

Mr. LOVETT. I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When was the fund established?

Mr. LOVETT. I am sorry, I can't be certain of the date.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was in the twenties; was it?

Mr. LOVETT. It was sometime in the twenties. I cannot give the exact year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you at that time chairman of the board of trustees?

Mr. LOVETT. No; I was just a member.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just a member of the board of trustees. Who were some of your fellow trustees?

Mr. LOVETT. Roger Baldwin was the prime mover in the matter. Norman Thomas was a trustee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall any others?

Mr. LOVETT. I think William Z. Foster was a trustee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was this fund set up by Charles Garland?

Mr. LOVETT. Charles Garland; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the purpose of the fund as you understood it?

Mr. LOVETT. The fund was established for the general public service, and the particular services to be rendered were passed upon by the board of trustees. The most important activity during my incumbency in office was support of workers' education. Mr. Clinton Golden was the agent of the fund to visit the educational bodies in connection with various labor unions, and funds were given to employ lecturers and assist in the process of education.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How often did the board of trustees meet?

Mr. LOVETT. I believe that there were no regular times assigned for meetings. My recollection is that the board met on call perhaps as often as once a month while I was a member. When I was in Chicago I did not attend meetings, and that was the reason why I withdrew.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you pass upon the various benefactions even though you were absent from the board meetings?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes. I attended the meetings very regularly when I was in New York in the decade of the twenties. I was in Chicago most of the time after 1928, 1929, and from that time on I was not, to the best of my recollection, connected with the board of trustees.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, how long were you in New York in the twenties?

Mr. LOVETT. I spent approximately 6 months, sometimes 9 months, a year. I was editor of the *New Republic* at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And were you at the same time a professor at the University of Chicago?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. With 6 months or more leave?

Mr. LOVETT. Six months' leave.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Each year?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know approximately how much money was put into the Garland fund in the beginning?

Mr. LOVETT. I think the original sum was a million dollars, but as most of it was in stock of the First National Bank of New York, as the fund was liquidated the total amount may have been a good deal more than a million. Mr. Morris Ernst was the treasurer. I should mention him, of course, as a prominent member of the board of directors.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To what agencies, enterprises, or projects of the Communist Party did the American Fund for Public Service give money?

Mr. LOVETT. I should say, so far as my knowledge goes, they gave money specifically to no object on the strength of the sponsorship of the Communist Party. It is quite true that a publication house was established, the Vanguard Press, under Mr. Jacob Baker. I think the fund contributed \$100,000 to establish that publishing house as an outlet for economic and other sociological books. The fund contributed a considerable sum for the publication of the works of Lenin. Maybe that you refer to as at the instance of the Communist Party, but I do not recognize the implication. I think the trustees acted because they considered that the political philosophy of Lenin was of importance and interest in order to be made available.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the fund contribute any sums of money to the *Daily Worker*?

Mr. LOVETT. Not so far as I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the year in which you resigned from the fund?

Mr. LOVETT. Well, my recollection is that it was about 1929, at the time when I ceased to be an editor of the *New Republic*.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would be 1929.

Mr. LOVETT. 1929, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not subsequent to 1929 the fund did make contributions to the Daily Worker?

Mr. LOVETT. No. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't know that as a matter of having seen reports of the fund subsequent to your membership?

Mr. LOVETT. No. I remember no reference to that matter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you appear as a witness before a committee of the senate of the State of Illinois in 1935?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was the chairman of the committee before which you appeared?

Mr. LOVETT. Senator Charles Baker, Rockford.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have seen the report of that committee to the senate, have you, Dr. Lovett?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have read the references to yourself in that report.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you any comment to make on the reference to you?

Mr. LOVETT. Only this, that the committee was appointed to examine Communist teachings in institutions of higher learning in the State of Illinois. The committee held one series of hearings only with reference to the University of Chicago. I was a teacher of English literature and did not imagine that I was concerned in the investigation and did not attend any of the sessions until I was told that frequent references were made to me. My name was brought, I should think irrelevantly into the proceedings, and the president of the university asked me if I had any objection to appearing. And, I said, "Certainly not." The questions that were asked me had no reference whatever to the teaching of communism in my classroom. If I had been asked I should have said that I considered it a matter of honor on the part of a teacher to confine his work in his class room to the objects for which he is appointed. I should not have taught communism or socialism or temperance or Presbyterianism or any other subject whatever. I confined my attention absolutely to English literature.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A portion of the report of the committee of the senate of the State of Illinois reads as follows:

Exhibits offered in evidence disclosing Professor Lovett's activities in communistic or unpatriotic organizations and associations with communistic speakers, regardless of their reputation, prove that Professor Lovett cannot be a threat to any forward-looking American educational institution. His personal attitude and testimony before the committee were unsatisfactory. He has frequently participated in communistic meetings in Illinois and other States. The Oxford pledge was given to students at meetings he attended. Fair consideration of all evidence received by the committee compels the conclusion that Prof. Robert Morss Lovett has pursued an unpatriotic course of conduct for a period of 8 or 10 years. From the testimony and exhibits considered by the committee he is not loyal to the spirit or letter of the Constitution of Illinois or the United States. However, Professor Lovett lost a son in the World War.

Do I understand your statement, Dr. Lovett, to mean that the investigation did not go into the question of your teaching at the University of Chicago, but did go into your activities as a private citizen?

Mr. LOVETT. They mentioned my activities as a private citizen, which

I did not understand to be relevant to the purpose of the meeting, and if they found my attitude unsatisfactory, I should think it was because I was not very sympathetic to the lines of inquiry which they put forward.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it be your view or not, that an employee of the Federal Government be subject to investigations of his personal and private activities in order to judge his qualifications for holding public office?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes. I understand that there is a list of subversive organizations put forth by the Attorney General, and I have made the statement in another committee, before which I appeared yesterday, that had I known of such a list, I should have resigned from any such organizations. As a Federal officer, as an appointee of the Department of the Interior, I should certainly have no right to embarrass that Department in its relations with the Department of Justice. And, I state further that if such a list exists, I think it should be made public.

I believe that the organizations concerned should be given a chance to purge themselves of the charge. I believe that every organization so named ought to inform its members of the fact that the charge was made and give them an opportunity to resign from the organization or to support the organization in its appeal from the ruling of the Attorney General.

Mr. MASON. Dr. Lovett, if that is your attitude as an employee of the Federal Government, that you must in your private life be above reproach so far as taint of subversive activities are concerned, and association with subversive elements are concerned, why wouldn't that apply to you as an instructor in the university? Wouldn't the same reasoning and the same judgment apply in that connection?

Mr. LOVETT. Certainly. And I meant, Mr. Chairman, to cover that point in saying that when an organization is found by the Attorney General to be subversive the facts should be made public and the members of the organization informed by the organization itself. I think every citizen, whether he is in a university or in a Government position or in any other connection, should be given a chance to know what the Department of Justice regards as subversive, just as a citizen has a right to know when the Federal Trade Commission states that a certain product, toothpaste, or what not, is not keeping its promises.

Mr. MASON. But, Dr. Lovett, as I gathered—maybe I got the wrong impression, you felt in this investigation by the State senate, headed by Senator Baker, that while that was to investigate teaching of subversive activities in the higher educational institutions of Illinois, that that should not cover your personal associations and activities outside of the university, and that because it did not confine itself to the particular teaching of these activities, you resented the fact that they checked up and questioned you about your personal activities.

Mr. LOVETT. No. I did not resent the questions of the committee, but I was not prepared to go into a discussion of matters that seemed to me irrelevant. It was not subversive activities, as I remember it, but Communist activities or, rather, Communist teaching in the colleges and universities of the State that were mentioned in the call.

Mr. MASON. Well, Dr. Lovett, perhaps you do not know, but I was a member of the State senate at that time in Illinois.

Mr. LOVETT. So.

Mr. MASON. And, of course, I knew Charles Baker quite well.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MASON. I felt that perhaps the investigation should have been conducted by probably someone better qualified to bring out the essential points in connection with the investigation. But be that as it may, I do remember that in the report made to the legislature by this committee, that most of the exceptions to you were in connection with your attitude in failing to cooperate with the committee in its attempt to investigate the teaching of communism in the higher educational institutions of Illinois and that you did not feel that your personal activities and personal associations had anything to do with teaching, whereas the committee felt that by going into your personal associations and activities and interests, they could thereby get light on perhaps the philosophy that must permeate any person's teaching because, as a teacher of 35 years' standing, I know when you are teaching, you are bound to color what you are teaching, regardless of how impersonal you may attempt to be in the teaching of that subject.

Mr. LOVETT. I answered every question that the committee asked, usually by saying "Yes" or "No." You will remember the background of that committee, the so-called Walgreen letters——

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. LOVETT. In which he challenged the University of Chicago, I should say, rather, challenged the trustees of the University of Chicago to give a public hearing, which the trustees refused. They offered Mr. Walgreen the opportunity to appear and make any criticism or complaints that he desired, and I have always supposed that the appointment of the committee followed on the failure of Mr. Walgreen to get a public hearing.

Mr. MASON. That was the genesis of the committee.

Mr. LOVETT. And you perhaps remember that Mr. Walgreen's complaint arose out of the fact that his niece, whom he had appointed as beneficiary of a scholarship, tuition scholarship for 1 year, which he had established, was withdrawn from the university, and the letters written to the board of trustees were prepared for Mr. Walgreen by his friends in the office of the Chicago American or Examiner, and that the person who was examined in connection with his niece's indoctrination to communism was Prof. Harry Gideonse, who is now president of Brooklyn University.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. LOVETT. And so far as I remember, the only document that was in question was the Communist manifesto, which Professor Gideonse, as a teacher of political science, had introduced in his list of required readings.

I feel that the background of the investigation held by the committee of the senate of the State of Illinois is a very important part of the whole story. And, I might observe that the report of the committee, handed to the president of the University of Chicago, and by him transmitted to the board of directors, was not acted upon by the trustees. As a matter of fact, my automatic retirement at the age of 65 was due a few years later, and the trustees asked me twice to continue my teaching—twice, yes, for 2 years after my 65th birth-

day, so that the trustees of the University, and I may say my colleagues in general on the university faculty did not agree with the report of the committee. And I had a letter from Senator Barbour, whom you remember—

Mr. MASON. I do.

Mr. LOVETT. He was a member of the committee and the tone of that letter was distinctly apologetic.

Mr. MASON. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Wholly apart from the findings of the Attorney General on the identity of various subversive organizations, do you consider the Communist Party to be a subversive organization?

Mr. LOVETT. I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It would naturally follow, would it not, that you also do not consider the various auxiliaries of the Communist Party to be subversive.

Mr. LOVETT. No. So far as my knowledge of the Communist Party goes, it is not committed to the policy of destroying this Government by force and violence. That, I take it is the charge or the basis of the charge that it is a subversive organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had occasion to read the Attorney General's decision in the matter of the deportation of Harry Bridges?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You recall the Attorney General's findings, which I believe is numbered finding No. 1, that the Communist Party from its inception down to the present time has advised, taught, and advocated the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence?

Mr. LOVETT. Historically, the Communist movement was a movement for violent revolution, but so far as I know, the American, or the Communist Party of the United States, is not committed to the destruction of the Government by force and violence. I felt that the Attorney General had gone rather far afield in tracing the history of the Communist movement back to the Communist manifesto of 1848 or 1847.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You recall the statement which I gave, in substance, on the decision of the Attorney General?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is your position that that is not based upon the facts in the case?

Mr. LOVETT. I think the facts cited by the Attorney General were not strictly relevant to the position of the Communist Party today.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it your contention that the Communist Party of the United States has not at any time advocated the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence?

Mr. LOVETT. Not so far as I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It has not, so far as you know?

Mr. LOVETT. It has not, so far as I know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the national committee of the All-America Anti-Imperialist League?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know the general nature and aims of the organization?

Mr. LOVETT. My recollection is that that committee grew out of protests which were becoming general against military interference

on the part of the United States in Latin-American countries, particularly in the Caribbean, Nicaragua, Haiti, and Santo Domingo, and the committee outlined what has since been known as the good-neighbor policy, and that it was in no sense subversive of the American Government. If it differed from the policy then pursued by the American Government, it was in an effort to change that policy by peaceful persuasion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware that the Attorney General in his Bridges decision characterized the All-American Anti-Imperialist League as a Communist front organization?

Mr. LOVETT. I don't remember that he did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you disagree with that finding?

Mr. LOVETT. There were Communists in the committee, and I think the majority were Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you personally know Manuel Gomez, the secretary of the United States section of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League?

Mr. LOVETT. I don't recall any acquaintance with him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But it is your opinion that the majority of the persons in the All-American Anti-Imperialist League were Communists, I believe you stated.

Mr. LOVETT. On seeing the letterhead which I was shown yesterday, I would certainly agree that the majority were Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit No. 1, in connection with the testimony of Dr. Lovett a photostatic copy of the letterhead of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League, containing a letter dated April 11, 1928, signed by Manuel Gomez, on which there appears a list of the national committee of the organization including Robert Morss Lovett, as a member.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 1.")

Mr. LOVETT. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I see nothing unpatriotic or subversive in my signing a protest against these military activities of the Government, of our Government, in South American countries, with other persons who were opposed to that policy, even though they were Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a sponsor of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you also aware that the Attorney General, in his interdepartmental memoranda, distributed to the departmental heads of the Government for their guidance in dealing with subversive affiliations of their subordinates, named the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as a subversive organization?

Mr. LOVETT. No; I was not aware of that fact.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Those interdepartmental memoranda were placed in the Congressional Record by Mr. Dies, of Texas, on September 24, 1942. Did you ever see a copy of that Congressional Record?

Mr. LOVETT. I did not; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had occasion to examine the list of sponsors and officers of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties?

Mr. LOVETT. At the time it was formed; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you note a predominance or a considerable proportion of Communists among the officers and sponsors of the organization?

Mr. LOVETT. I can't say that I know personally whether the majority were Communists or Communist sympathizers. I recognize some, certainly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 2 a photostatic copy of the call, National Action Conference for Civil Rights, under the auspices of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties to be held in Washington, D. C., April 19 to 20, 1940. The date "1940" does not appear on the document itself, but that has been determined to be the fact in the case.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The program referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 2")

Mr. MATTHEWS. On this exhibit the name of Hon. Robert Morss Lovett, St. Thomas, V. I., appears as a sponsor of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Were you a member of the national committee of the International Labor Defense at any time?

Mr. LOVETT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware of the fact that the letterhead of the International Labor Defense listed you as a member of its national committee?

Mr. LOVETT. This was 1929? I don't remember. I accept the fact that if they listed my name as a member of the national committee, I was so regarded. That must have been at the origin of this International Labor Defense, and since that time, of course, I have had no connection with it. Since it appeared as a generally accepted organ of the Communist movement I have not been a member of the committee or any connection with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied that the International Labor Defense is properly classified as a Communist organization?

Mr. LOVETT. I would so regard it; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1929 when your name appeared on the letterhead of the organization as a member of its national committee, Alfred Wagenknecht was executive secretary of the organization. Are you acquainted with the fact, Dr. Lovett, that Alfred Wagenknecht was a charter member and leader of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. LOVETT. I was not aware of that fact; but I will say that at the time I joined the International Labor Defense, I did so because I was interested in the objectives of the organization, labor defense, and was doubtless at the time fully aware that the majority of the committee was composed of Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The International Labor Defense at that date was also formerly affiliated with the International Red Aid, whose international headquarters were in Moscow.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You probably were acquainted with that fact at the time?

Mr. LOVETT. I don't remember, but probably I was aware.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 3 a letterhead of the International Labor Defense containing a letter dated February

18, 1929, and a printed list of the national committee of the organization, on which the name of Robert Morss Lovett appears as a member.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 3.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you one of the contributing editors to a magazine known as Soviet Russia Today?

Mr. LOVETT. I may have been an advisory editor. I don't remember specifically contributing to that magazine.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The letterhead of the organization in the year 1932 carried a list of contributing editors, which includes your name.

Mr. LOVETT. It is probable that I promised to contribute to the magazine.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The letterhead also indicates that the magazine was published by the Friends of the Soviet Union. Did you ever hear of the organization known as Friends of the Soviet Union?

Mr. LOVETT. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a list of the contributing editors and ask if that reflects the fact, as you now understand it?

Mr. LOVETT. I see names here of persons who are certainly not Communists. I see the names of some who are. Upton Sinclair certainly is not a Communist. John Dos Passos is not a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say John Dos Passos was not or was?

Mr. LOVETT. Not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not he was a Communist at that date?

Mr. LOVETT. That I can't say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think perhaps if you would refresh your recollection on him you would remember that he was a publicly avowed member of the Communist Party at that date, and later broke with the party.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes. Well, there again I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I was a friend of the Soviet Union at that time, and saw no impropriety in acknowledging myself as such, even although some of the cosponsors of the paper published were Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On this letterhead the name of Marcel Scherer appears as national secretary of the Friends of the Soviet Union. Are you aware, Dr. Lovett, that Marcel Scherer has been publicly identified as a member of the Communist Party by running for office on the Communist Party ticket?

Mr. LOVETT. I am not aware of that fact, but I am quite prepared to state that I believe, on your assertion, that that is the case.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Liston M. Oak is listed is managing editor of Soviet Russia Today. Do you know whether or not in 1932 Liston M. Oak was a publicly avowed leader of the Communist Party?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the United States.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes; he was a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have no doubt that the publication, Soviet Russia Today, and the organization, Friends of the Soviet Union, were Communist Party enterprises, have you?

Mr. LOVETT. They were certainly dominated by Communists who were at that time and since the most outstanding friends, naturally, of the Soviet Union. I have been a friend of the Soviet Union

since 1917 and have watched that experiment with the greatest interest and sympathy, and I am rejoiced to find that at the present date a very large majority, it seems to me, of my countrymen agree that the Soviet Union deserves the friendship of democratic nations.

Mr. THOMAS. May I just ask a question?

Doctor, do they agree that the Soviet Union deserves the friendship of the Democratic nations because of the politics of the Soviet Union, because of the form of government in the Soviet Union or because of the fact that the Soviet Union is an ally of the democratic nations?

Mr. LOVETT. Because, as an ally of the democratic nations, the Soviet Union is committed to the same cause, the international cause for which the democracies are fighting.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but did they commit themselves because of something they believed in, or did they commit themselves because they were attacked by Germany?

Mr. LOVETT. I believe that the attack by Germany was the result of the —

Mr. THOMAS. That is not answering the question.

Mr. LOVETT. Excuse me.

Mr. THOMAS. I am asking you this question: Did they commit themselves because of something they believed in, we will say the "four freedoms" or something else, or because they were attacked by Germany?

Mr. LOVETT. Undoubtedly because they were attacked by Germany.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. That is all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 4 a photostatic copy of a letterhead of the magazine Soviet Russia Today, with a letter dated June 28, 1932, containing a list of contributing editors of the publication, among which is the name of Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 4.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Lovett, did you sign the call of the American Youth Congress to its annual gathering in the year 1939?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes; if my name appears, undoubtedly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 5 a photostatic copy of page 2 from the official program of the American Youth Congress for its gathering in July 1939, on which document the name of Robert Morss Lovett appears as one of those who signed the call to that gathering.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 5.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Lovett, were you an advisory editor of a publication known as Champion of Youth?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 6 a photostatic copy of the masthead of the publication known as Champion of Youth for January 1937, which lists the advisory editors of the publication, and includes the name of Robert Morss Lovett as one of them.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 6.")

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, at that point may I ask a couple of questions?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to digress just a moment. Dr. Lovett, some of this might have been offered in the earlier testimony, and if it has, why I will not follow it out, but when you got your appointment to your present position, who did you get your appointment from?

Mr. LOVETT. From the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. THOMAS. From the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. LOVETT. From the President through the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. THOMAS. From the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Do I understand correctly that the Secretary of the Interior has a written resignation from you at the present time?

Mr. LOVETT. No. He has my assurance that at any time he considers it in the interest of the public service that I should resign, of course, I will do so.

Mr. THOMAS. When did you give him that assurance?

Mr. LOVETT. I think from the date of my appointment.

Mr. THOMAS. Three years ago? Was it 3 years ago?

Mr. LOVETT. I think so; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And since that time haven't you expressed to him the fact that you were willing to resign?

Mr. LOVETT. Why, of course. The Secretary is fully aware of the fact that I hold my appointment by virtue of his recommendation, and if he feels that my continuance in office is not advisable, obviously I should resign.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; that is natural. I think that is natural. When did you express that to him?

Mr. LOVETT. Always; whenever I had any occasion to.

Mr. THOMAS. The last time; when was the last time?

Mr. LOVETT. This morning.

Mr. THOMAS. This morning?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Why did you express it to him this morning?

Mr. LOVETT. Because I feared that the Secretary might be embarrassed by the investigations which have been directed particularly against me.

Mr. THOMAS. Wasn't it also because the Secretary might be embarrassed as the result of all of these organizations that you belonged to and sponsored over a period of time?

Mr. LOVETT. I don't think so.

Mr. THOMAS. Has the Secretary a written resignation from you?

Mr. LOVETT. No; not in form.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, has he a written statement from you that you would be willing to resign?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1940 there was held in Chicago a gathering which was sponsored by the Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War. That gathering which was held the last of August and the first of September set up an organization which was known as the American Peace Mobilization. Dr. Lovett, were you a sponsor of the Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War?

Mr. LOVETT. May I explain, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MASON. Yes, Dr. Lovett. We have usually instructed the witnesses, Dr. Lovett, to say "yes" or "no," and then give the explanation which will cover the thing.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes. My answer is "Yes." I had at that time a good many associations among people who were devoted to the cause of peace. This organization was composed of such persons, and I accepted their invitation to join with them making, however, the stipulation that my position, which was not that of many of them, was that America could keep out of war only by carrying through its policy of collective security and giving all-out aid to the nations which were fighting for collective security and against Germany. And, I said if I could attend the convention, I should present that view.

The chairman wrote me that they would listen to my presentation of that point of view. I was unable to attend the convention, and my name simply ceased to be connected with the organization. I want to be very clear on the point that from the beginning of the European war in 1939 I have consistently taken the position that the salvation of the United States was in supporting the democracies.

When England was alone among the democracies still fighting Germany, I expressed myself emphatically to the effect that the salvation of America was bound up in the success of England in that struggle, and that we should give all possible aid to England; that that was the method by which we might keep out of war, or we might abolish war if we were obliged to go in and fight for a complete world organization to suppress the aggressors.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied that the American Peace Mobilization was an adjunct or auxiliary of the Communist Party?

Mr. LOVETT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are acquainted with the fact that the American Peace Mobilization, down to the date and almost the hours of Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union was emphatically opposed to aid to the democracies; are you not?

Mr. LOVETT. I presume so. I was not connected with it after the original convention which, as I say, I agree to attend in order to express my views, which were the views of a thorough believer in peace.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who approached you to have you associate yourself with the Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War?

Mr. LOVETT. I think Professor Rautenstrauch, of New York.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Walter, if you wish to include the first name.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your correspondence was with Professor Rautenstrauch.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes; and afterward with the Reverend Mr. Thompson who became, I think, chairman of the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a reproduction of the letterhead, front and reverse sides, of the Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War, which has the letter on it dated August 10, 1940, and also a list of the sponsors of the committee including Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That will be marked "Exhibit 7."

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 7.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were already Government Secretary in the Virgin Islands at the time this committee was set up?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Lovett, were you a sponsor at any time of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-born?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a reproduction of a letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, which announces the fourth annual conference of the organization to be held in Washington, March 2 and 3, 1940, which letterhead contains a list of the sponsors, including the name of Robert Morss Lovett. This will be exhibit No. 8.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 8.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Lovett, did you in 1937 join in signing An Open Letter to American Liberals, which appeared in the magazine Soviet Russia Today?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 9 a reproduction of two pages from the magazine Soviet Russia Today for March 1937, which contains the text of An Open Letter to American Liberals, and a number of alleged signatories, including Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received as part of the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 9.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Lovett, were you a member of the National Committee for the Student Congress Against War, which was held on the University of Chicago campus in the winter of 1932-33?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 10 a reproduction of the 4-page program of the National Committee for the Student Congress Against War, which contains a list of the national committee, including the name of Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received and made a part of the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 10.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Dr. Lovett, were you a sponsor of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, which met in Washington and set up the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 11 the reproduction of a four-page program and Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, which contains a list of sponsors including Hon. Robert Morss Lovett, of St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.

Mr. MASON. It may be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 11.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a sponsor of the Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign, which was conducted under the auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 12 a reproduction of a letterhead of the Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign, containing a letter dated August 3, 1939, and a list of sponsors which includes the name of Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 12.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. You had taken your position in the Virgin Islands at the time of this sponsorship, had you?

Mr. LOVETT. Would you give me the date again?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The date of the letter on the letterhead is August 3, 1939.

Mr. LOVETT. I presume that I signed the letter or joined the organization before taking office in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you agree to act as a judge in a prize contest held under the sponsorship of the League of American Writers, the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and the American Student Union?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 13 a reproduction of a brief article from the Daily Worker of March 23, 1938, which announces a prize contest open to all American college students and sponsored by the League of American Writers, Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and American Student Union. The article states that Robert Morss Lovett is one of the judges of the contest.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 13.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the Committee of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 14, a reproduction of the letterhead of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, containing a letter dated November 18, 1936, and a list of the committee, which includes the name of Prof. Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 14.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you on or about April 2, 1940, sign a petition to the President of the United States protesting against the badgering of Communist leaders by the Department of Justice?

Mr. LOVETT. I don't recollect.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware of the fact that the New Masses of April 2, 1940, listed you as a signer of such a document?

Mr. LOVETT. That I do not recollect, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you took a glance at the text of the petition and some of the signers, would it refresh your recollection?

Mr. LOVETT. I know many of the signers, Joseph Warren Beach; many college professors and college men and others. I have no recollection of it, but I would not deny it, in view of the exhibit.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 15 a reproduction of a page from the publication New Masses, page 21, for April 2, 1940, which contains a petition addressed to the President of the United States, signed by numerous individuals, including Robert Morss Lovett, who is listed as Governor of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. LOVETT. That, of course, is a mistake. I would say that I should consider it highly improper for me to sign a statement to the President of the United States.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 15.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you join in signing the call to the fourth congress of the League of American Writers in 1940?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The League of American Writers held its fourth congress in New York City in June of 1940. That was approximately 1 year, or a little less than 1 year after you had gone to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To take your position.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was also approximately 9 months after the outbreak of the European war.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were aware of the fact, were you not, that the League of American Writers during that period of 9 months subsequent to the outbreak of the European war had publicly taken a position against any aid of any kind whatsoever to Great Britain, and it opposed various measures of defense and preparedness on the part of the United States Government.

Mr. LOVETT. I was aware of that fact, and my reason for signing the call was to give an opening for the expression of my own views on the matter. I was actuated by exactly the same reason as in the case of the American Peace Mobilization. I felt that any influence I might have with professed pacifists, those who were for peace at any price, should be used at that time to express my view that the only way to peace, to permanent peace, was through support of Great Britain in the World War.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I understand your answer to be that you signed this particular document in order to present a viewpoint.

Mr. LOVETT. To present a viewpoint, which was indicated in the call; the viewpoint which was indicated as a question in the call: Should we do this or that. And, I felt that it was an opportunity for me to render a public service in that connection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Asking you a hypothetical question, Would you under any circumstances sign a call to a gathering held under the auspices of the German-American Bund, in order to prevent a viewpoint at such a gathering?

Mr. LOVETT. No. I should sign only a call in which I felt that my influence would be of some importance.

Mr. THOMAS. Where is this matter in here that was asked about, to allow the presentation of a viewpoint?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will see if I can find the question for you, Congressman. There are several questions listed. I will read them off.

How best as writers can we resist the drive toward war and reaction which threatens our democratic culture

• What can we do to extend further help to persecuted writers of other lands?

What can we do to restore the Works Progress Administration cultural projects and to transform them into permanent people's art projects vital to the Nation's strength?

What new technical developments in the various forms of writing need to be analyzed and evaluated?

What measures can we take to combat and surmount the growing restrictions on our work as honest craftsmen?

How can we contribute to a genuine cultural interchange between the peoples of the Americas?

How can we enrich America's imperishable democratic literature and extend its audience?

Mr. THOMAS. Are those the only questions?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; they are the only questions.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the only question that might refer to the war there, or does refer to the war, is the first one, I think, which has something to do with resisting the drive. What is that question, again?

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading):

How best as writers can we resist the drive toward war and reaction which threatens our democratic culture?

Mr. THOMAS. Then that is the question you had in mind?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. To present your views?

Mr. LOVETT. I had in mind the probable attitude of the league, and the members composing it. I knew that their tendency would be, like the Peace Mobilization, to keep America out of war, by isolation, and it was against that tendency that I was to protest.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you protest?

Mr. LOVETT. I did.

Mr. THOMAS. In what form did you protest?

Mr. LOVETT. By letter. I was too far away to attend the conference.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you got copies of those letters?

Mr. LOVETT. I submitted them to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. THOMAS. The Secretary of the Interior has copies of them?

Mr. LOVETT. He has.

Mr. GARDNER. Copies have been sent to the Kerr committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 16 a copy of the call to the fourth congress of the League of American Writers. The call is entitled "In Defense of Culture," and includes the name of Robert Morss Lovett as one of the signers.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 16.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you, in March 1938, lend your name and prestige to a document issued by the International Labor Defense, dealing with questions of Japanese political movements?

Mr. LOVETT. I do not recollect specifically, but I should undoubtedly accept the document in question. I do not believe it a forgery.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 17 a reproduction of an article from the Daily Worker for March 1939, which contains a news item concerning a manifesto issued by the International Labor Defense and includes the name of Robert Morss Lovett as one of the signers.

Mr. LOVETT. May I observe that this was a petition directed to the Chinese Ambassador in Washington.

Mr. GARDNER. Japanese Ambassador.

Mr. LOVETT. Did I say "Chinese"?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. LOVETT. Japanese Ambassador; yes, sir. Thank you.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received and made a part of the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 17.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the advisory board of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever resign from that organization?

Mr. LOVETT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you still a member of the advisory committee of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 18 a copy of the letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, with a letter on it sent out in January, 1940. The letterhead contains a list of the Advisory Committee members including the name of Professor Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 18.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. In connection with the same organization, American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, I offer as exhibit 19 an article from the Daily Worker for January 10, 1938, which indicates that the witness sent special greetings to a gathering of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, and I would like to ask the witness, before you receive this article in evidence, if you recall having sent greetings to the conference.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The answer is "Yes".

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 19.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners?

Mr. LOVETT. The international committee?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That organization subsequently changed its name to the National Committee for Peoples Rights.

Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 20 a reproduction of a letterhead of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners, which lists Robert Morss Lovett as one of its members.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 20.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware of the fact that the organization did change its name to the National Committee for People's Rights?

Mr. LOVETT. No; I don't remember that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is the organization letterhead [handing letter to witness].

Mr. LOVETT. Yes; I remember now.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General in his interdepartmental memoranda has listed both the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners and the National Committee for People's Rights as subversive organizations.

I offer as exhibit 21 a letterhead of the National Committee for People's Rights, which contains the name of Robert Morss Lovett as a member.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 21.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you vice chairman of the American League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, as exhibit 22 I offer a letterhead of the American League Against War and Fascism, which lists Harry F. Ward as chairman, Robert Morss Lovett, as vice chairman, Lincoln Steffens as vice chairman, Earl Browder as vice chairman, and William P. Mangold, as treasurer.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 22.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you continue as vice chairman of the organization after it changed its name to the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 23 copy of a letter on the letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which contains the name of Robert Morss Lovett as vice chairman of the organization.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 23.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you sign the call for the National Writers' Congress in 1937?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes. I think that was the beginning of the League for American Writers, or League of American Writers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; League of American Writers.

Mr. LOVETT. It grew out of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The League of American Writers was organized at a gathering held in 1935. This was the second of the gatherings.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a copy of the manifesto and call for a National Writers' Congress, as it appeared in the New Masses for May 4, 1937, which gives the name of Robert Morss Lovett as one of those who signed the document. That will be exhibit 24.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 24.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, as exhibit No. 25 I offer a list of the advisory board of the American Student Union, as it appeared in the official publication of the organization.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received and made a part of the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 25.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you write a letter to the New Masses in the spring of 1938; the letter appearing in the New Masses on May 3, 1938?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In that letter did you take up the question of neutrality legislation as it affected Spain?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In that letter did you write the following:

The guilt lies with the inconsistency of the President, who in November 1936 asserted: "We are acting to simplify definitions and facts by calling war war when armed invasion and resulting killing of human beings takes place." It lies

with the cynical indifference of Secretary Hull, who asks blandly, "How do I know that the bombs exported to Italy and Germany are used in Spain?" It lies above all with the nest of Fascist sympathizers in the State Department, now exposed by Messrs. Pearson and Allen: Dunn, Moffat, Hackroth, and Moore—in whose adroit hands Roosevelt and Hull have been, up to the present, something less resilient than putty.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you appointed to your position in the Virgin Islands approximately 1 year after the publication of that letter?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as exhibit 26 a copy of the letter which the witness addressed to the New Masses, and which appeared in the New Masses on May 3, 1938.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 26.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you join in signing an open letter which appeared in Soviet Russia Today in September 1939?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, exhibit No. 27 will be a copy of the text of an open letter which appeared in the magazine Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, signed, among others, by Robert Morss Lovett, who again is listed mistakenly as Governor of the Virgin Islands, and an editor of the New Republic; I don't mean that the letter is mistaken—

Mr. LOVETT. I am not, of course, responsible for the error.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is understood.

Mr. LOVETT. They are speaking of a position, and that should not have been referred to in any case.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 27.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the advisory counsel of the League for Mutual Aid?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as exhibit 28 a letter on the letterhead of the League for Mutual Aid, which contains the name of Robert Morss Lovett as one of the members of the advisory committee of the organization.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received and made a part of the record.

(The letter referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 28.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall, Dr. Lovett, that in March of 1940 the American Civil Liberties Union, through its high governing body, held that Communist Party members were not eligible for membership on that body because of the position of Communists with respect to civil liberties? Is that a correct statement of what happened?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you sign a letter of protest against the position of the American Civil Liberties Union in that matter?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes, sir; but I did not sign it with the intention of having it made public. My understanding was that it was a statement from other members of the American Civil Liberties Union protesting against an action which they thought and which I thought detrimental to the union itself. It was, in my understanding, not a public document, but a document addressed to the executive committee or the board of directors of the union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited your signature to this particular communication?

Mr. LOVETT. I think that Mr. I. F. Stone wrote me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that your recollection that Stone is the man who solicited your signature?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not Stone is the Washington representative of the publication PM?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At the present time.

Mr. LOVETT. And of the Nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And of the Nation, also?

Mr. LOVETT. I have known him in that connection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 29 the text of the letter dealing with this matter signed, among others, by Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, Governor General of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 29.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not in 1936 you attended a political rally on behalf of the Communist Party's candidates for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, in the city of Chicago?

Mr. LOVETT. I do not recall it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. An article from the Daily Worker for November 3, 1936, states that you attempted to enter the Garden after the doors were closed; the Garden apparently being shut; that they had to close the doors. Have you been apprised of the fact that the Daily Worker carried that article?

Mr. LOVETT. My attention was called to that article, and I have taken exception to the fact as alleged that I tried to enter the Garden. It was in New York, by the way, Mr. Matthews; not Chicago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Pardon me.

Mr. LOVETT. I passed Madison Square Garden some time in the evening and saw the crowd outside and paused for a short time; I was not intending to attend the meeting, and I merely paused for a few minutes in passing. I remember the occasion, because someone must have seen me and informed the high command that I was among those at the so-called overflow meeting, because from the loudspeaker an invitation was extended to me to enter the hall, an invitation which I did not accept.

Mr. THOMAS. Who extended that invitation?

Mr. LOVETT. I don't know. It was someone speaking from the loudspeaker that was addressing the crowd outside. I certainly should not have identified myself with any political activities on the part of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the National Mooney Council of Action?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, as exhibit 30 I offer an article from the Daily Worker for May 12, 1933, which gives a list of the members of the National Mooney Council of Action, which includes the name of Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 30.")

Mr. LOVETT. I see Prof. J. B. Matthews also signed this call.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; that is already in the record, Dr. Lovett.

Mr. LOVETT. Well, some of us were interested in securing Mooney's release, and if we signed petitions to that effect, or persons who were Communists, I fail to see that that reflects upon our integrity.

Mr. THOMAS. Is Archibald MacLeish's name on that list, by the way?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No. I have a reproduction of an article from the Daily Worker of July 1, 1939, which gives an account of the celebration of Mother Bloor's seventy-fifth birthday in Chicago. According to the story it says: "Robert Morss Lovett wrote that he was proud to be asked to sponsor the celebration."

Did you address such a communication to anyone?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To whom did you address that statement?

Mr. LOVETT. Perhaps to Mrs. Bloor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 31 the article referred to.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Lovett Exhibit 31.")

Mr. THOMAS. For the record, who was Mrs. Bloor?

Mr. LOVETT. She is a person interested in farm relief, in the case of farmers' wives. She is an Iowa woman, and undoubtedly a Communist. I knew her, however, as in my opinion a very worthy, self-sacrificing old woman, and I undoubtedly wrote a letter of congratulations on her seventy-fifth birthday.

Mr. THOMAS. Isn't it true that she has been one of the most active of the women Communists in the United States, if not the most active?

Mr. LOVETT. I am not prepared to say. I know that she is an active Communist.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you know of any woman Communist that has been any more active than Mother Bloor?

Mr. LOVETT. I am sorry, I am not familiar enough with the details of the activities of Communist Party members. I wish to say that I am not interested in the Communist Party or in the status of members in the Communist hierarchy. I have participated with Communists in various efforts in which I agreed with their position, but as for political interests in the Communist Party, I have none.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, from this voluminous testimony which has been offered here today, you certainly have not missed many of the Communist front organizations, and I hope that when Dr. Matthews completes his questioning here, you will enlighten the committee on any other organization that you might have joined, that we haven't mentioned here today; but, from the record, I know of no person in the Government or out of the Government who has been a member or sponsored any more Communist front organizations than you have.

Mr. LOVETT. I don't recognize the term "Communist front organization."

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is perfectly natural, that you would not; in fact, all the witnesses we have had, who have joined these organizations and have sponsored all these Communist movements, never seem to recognize that term. That is perhaps only a coincidence, but it seems strange to me.

Mr. LOVETT. An analysis of the various letterheads submitted will, of course, show a great many persons who are not Communist. The impression might be given the committee that I associated with no one but Communists and that my activities were strictly conditioned or directed by Communists, but that is not the case.

Mr. THOMAS. That is very true, but an analysis of the record will also show that there are perhaps no other individuals that have joined or sponsored as many of these organizations as you have.

Mr. LOVETT. I am not prepared to say. I remember that at the opening of the Dies committee my friend, Professor Matthews, identified himself as being active—

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, we have heard that before; we have heard that before.

Mr. LOVETT. Except me.

Mr. THOMAS. We have heard that from a lot of you people before, but Professor Matthews has been doing a very good job because of the fact that he did belong to some of these organizations, and you could perhaps do even a better job if you were in his position, because I don't think even Professor Matthews belonged to as many as you did. I am amazed that anybody should be given the position that you have been given in the Government after the fact is known that you belonged to all of these screwball and nitwit organizations.

Mr. MASON. All right, Dr. Matthews; are you about through with your exhibits?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you a member of the American Council on Soviet Relations?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I offer as the final exhibit, exhibit 32, an article from the Daily Worker for July 23, 1938, which deals with the formation of the American Council on Soviet Relations, and lists the name of Prof. Robert Morss Lovett as one of the members of the council.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit will be received.

(The document referred to was marked as "Lovett Exhibit 32.")

Mr. MASON. Is that the final one, Doctor?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the final one; yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. Dr. Lovett I did not get quite clear in my mind at the beginning of the testimony your exact title in regard to the Virgin Islands?

Mr. LOVETT. Government secretary.

Mr. MASON. Government secretary?

Mr. LOVETT. Government secretary.

Mr. MASON. Now, Dr. Lovett, at the conclusion of the questions propounded by Dr. Matthews and the members of the committee, we have always given a witness the opportunity to make any further statement that he might want to make in order to clarify his position and his attitude in connection with these subversive organizations or groups that he has been publicly associated with or sponsored, and so forth. Do you care to make any such statement?

Mr. LOVETT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to state that my interests and activities have been in three departments: Interests in civil liberties interest in peace, and interest in an improved and better social order, and I think all of the organizations and committees to which I belonged have been actuated by one or the other of these objects.

Mr. MASON. And will you say, Dr. Lovett, that because of your interest in those three types of social activities that that has been the underlying cause of your association with so many of these so-called Communist front organizations because, on the surface, at least, they had the same objectives?

Mr. LOVETT. Yes; and I believe that their interest was sincere in these causes.

Mr. MASON. At the beginning of the testimony, Dr. Lovett, you were also frank in stating that so far as your knowledge was concerned, and so far as your belief was concerned, you did not think or know that the Communist Party of America, or the United States, preached or advocated the overthrow of the Government by force; is that right?

Mr. LOVETT. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. And you still do not believe that that is true?

Mr. LOVETT. I do not know or believe that to be the case.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the witness to say in answer to your question that he did not know and does not know now that the Communist Party believes in the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?

Mr. MASON. Yes, Congressman. At the beginning of the testimony Dr. Lovett made that statement and was very explicit in the statement that from his knowledge and according to his belief, the Communist Party of the United States does not and has not preached the overthrow of the Government by force or advocated it, in spite of the fact that the Attorney General so found, because he believes that the party here in America does not go back for its objectives to the early Communist Party group in Europe which did advocate force in overthrow of the government. He was very explicit in that, and I wanted to kind of round it out in my own mind.

Mr. LOVETT. Thank you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The witness also stated that he did not consider the Communist Party as a subversive organization, in answer to a question which was asked.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes.

Mr. MASON. Dr. Lovett, what year was it that this investigation in the Illinois Senate took place; was it 1935 or 1936?

Mr. LOVETT. 1935 is my recollection.

Mr. MASON. That is all I have. Have you anything further?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all.

Mr. MASON. Have you anything?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. I would like to ask a couple of questions. Dr. Lovett, do you recall the names of any other organizations along the line of these organizations that have been mentioned here today that you have joined or have sponsored or been affiliated with?

Mr. LOVETT. Well, it is well known that I was president of the League for Industrial Democracy for a period of some 20 years. That is an organization for economic education for students in colleges and universities and is distinctly socialistic in its background, other than communistic, and my well-known affiliation with the Socialists—I don't say the Socialist Party, because I was never a party member, but my association with leading Socialists would, I think, show completely my complete negative attitude toward the Communist political movement.

Mr. THOMAS. Can you think of any other organization, Doctor?

Mr. LOVETT. I cannot at this moment. My memory has been very greatly refreshed already by the exhibits shown.

Mr. THOMAS. Dr. Lovett, have you known right along that the Communist Party has used many of these organizations that you have been a member of or sponsored or been affiliated with?

Mr. LOVETT. How used? I know that the Communist Party has represented some of these organizations as directed by them or as contributory to their movement. That statement was made by Earl Browder in connection with the League Against War and Fascism. He called it, I remember, a transmission belt. I don't know what he meant, precisely, by that phrase. I presume that was a piece of boasting designed to build up the credit of the Communist Party with its members and with others as an indication of their influence. I know in my connection with the American League Against War and Fascism, that it was not controlled by Communists. An excellent article was published in the New Republic dated March 18, 1941.

Mr. THOMAS. Even if it had been controlled by the Communists, it would not have made any difference with you, would it, because of the testimony you gave here today, that you did not feel that the Communist Party believed in anything subversive.

Mr. LOVETT. Yes; it would have made a difference.

Mr. THOMAS. It would have made a difference?

Mr. LOVETT. Certainly. We were very anxious to eliminate any possibility of control of that organization by the Communists.

Mr. THOMAS. Why would it have made a difference to you if you felt that the Communist Party was not subversive?

Mr. LOVETT. Because the league could not have accomplished its purpose if dominated by the Communist Party.

Mr. THOMAS. Why not?

Mr. LOVETT. Because it would not have appealed widely to liberals, friends of peace; others whom we were anxious to reach. It would not have appealed to the liberal movement.

Mr. THOMAS. Why wouldn't it have appealed?

Mr. LOVETT. Because recognition of the fact that it was a Communist-dominated organization would have entirely cut off the resources from these various groups; I mean resources in membership.

Mr. THOMAS. From your testimony I would not see why the recognition of the interest in the Communist Party would be harmful to any organization. Just explain what you mean by that.

Mr. MASON. I think Dr. Lovett means that so far as he was concerned, he didn't see any objection to it, but so far as these other organizations, like labor organizations and so forth, they would see objection to it if it were controlled by the Communist Party.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that what you mean, Doctor?

Mr. LOVETT. I should object to any organization formed for a specific social purpose being dominated by a political party, Republican, Democratic, Social, Communist, Prohibition, or any other.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you believe that the Communist Party is nothing more than a political party.

Mr. LOVETT. The Communist Party is a political party.

Mr. THOMAS. Nothing more than a political party?

Mr. LOVETT. Nothing more than, in its public character. The Communists may have other interests in politics, but the Communist Party certainly is a political organization.

Mr. THOMAS. And, as a party it just stands for a change in existing conditions through constitutional means; is that what you mean?

Mr. LOVETT. I understand so.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all, Doctor.

Mr. MASON. All right.

Mr. MATHEWS. Were you a vice chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy until the organization was dissolved in February 1940?

Mr. LOVETT. No. I resigned sometime before the organization passed out. I resigned, to the best of my recollection, early in 1939, when I was no longer able to be in contact with the executive committee. I did my last work for the league in the summer of 1938, in making an investigation of Nazi penetration in the city of Chicago, as published in the Fight Organ of the organization. After that I had no time, since I was not living in any one place after that.

Mr. MATHEWS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Dr. Lovett, is Mr. Ickes conversant with your views on communism?

Mr. LOVETT. I don't know. I presume that he does know. I regard Communists as human beings with whom it is possible to work to the accomplishment of general desirable ends.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you made that statement to Mr. Ickes?

Mr. LOVETT. No; but he must know that. He knows that I have been a member of these various organizations. He is familiar with my background.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all.

Mr. MASON. All right. The hearing stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon the subcommittee adjourned.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
New York City, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The subcommittee, appointed by the chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, met in New York City, N. Y., at 9:30 a. m., in room 2301, Federal Court Building, the Honorable J. Parnell Thomas presiding.

Present: Hon. J. Parnell Thomas.

Also present: J. B. Matthews, director of research for the committee.

TESTIMONY OF MERLE D. VINCENT, DIRECTOR OF THE EXEMPTIONS BRANCH, WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please give your full name.

Mr. VINCENT. Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to answer any questions that you or any member of your committee asks me. I will not be questioned by a man who has publicly advocated the overthrow of the American economic and political system.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. Vincent, first of all, I want to make it plain to you that you are here as a witness to give testimony to the Dies Committee and you are here as the result of certain statements that have been made about you by the chairman of our committee. We are asking you to come as much in fairness to yourself as in fairness to the committee. We are going to lean over backward to give you every possible break and every possible opportunity to present any evidence that you want to in connection with the statements which have already been made by the chairman of our committee.

As far as who will do the questioning and what the procedure of the committee will be, that is a matter for the committee to decide and not for the witness to decide. Mr. Matthews is an employee of our committee. He has been a very valuable employee of the committee and he does all of the questioning; that is, he starts the questioning and I question as I believe it necessary in your behalf and in behalf of the committee. So whether you like to have some particular person question you or not is not a factor. I will determine who will do the questioning.

Mr. Matthews, proceed.

MR. VINCENT. Mr. Chairman, in deference to the stated object of your hearing, your own statement, I shall comply with your suggestion. I shall endeavor to answer any questions. I want you to distinctly understand that the first objection I made embraces precisely my attitude.

MR. THOMAS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. MATTHEWS. Please give your full name.

MR. VINCENT. Merle D. Vincent.

MR. MATTHEWS. What does your middle initial stand for?

MR. VINCENT. Dean.

MR. MATTHEWS. D-e-a-n?

MR. VINCENT. Dean, D-e-a-n.

MR. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

MR. VINCENT. At Harrisville, Mich.

MR. MATTHEWS. When?

MR. VINCENT. December 15, 1876.

MR. MATTHEWS. Will you please outline your educational experience?

MR. VINCENT. My education, except for brief terms up until I was 15 years of age, has been private study. After working in the mines in Cripple Creek—I will say first I lived with my father on a ranch in Colorado until I was in my sixteenth year. I then went to the mining camps and worked in the mines and later studied law in a law office in Denver, the firm of Tolls & Covey, where I was admitted to practice before the supreme court in June 1903.

MR. MATTHEWS. Was that before the supreme court of the State?

MR. VINCENT. Yes.

MR. MATTHEWS. Does that cover your educational statement completely?

MR. VINCENT. That is all there is to it, except experience.

MR. MATTHEWS. Will you please state where you have been employed since your adulthood.

MR. VINCENT. Immediately after being admitted to practice, I went to Dover County in western Colorado where I practiced a number of years. I then moved to Grand Junction in Mace County where I continued practice until the end of 1926. In January 1927 I went to Denver to act as counsel for the estate of Mr. John J. Roche, president of Rocky Mountain Fuel Co. in a reorganization of that company's affairs. In March of that year I became vice president and general manager of the company. I continued in that position until January 1933, when I resigned. I did nothing in 1933 after January except to rest until about August 1, when I came to Washington at the request of Mr. Paul Kellogg to sit as an observer in hearings at which the coal industry code was formulated and to write a review of it. I did that, returning to Denver about in early September, I think. I remained home until about the 1st of January 1904 when I went to New York to obtain material and prepare some articles for Mr. Kellogg.

MR. MATTHEWS. You said 1904.

MR. VINCENT. 1934.

MR. MATTHEWS. 1934.

MR. VINCENT. I meant 1934. Thank you for correcting it. In February 1934 I met Mr. A. D. Whiteside, of Dun & Bradstreet, who

was then a Divisional Administrator in National, the N. R. A., who invited me to join his staff. A few days later I did so as a Deputy Administrator.

A few months later I became Divisional Administrator, not succeeding Mr. Whiteside—there was another Divisional Administrator who succeeded him—Mr. Prentiss Cooney, and I succeeded him as Divisional Administrator. I remained in that position, Mr. Chairman, until the Supreme Court sunk the ship.

The President, as I remember, on June 15, 1935, issued an Executive order directing a survey of certain major industries. I was made Coordinator of that survey, and with a staff made up in part of the Division, Research and Planning Division, that Mr. Leon Henderson headed, and part Administrator's personnel from other divisions. I conducted that survey, and I finished it, I believe, March 15, 1936. I resigned on that date, or about that date, and took a brief vacation, and I believe about the first week or early in April, I acted for a short period—I think only 30 days—as an adviser to Major Walker, who was the Chief of the Management Division of the Resettlement Administration, respecting one of their projects.

At the end of that period, which was early in May, as I remember, I resigned and returned home to Denver, where I engaged in campaign and political work in the Democratic Party, returning east, I believe, in early December. It was after the election, about December 1, 1936. I intended to engage in the private practice of law. However, I never opened an office for general practice. I was asked by Mr. Sidney Hillman and Mr. David Dubinsky if I would take a retainer to represent them on various matters they had before the Department in Washington.

Mr. THOMAS. What Department was that?

Mr. VINCENT. Chiefly the Labor Department. And in matters involved in the public contracts under the Wheeler-Healey Act.

I was also asked to appear before committees of Congress in their behalf, in behalf of their organization, at the time of the consideration of the Fair Labor Standards Act. There were various other subjects on which they consulted me. I wouldn't be able—

Mr. THOMAS. That is all right.

Mr. VINCENT. I wouldn't be able to outline in detail all of them. That employment continued until October 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you speak of representing Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky, do you mean you were the representative of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and the Ladies' Garment Workers Union?

Mr. VINCENT. Their two organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Their two unions.

Mr. VINCENT. Yes. I think it was in October 1938 when Mr. Andrews, who had been appointed Administrator of the Fair Labor Standards Act, asked me if I would join his staff and take charge of the industrial exemption provisions of the act. At first I told him I was not interested. Two or three weeks later, however, he called me again and I agreed to do so, provided he could arrange the appointment, which you understand had to be made by Executive order, because it was a civil-service position, and an Executive order was necessary to effect the appointment. I believe I was appointed and

entered upon that work about November 1—it may have been in late October.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all right.

Mr. VINCENT. Or by November 1.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of 1938?

Mr. VINCENT. Of 1938. I continued in that position under Mr. Andrews, under General Fleming, and now under Mr. Walling. I am now a Director of the Exemptions Branch of the Division.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which Mr. Walling is this?

Mr. VINCENT. Mr. Metcalf Walling.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your salary in your present position?

Mr. VINCENT. The salary was \$7,000 to which has been added an administrative increase that was provided in the so-called Ramspeck bill, which became effective October 1, I believe, in 1941.

Mr. THOMAS. This Exemptions Branch is in what agency of the Government?

Mr. VINCENT. It is in the Department of Labor. It is the Exemptions Branch, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. I know. That is all I want, just the Department of Labor.

Mr. VINCENT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And this particular branch is located in New York?

Mr. VINCENT. In New York.

Mr. THOMAS. The whole Branch is located in New York?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes. There is still a Washington office for information.

Mr. THOMAS. How long has it been located in New York, here?

Mr. VINCENT. We moved to New York February 5, 1942.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all. Continue, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is in the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor; is it not?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes; it is now consolidated with the Public Contracts Office and is known as the Wage and Hour Division.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you give a brief statement of your duties in your present position?

Mr. VINCENT. My function is to administer the exemptions provisions of the act under regulations that are issued by the Administrator. I may say that those regulations are the result of public hearings, findings of fact, and the recommendations which I make and the regulations that issued are issued by the Administrator. They cover the subjects of—I perhaps had better try to name them in the order they occur in the act—first, under section 3, pay-roll deductions that are made by employers for facilities, rents, lodgings, merchandise, supplies, and so on. The next on the—I administer the exemptions that are provided for seasonal industries under section 7-B-3 of the act; the pay roll record-keeping regulations under section 11 of the act; the classification into exempted and nonexempted categories of executive administration and professional people employed in industry under section 13-a-1 of the act and definitions of area of production under section 13-a-10 of the act. That is the section under which the Administrator, as you of course know, Mr. Chairman, has authority to make definition of area production within which em-

ployers engaged in handling and processing horticultural and agricultural products may be exempted from the act.

Those are the primary functions that are administered with a staff and while there are many incidental functions they are all related to the primary functions I have described.

Mr. THOMAS. How many employees are there under you?

Mr. VINCENT. Fifty-five.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who were your sponsors in your Government appointment?

Mr. VINCENT. In my appointment?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. VINCENT.. Well, there were several. I did not know who they were until after Mr. Andrews had asked me to take the position. He told me that Mr. Hillman and Mr. Dubinsky had urged it. But—I am not sure I can name the others—Father Francis Haas was one of them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that H-a-a-s?

Mr. VINCENT. Mr. H-a-a-s.

Mr. THOMAS. Where does he come from?

Mr. VINCENT. Well, I think he came from the Catholic University. However, he has been industrial relations adviser in a number of capacities with the Government from time to time. He was with W. P. A., and I believe is at the present time, although I have not seen him for several months. Mr. Edward Keating, the editor and manager of Labor, published by the Railroad Labor Organization.

Mr. THOMAS. How is it all these people sponsored you out of a clear sky? Did they all get together or did someone contact them. It just doesn't seem reasonable that suddenly these sponsors should come from these different sources.

Mr. VINCENT. Well, Mr. Chairman, it did. I will say now to you that these people and a number of other people, without knowledge on my part, had previously sponsored my appointment with the Labor Relations Act. I knew nothing about it whatever until Mr. Keating told me that the recommendation had been made. You understand that they and others are men whom I have known for many years. I have known Mr. Keating for probably 35 years.

Mr. THOMAS. Did they know you were seeking this position?

Mr. VINCENT. I was not seeking it but they knew I was interested in the subject of industrial relations.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems odd to me, though, that all at one time, four or six different persons, would select you and sponsor you for a particular position in the Government.

Mr. VINCENT. Well, these men, I had met many of them here previously; some of them when I was Divisional Administrator in—

Mr. THOMAS. That might be so, but how do you account for all of them sponsoring you at the same time? Someone must have started the ball rolling.

Mr. VINCENT. I think undoubtedly that they did. The first man who asked me if I would be interested in it was Mr. Fred Umhey, the executive secretary of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. I told him I did not think I would be interested in it.

Mr. THOMAS. I see.

Mr. VINCENT. That is the first man.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. VINCENT. The next man I talked to was Mr. Andrews, the administrator, who had just been appointed administrator.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is Andrews' first name?

Mr. VINCENT. Elmer. Mr. Elmer Andrews. I knew these men, Mr. Chairman. They had known me for years. I may say to you this is not one of the things that one goes out on a street corner and boasts about but when the President directed a commission to examine the personnel of N. R. A. and report on its qualifications, like other administrative organizations, it had strong spots and weak spots. The committee, of which Mr. R. V. Richor, now with the United States Cartridge Co., was chairman spent several weeks examining the executive personnel and of the 53 ranking officers, I was given the first place by that committee. I did not know one of them when they began their work. I became acquainted with them during the process of their work. Those facts were known to many people in administrative circles in Washington.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are any members of your family employed in Government positions?

Mr. VINCENT. One of them is in the military service overseas.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that a son?

Mr. VINCENT. Mr. Matthews, a son; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is his name?

Mr. VINCENT. I understood you asked me about my sons, or my family.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; members of the family.

Mr. VINCENT. His name is William C. Vincent. Lt. William C. Vincent. He is in the Air Corps in the One Hundred and Fifty-eighth Fighter Group. Another son, Craig S. Vincent, is Director of Recruiting and Placement of Merchant Marine under the Maritime Shipping Administration. I think that is the title of it. Maritime Shipping Administration.

Mr. THOMAS. Any other member of the family connected with the Government?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes. I have another son who is an examiner with the National Labor Relations Board in San Francisco.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is his name?

Mr. VINCENT. Merle D. Vincent, Jr. I have a fourth son, who is employed at the magnesium plant in Las Vegas, Nev.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that in a Government capacity?

Mr. VINCENT. No. He is not in the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Any other relative in the Government?

Mr. VINCENT. Not that I know of.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you publicly associated with the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. VINCENT. I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what capacity?

Mr. VINCENT. When it was first organized, as chairman for, I think, about 90 days. I had sat—

Mr. THOMAS. Never mind, just confine your answer to the question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; how long were you chairman?

Mr. VINCENT. I agreed to act for 60 days and I think I acted another 30 days, or about 90 days.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By whom were you succeeded, do you know?

Mr. VINCENT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you elected chairman at a meeting of the organization, or some body of the organization?

Mr. VINCENT. At an initial conference meeting.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When was that election, approximately?

Mr. VINCENT. Well, it was in the spring of 1940. I believe it was 1940 or 1941. I think it was 1940.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; that is correct. It was 1940.

Mr. VINCENT. 1940.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had occasion to read the so-called inter-departmental memorandum circulated by the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, to the department heads of the Federal Government dealing with various organizations, including the Washington Committee for Democratic action.

Mr. VINCENT. Well, I think I read a press report of it. I read an account of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall specifically what the Attorney General said about the communistic control about the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. VINCENT. My memory is that he classified the organization as a Communist-front organization. In substance that is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to read you the particular statement from the Attorney General's memorandum on the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as follows:

Ample opportunity to observe this affiliation and control have been present, however, throughout the committee's existence and it is doubtful that many active members remain unsuspected.

The context indicates that the affiliation and control, that the Attorney General reported about, was communistic affiliation and control. Was it your observation in your office of organization, with the organization that the Attorney General's statement is essentially correct?

Mr. VINCENT. I will have to answer that by answering what I observed and did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the first place, could you answer whether or not you did observe communistic control and then elaborate, if you wish?

Mr. VINCENT. No communistic control, but the attitude developed early which appeared to be hostile to the administration and caused my withdrawal.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who were some of the persons who expressed that attitude of hostility toward the administration?

Mr. VINCENT. I could not name the individuals. It was in the resolutions which were presented and which I examined that I found this attitude. I cannot tell you who introduced the resolutions. I can state to you that the people with whom I was personally interested in the initial steps of it are not Communists nor Communist sympathizers any more than I am. I am a plain everyday simple garden variety of Democrat.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who are those persons of whom you speak?

Mr. VINCENT. Mr. McNamara, A. F. of L. officer in Washington.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is he in the Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes. Mr. Cecil Owen—he was then with the C. I. O. organization. Mr. Kenneth Crawford; Mr. Edwin Smith.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he at that time still with the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes. Mr. Lamberton.

Mr. MATTHEWS. L-a-m-b-e-r-t-o-n?

Mr. VINCENT. Lamberton, L-a-m-b-e-r-t-o-n.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Harry C. Lamberton?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was in the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. VINCENT. Federal Power Commission. I did not know him until I met him in connection with this organization. The others I had know. There were numbers of others. They came in from time to time, including two or three Members of Congress; perhaps three or four Members, and their object was my object, and that was an organization through which individuals who were not frequently in position to defend themselves should have an organization and an opportunity to turn for assistance, to which they could turn for assistance in cases where their civil liberty was involved.

In carrying out that object, two general conferences were called; one in Washington and then—they were both in Washington. One, a national conference, the object of which was to extend it out into communities of the country, many civic organizations, labor unions, et cetera, and many individuals were invited. Those invitations largely, and I think most entirely went out in form of letters which if I did not sign my signature was signed to them.

I became dissatisfied with the resolutions that were introduced. I made that known—

Mr. THOMAS. How did you make it known?

Mr. VINCENT. By personal statements, calling attention to the resolutions, parts of which I could not and would not endorse as proper.

Mr. THOMAS. Ever make it known in writing?

Mr. VINCENT. I don't think I did formally, although in a statement at the last conference which I called to order, I made my position clear, including a statement of my position of endorsement of the administration's foreign policy, its defense provisions, for the reason that I had heard considerable criticisms of those who were attending. As a matter of fact, I personally knew very few of those who were attending.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. Vincent, have you got a copy of the membership list of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. VINCENT. No. I am sure I don't have. I will tell you what I do have. I have a copy of the names who sponsored the first conference. I have that.

Mr. THOMAS. Have we got that, Mr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you recall whether Mr. Stuebaker, Commissioner of Education, was a member of the committee?

Mr. VINCENT. Of New York?

Mr. THOMAS. No; Mr. Stuebaker in Washington—the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. VINCENT. No; I do not.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you know Mr. Studebaker?

Mr. VINCENT. Of the Office of Education in the Interior Department?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. VINCENT. I have met him; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. You don't recall—

Mr. VINCENT. I think I do. My office coordinates in relation to industrial training and so on with the Office of Education. I have met and I know of Mr. Studebaker. I know some of the people over there very well.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you know whether he is a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. VINCENT. I do not.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you ever see him at any of your meetings?

Mr. VINCENT. I cannot recall that I did. He may have been there, though.

Mr. THOMAS. Go ahead, Mr. Matthews. Let's hurry it along.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you associated in any capacity whatever with the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. VINCENT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which preceded the Washington Committee for Democratic Action.

Mr. VINCENT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it brought to your attention that Harry C. Lambertson was the chairman of the Washington Branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy, just prior to the set-up of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. VINCENT. I had heard of him. I don't know whether I had heard of him in that connection. I don't know whether I recall that or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now in June of 1940 there was a conference held in Washington which called itself the National Conference on Constitutional Liberties.

Mr. VINCENT. That's right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. June 7 to 9, 1940.

Mr. VINCENT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it at that conference that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was set up?

Mr. VINCENT. I think that was the beginning of the national organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, were you chairman or temporary chairman of the national conference?

Mr. VINCENT. I called it to order as temporary chairman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you preside at the first session?

Mr. VINCENT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you sit through any of the sessions of the conference?

Mr. VINCENT. No; I did not. As a matter of fact I was there only at lunch time spending my time in looking over resolutions that had been handed in. I went to lunch with two or three persons in attendance—and I cannot tell you who they were—but I discussed these reso-

lutions and expressed my opposition to a number of them. Some of them I had no objection to. They were in accord with the original stated purpose of the organization that related solely to civil liberties. Most of these resolutions went beyond that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who succeeded you as chairman after you called the meeting to order?

Mr. VINCENT. I cannot remember that, Mr. Matthews. I presented whoever was—acted as chairman. From memory I cannot tell you who that was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you—

Mr. VINCENT. I have no doubt my files containing the program contain that name and I can get it for you.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you in January 1943 deliver a lecture at the Workers School in New York?

Mr. VINCENT. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not?

Mr. VINCENT. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not you were announced to give such a lecture?

Mr. VINCENT. I have been told that I was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you invited to give such a lecture?

Mr. VINCENT. I was invited to give a lecture but I did not know the occasion. Mr. Chairman, the officers of the Division, the Administrator, myself, and other heads of branches are very frequently asked to speak on the law to trade associations, unions, civic bodies, and so on. I have made numbers of speeches to trade associations in different parts of the country explaining the act and questions relating to it, and to unions, who have asked us to appear. This invitation came in to my secretary while I was out. She told me of it and stated that it was a student body studying labor questions and she told me the date, and I said, "Am I going to be in town on that day?" And she said, "You have no outside engagements." I said, "Yes; I will."

A few days later I got the announcement—a letter containing the program, the subjects, the speakers. I called our Information Branch and asked them if that was not a Communist organization. I was not sure. But I did not recognize it as any of the types of organizations that we ordinarily speak to. And he told me it was. I told my secretary—the man whom I had been called by was a Mr. Barron, if I remember the name correctly—I told her to get him. He was out of his office. I left word with her to get him and to tell him I would not speak to that group or keep the engagement. She told me, I think the following day, that she had got him and delivered my message.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the original invitation from the Workers School come by telephone or by letter?

Mr. VINCENT. By telephone. There never was any written correspondence except these notes or outline of the program that I got afterward—after the first conversation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you instruct your secretary to state to Mr. Barron that your reason for declining to appear was that you had found out that it was a Communist enterprise?

Mr. VINCENT. I told her to tell him that I would not keep the engagement and that she need not make any explanation. Obviously, if I got him myself I should have made an explanation. But I did not leave the explanation to her. My object was to cancel.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you associated in any official capacity with the National Lawyers Guild?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was that?

Mr. VINCENT. I was president of the Washington chapter.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What were the dates of your presidency of the Washington chapter—approximate dates?

Mr. VINCENT. I am not too sure. I believe I became president in 1939 or 1940. Perhaps it was later than 1939, 1939 or 1940, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you serve in that position?

Mr. VINCENT. Two years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you an official in the National Lawyers Guild at the present time?

Mr. VINCENT. I am a member.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But not an official. Do you hold any committee memberships?

Mr. VINCENT. I don't think so. I was one of the district vice presidents until the last national meeting in Chicago, which occurred just 4 or 5 weeks ago, and I told the secretary that I did not have the time to attend any business and be of any value, and that I did not want, for that reason, to be elected or continued as an official.

Mr. THOMAS. It was held how long ago?

Mr. VINCENT. Oh, that last national meeting was in Chicago in February, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the present year?

Mr. VINCENT. Of this year; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you president of the Washington chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild at the time of the resignation from the organization of Adolph Berle?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes; there were a number of others.

Mr. THOMAS. You were. Your answer is that you were?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Robert H. Jackson also resign at the same time?

Mr. VINCENT. At about the same time. Within a very short time—a very few days.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the reason given by Berle in particular for his resignation from the Lawyers Guild?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes; I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was that?

Mr. VINCENT. Without assuming to quote him—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; I understand, paraphrase it.

Mr. VINCENT. The substance was that communistic influence, Communists or fellow travelers and sympathizers, were directing its action. That is the substance. That is not all he said or possibly the way he said it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you remain as president of the Washington chapter of the guild for approximately 2 years after that?

Mr. VINCENT. No; but for, I think, a year after that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, it was in the spring of 1940, was it not, when Mr. Berle resigned from the guild?

Mr. VINCENT. I believe so. It may have been more than a year. It may have been a considerable part of both years. I wouldn't be sure about that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; the exact time is not important.

Mr. VINCENT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you remained president until sometime in 1942, did you not?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes; I think until the spring of 1942. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to add a brief statement on that, if I may. I desire to state on that that while of course I did not know all of the 400 members of the Lawyers Guild, I did know a considerable number of them, and in particular I knew those who were active on committees and doing what I will describe as much of the work of the details of the organization. They were men of character, men of integrity, and they were not Communists or Communist sympathizers. They were the type of men represented by Attorney General Kenny of California, who is now the president.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that Robert W. Kenny?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes. Whatever their particular views might be. There was Judge Holley of Chicago. There were other members whom I could mention of the Washington chapter that were not only not Communists, that were not sympathizers. Most of them were Democrats, some of them, a few of them, were Republicans. Many of them were in Government service. Some of them were in private practice and have constituted—I will say—a very influential part and had a very great influence on the particular actions which the organization took on specific subjects, made committee reports and things of that sort. They are well, they are typical Democratic and Republican lawyers. That is what they are.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Mr. Nathan R. Margold?

Mr. VINCENT. Former Solicitor—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. VINCENT. Of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. VINCENT. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you receive a letter of resignation from him?

Mr. VINCENT. I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I wonder if you could identify this as a copy of the letter of resignation from Mr. Margold [hands paper to Mr. Vincent]?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes; that is a copy of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer it as exhibit 1.

Mr. VINCENT. May I make a comment on that letter?

Mr. MATTHEWS. A letter of resignation to the National Lawyers Guild dated May 29, 1940, sent by Nathan R. Margold to the Honorable John Gutknecht, president of the National Lawyers Guild, and to Merle D. Vincent, president of the Washington chapter.

Mr. THOMAS. It will be so declared.

EXHIBIT I

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, May 29, 1940.

HON. JOHN GUTKNECHT,
President, National Lawyers Guild,
Hotel Roosevelt, New York, N. Y.

MEBLE D. VINCENT, Esq.,
President, District of Columbia Chapter, National Lawyers Guild,
1653 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE GUTKNECHT AND MR. VINCENT: In the recent elections for delegates from the District of Columbia to the 1940 convention of the National Lawyers Guild, a group of candidates stood on a platform of unequivocal opposition to nazism, communism, fascism, and other movements which similarly reject the principles of free press, free speech, freedom of assembly, right of religious worship, and fair trials. These candidates undertook, if elected as delegates, to cast their votes at the 1940 Guild convention for national officers of the Guild who share these views. Of the twenty candidates who stood on this platform, fourteen were defeated.

The reasons for that defeat cannot be ascribed to lack of interest in the Guild on the part of the candidates, for among the defeated candidates are the National Treasurer of the Guild, who is also the Vice President of the District Chapter, the chairman of the local chapter's membership, forum, and professional economics committee, the chairman of several national standing committees, and other individuals who have demonstrated by labor their devotion of the organization. I can therefore conclude only that the principles on which these individuals stood for election were distasteful to a majority of the voting members of the chapter.

Considering these principles to be a central reason for the Guild's existence, I am compelled to resign from membership in the Guild, and thereby from membership on the National Executive Board of the Guild, and from membership on the Executive Committee of the District Chapter.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN R. MARGOLD.

(The above was marked Exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. VINCENT. May I make a comment?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. VINCENT. Mr. Margold knows that the possible implications there, that he and those who stood for, or those who stood for election on that platform, that others were not of the same mind, is not justified. I think that anyone who knows Judge Gutknecht would not suggest that he is anything but a Democrat.

As a matter of fact, he was one of the men who was chiefly concerned over what he regarded as the Communist or fellow-traveler influence in New York. He had no such views of his own Chicago chapter; he came to Washington and met with members of us, and as a matter of fact, I called a special meeting for him to appear. He had no such concern relative to the majority who were active in the Washington chapter. He was very critical of others who he regarded as either belonging to or influenced by, I will put it, the Communist group. Respecting a great majority of them, the implications of the letter are inaccurate and unjust.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the letter of resignation Mr. Margold wrote as follows [reading]:

In the recent elections for delegates from the District of Columbia to the 1940 convention of the National Lawyers Guild, a group of candidates stood on a platform of unequivocal opposition to Nazism, Communism, Fascism, and other movements which similarly reject the principles of free press, free speech, freedom of assembly, right of religious worship, and fair trials. These candidates

undertook, if elected as delegates, to cast their votes at the 1940 Guild convention for national officers of the Guild who share these views. Of the twenty-candidates who stood on this platform, fourteen were defeated.

I think reading that would make it clear what it is you are referring to in your remarks. I would like to ask you if during the discussions over the elections of delegates from the District of Columbia chapter to the national convention of the Lawyers Guild in 1940 you circulated a memorandum touching on this issue which had been raised.

Mr. VINCENT. I helped prepare a statement which I think was circulated before the election.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Could you identify that as a copy of the statement to which you refer [hands paper to Mr. Vincent]?

Mr. VINCENT. I think so.

Mr. THOMAS. Your answer is "yes"?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that there were those two—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as exhibit 2 a two-page mimeograph statement dated May 18, 1940, addressed to "Fellow Members of the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild" signed, "Merle D. Vincent," and having appended at the end a list of some 22 names of persons who state that they share the President's view, that is Mr. Vincent's view, as expressed in the letter.

Mr. THOMAS. It will be included in the record.

EXHIBIT 2

MAY 18, 1940.

Fellow Members of the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Lawyers' Guilds:

A group of candidates of this Chapter for delegates to the National Convention of the National Lawyers' Guild have circularized members with a certain declaration of principles, constituting the platform upon which they stand for election. I do not intend to advocate or oppose any group of candidates but I believe I should explain the origins and attempt to clarify the issues raised by this declaration. As initially circulated this declaration contained the following sentence: "The election of any candidate refusing to subscribe to this statement necessarily will be interpreted as a rejection of this impersonal platform." I first heard of it when Mr. Curry read it to me over the telephone and asked me to approve it. I questioned the propriety of this procedure and test and wrote Mr. Curry in part as follows:

"I do not agree with the idea of test declarations or test oaths. This is one of the first steps in policies which the Committee's statement condemns. Such tests are characteristic of dictatorial regimes. They are not in my judgment consistent with democracy. Being a democrat who believes our constitution and form of government are both sufficient and justified I feel competent to analyze the import and implications of such a requirement.

"For example, my first choices for President of the Guild for the coming year are Lloyd Garrison and Malcolm Sharp. I should certainly resent and reject a proposal to require them to subscribe to a test declaration of their patriotism. Nevertheless, if a majority of the Convention considered such a test necessary in the present chaotic and menacing circumstances confronting democracy I should acquiesce without agreeing with such decision but I do not believe democratic authority for such decision rests in a self-appointed committee which is necessarily a minority in advance of the convening of the Convention.

"It is my understanding that such a test is being applied by the Committee to candidates for delegates and will likewise be insisted upon for candidates for the national offices. If elected I shall be very happy to serve as a delegate to the National Convention this month in New York but I shall have to be accepted as I am and for what I have been—not upon the basis of a present willingness to subscribe to a test as a condition of election.

"Don't you think we had better leave to the dictatorships of Europe the techniques of their system and continue to pursue the traditional methods and practices of democracy?"

I cannot accept the claim of any self-appointed group within the Guild to a monopoly in devotion to the principles of democracy, nor its right to challenge the devotion of other members to the principles clearly expressed in the constitution of the Guild. I am not aware of any facts which would justify the sponsors of this test declaration to sit in judgment on the integrity of other members, or their fitness as candidates for delegates to the Convention. In short, I am convinced that the test declaration being circulated as a platform of eligibility raises a purely fictitious issue which can only lead to dissension within the Guild and divert its energies from its principles and objects.

Perhaps, to some, the willingness of a candidate to declare his adherence to obvious generalities which are incorporated in the constitution of the Guild, and to which no one can take exception, constitutes the basis upon which they will lend their support. I am much more concerned with the stand the candidate will take on concrete issues, such as Amendments to the Wagner Act, Amendments to the Social Security Act, Housing, a Public Health Program, the Dies Committee, the use of the antitrust laws against labor, the many alien bills now pending before Congress, and other such vital issues which in my opinion are more concrete and revealing tests. I am much more concerned with a candidate's public record of activity on vital issues than I am in his public professions urged upon him on the eve of an election.

Very truly yours,

MERLE D. VINCENT, *President.*

(Due to lack of time it has been impossible to reach all candidates for delegate. The undersigned candidates for election as delegates to the national convention subscribe in all respects to the views expressed in the above letter of President Vincent.)

Bernard Cahn, David Cohen, Edward Fruchtman, Albert Gerber, William H. Hastie, Allen Heald, Martin A. Kurasch, Robert W. Ming, Jr., Joseph Kovner, Stanley Morris, Shad Polier, John W. Porter, David Rein, Mortimer Riemer, George Slaff, Lorton Stavis, Ruth Weyand, Ann Landy Wolf, Lee Pressman.

(The above was marked Exhibit No. 2.)

Mr. VINCENT. May I see that letter again?

(Exhibit 1 is handed to Mr. Vincent.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Vincent, in this statement you took a position opposing the selection of delegates from the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild to the national convention on the basis which had been proposed by Mr. Margold and others; is that correct?

Mr. VINCENT. Not exactly correct, Mr. Matthews. I opposed the idea of a test of a candidate. I believed there should be an open judgment on the character of the candidates without subjecting them to any test. May I add a word, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. THOMAS. What was your question there?

Mr. MATTHEWS. If in his communication he did not oppose the selection of delegates on the basis which had been proposed by Mr. Margold and others.

Mr. THOMAS. Can't you answer that?

Mr. VINCENT. I was not opposed to the principles expressed. I was opposed to the practice of a small group imposing as a test of qualifications a statement of their own which the organization had had no opportunity to pass upon. May I supplement that by saying at a subsequent meeting of the National Lawyers Guild action was taken upon this development abroad and in that organization, in the action taken I insisted that the resolution should include a condemnation not only of the dictatorships in general but by specification. And I might

say, Mr. Chairman, that that resolution is amended to correspond to the suggestions I named; namely, Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and the Soviet Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Communist Russia?

Mr. VINCENT. Whether it referred to Communist Russia or the Soviet government, it referred to Russia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did that resolution condemn the dictatorships of those three countries or did it condemn the governments of the three countries?

Mr. VINCENT. It condemned the governments, the type of governments. It condemned in particular, I remember, the invasion of Finland.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The reason I asked you that, Mr. Vincent, is this: You may or may not know that the Communist Party has said that its members may join in a condemnation of the dictatorship of communism, because there is no such thing, and I wanted to be sure that that subterfuge had not been employed.

Mr. VINCENT. I am afraid, Mr. Matthews, you are a better authority than I am. I do not know its practices and rules.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is so stated in the Daily Worker.

Mr. VINCENT. It may interest you to know, as a citizen I have a right to read anything upon which I desire information. It just so happens I never read a copy of the Daily Worker.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Margold and others did propose a test based upon an unequivocal rejection of nazi-ism, fascism, and communism.

Mr. VINCENT. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And it was that test which you opposed.

Mr. VINCENT. I opposed the idea of a test which carried with it an implication that this group of men would pass upon character and qualifications of an organization of any of its members, not one of whom except themselves had had an opportunity to sit down together and discuss what conditions might be imposed upon candidates for delegates. In other words, I opposed a little group taking it into their own hands. I had no objection to the views they expressed. They were expressing the views that were the common views of the members of the organization. As a matter of fact it was one of those little internal organization struggles for election and control of delegates, and as I told you, I voted for candidates on both slates.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Lawyers Guild of Washington numbered how many members?

Mr. VINCENT. Something over 400. I could not give you the exact number.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was a majority of these Government employees, or do you know?

Mr. VINCENT. I think the majority of them were Government employees; yes. I am sure of that.

Mr. THOMAS. While on this Lawyers Guild, after Mr. Jackson and others turned in their resignations, did you still continue on as president of the Washington branch?

Mr. VINCENT. I did, and I want to tell you why. I thought the action taken under the circumstances—it was taken—that is these resignations were an unjust, inaccurate, unfair reflection upon, generally upon the members of an organization, a majority of whom were

loyal and devoted citizens. They did not want the organization destroyed. I said I did not care to be president again. I made it emphatic.

Mr. THOMAS. But you said that how long after Mr. Jackson resigned?

Mr. VINCENT. I didn't say that until the end of the term.

Mr. THOMAS. How long after?

Mr. VINCENT. It was several months.

Mr. THOMAS. When Mr. Jackson claimed in his statement that the Lawyers' Guild—I don't know the exact wording, but the purport of it, as I recall now, was to the effect that it was influenced by communism. When he made that statement did you deny it?

Mr. VINCENT. Not in answer to his letter. I called first an executive committee meeting to discuss it. If I remember correctly, I advised that a membership meeting be called to discuss it and to determine what action they desired to take about it. I wouldn't assume from memory to report what was said or the precise action subsequently taken, but the view that prevailed was that the charges that Mr. Berle, Mr. Jackson, and others made, applied to a very small minority of the membership of the guild.

Mr. THOMAS. Was that your view also?

Mr. VINCENT. That was my view. I think that a very substantial majority of those people were in nowise influenced by any Communist belief or association. They wanted to continue the organization.

At the end of the term I told them I did not care to become a candidate for reelection—the practice is to appoint committees to nominate. The usual committee was appointed. I told them I would not be a candidate. After several sessions they were unable to agree upon anyone. They asked me to serve again. I did so because I felt an obligation to stand by men who were under a cloud of an unjust implication by the resignations that had occurred. I was asked to continue by such men as Lester Schoene, who subsequently became president. Certainly nobody will suggest that he has any Communist sympathies.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you spell the name?

Mr. VINCENT. S-c-h-o-e-n-e. General counsel for the Railroad Retirement Board, or was at that time. Mr. Thomas Anderson was one. Mr. Gerald Riley was another.

Mr. THOMAS. Why do you think Mr. Jackson or Mr. Berle could have made such a statement, unless they knew pretty well what was going on, and they certainly must have known something about the National Lawyers Guild.

Mr. VINCENT. During my presidency they were not in active attendance. I remember Mr. Berle attended once and made an address. I don't remember Mr. Jackson attending. I have no doubt that they entertained these views respecting a number of individuals. The point I am making is not that they did not think as genuinely as I think I was thinking at the time and am now, but that their conclusions were not true as applied to the majority of the membership of the organization.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be so; but don't you think they drew those conclusions as a result of certain resolutions you passed? You yourself admitted that there were a number of resolutions that you did not agree with, did not care for.

Mr. VINCENT. No, no. That, Mr. Chairman, were resolutions proposed at the—

Mr. THOMAS. Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. VINCENT. Washington Committee for Democratic Action; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Don't you think then that the same was probably true of the Lawyers Guild, that the Lawyers Guild approved certain resolutions?

Mr. VINCENT. Mr. Chairman, I would be quite willing for your committee to examine every committee report and resolution in formal action taken, whether it was the adoption of a committee report or something that came up on the floor during the time I was president, to determine that. I think you will find nothing in those actions that justify what I will say is a reflection upon the general board of membership and nothing to confirm their reflections. As a matter of fact, the usual actions of the guild were on matters, subjects that bar associations—I was president of my State bar association, I was president of it at the time I quit practice—and it dealt with such subjects as they deal with, or the National Bar Association. In addition to that they frequently had—I say frequently—they had at least an occasional committee consideration of pending legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but why—I just can't understand why a group of candidates would make a strong point that they were against fascism and nazi-ism and communism and why it should be a big factor in the election of officers for this organization. What brought about their—

Mr. VINCENT. This brought it about: When Judge Pecora ended his term as president of the National he was succeeded by Judge Gutknecht, of Chicago, who, I believe, was a unanimous choice. I did not attend the convention, but I think he was the unanimous choice. Shortly after Judge Pecora issued a statement which you may have seen denouncing the communistic influences in the New York City chapter—I am not sure whether he included other chapters, too—I think his statement reflected generally on parts of the membership of other chapters. Judge Gutknecht was greatly concerned about it—what I am saying now he told me—he went to New York to see Judge Pecora. He thought that he should not be let in for a unanimous choice as a successor and assumed that he was the head of an organization of the character he assumed the guild was, and to then be told by the president who had just retired, and a man of great influence, that the organization was dominated by Communist interests. And he told me he protested against the injustice to himself of that. And he said, "If that is true, I told Judge Pecora, that I wouldn't remain as president for another hour." He told me that he visited in New York with a number of members of the organization; that he had visited with members of the Chicago chapter before he left and that he had come to Washington for the purpose of visiting with us.

He said, "I want to find out the kind of an organization you have. I will not remain as national president if the charges that Judge Pecora has made apply to the membership of the principal chapters," and he said, "The principal chapters are the Chicago chapter, the New York chapter and the Washington chapter." He said, "That is not true of the Chicago chapter, and I am up here to find out whether it is of Washington." I said, "Judge Gutknecht, I want

you to meet anybody that you want to meet. As a matter of fact there are members called at the hotel"—I called a membership meeting, I wouldn't be sure whether I called that at his request, but it was in conference with him and a number of others that it was called. He appeared to discuss these charges that were made. He made his own position clear. He said, "I wouldn't remain at the head of an organization that was Communist controlled or influenced in any way," and he said, "My decision to remain will be made upon my own decision of what the character is."

Later, before he left the city, he told me that he thought he would remain. He said it was not a very happy situation to be left in, but he did not want to do the organization nor the members of it an injustice. He said, I "am not going to say a word now." Later upon returning to Chicago he did announce that he was going to remain. I recall a few weeks or a few months later he came back to Washington.

I got a group hastily together, probably 40 or 50, at a little dinner at which he desired to discuss the Guild policy, he said, "so there may be no question about the character of this organization, I think we ought to confine ourselves to certain subjects," and he outlined them.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. Jackson resigned for that reason; Berle resigned for that reason; Judge Pecora resigned for that reason. How many others resigned for that same reason?

Mr. VINCENT. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I would say there were 40 to 50 resigned at that time.

Mr. THOMAS. And you think they were all mistaken?

Mr. VINCENT. I don't think any of them knew the membership as a whole. They were men who did not take active part in it. I know it was an unjust reflection upon a very great many good people who were plain simple Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. THOMAS. What has it got to do with whether they were Democrats or Republicans? I notice you bring that up quite often. Do you mean to infer that the Communist Party is also a political party?

Mr. VINCENT. I don't know what it is.

Mr. THOMAS. You are always referring to Democrats and Republicans. Why not bring in Protestants. I must infer that you consider the Communist Party as a political party.

Mr. VINCENT. Nothing I said justifies that inference.

Mr. THOMAS. Why do you bring that in then?

Mr. VINCENT. May I repeat that nothing justifies that inference.

Mr. THOMAS. Why do you refer to Republicans and Democrats all the time?

Mr. VINCENT. Because I regard it as a rather distinctive fact if a man is a Democrat or a Republican in his life I think it rather indicates his views towards this Government. I have disagreed with many, but I have not found any Democrats or Republicans that I regard as public enemies.

Further I referred also, Mr. Chairman, to the specific action which the Lawyers Guild has taken while I was president. I am not assuming to speak of the action they took before or the action they took after.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the resolution that they passed, that you referred to before, condemning Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy and Communist Russia.

Mr. VINCENT. That was one of them. That was in our national executive committee meeting. I am now referring to the action taken by the Washington chapter, and I would be very glad to have you or somebody for your committee to examine every formal action of any sort by which you test the attitude of the organization toward the Government, while I was president. I invite it. May I add another thing. I am not here defending my position to a job in the the Government. I have enjoyed Government service but I don't need or have to have Government employment. I am here as a citizen who has had no previous opportunity to have and be confronted by a single man who has made insane charges that are false as hell.

Mr. THOMAS. What are those charges that you refer to?

Mr. VINCENT. I refer to the charges that group me with a number of other individuals, on whom I am not assuming to pass, except that I know some of them are good citizens. Many of them I do not know. In which I was referred to as a pro-Communist bureaucrat.

Mr. THOMAS. So you take exception to the fact that it was unjust to call you a pro-Communist?

Mr. VINCENT. Well, I certainly do, or having been influenced in any way by them.

Mr. THOMAS. You also believe it is unjust to call you a bureaucrat?

Mr. VINCENT. Well, I am not taking issue on the bureaucrat thing, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all I have. Do you have any more questions, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, I have.

Mr. VINCENT. I take it "bureaucrat" is subject to legitimate debate in and out of Congress.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As I recall the testimony, the record is not exactly clear as to some dates. I would like to ask the witness how long a period were officers of the Washington chapter elected for?

Mr. VINCENT. One year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. One year. The reason I think there is some confusion, at one point you stated that several months after Mr. Berle's resignation and Mr. Jackson's resignation you left the presidency of the Chapter?

Mr. VINCENT. No. I think at first I said I remained a year afterward. As a matter of fact, from the correspondence which is here, I think those resignations occurred during the first year I was president. I know they did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is 1940?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes. And after the expiration of that term, I served one more term of one year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you personally acquainted with Thomas I. Emerson?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he one of the men who personally urged you to accept that second term of office?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is he or has he been an assistant general counsel in the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes; he is the same man.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Mortimer Riemer?

Mr. VINCENT. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he an official of the Lawyers Guild in Washington?

Mr. VINCENT. I don't remember that he was. He may have been a member of some committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he one of those who urged you to accept a second term?

Mr. VINCENT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Lee Pressman urge you to accept a second term?

Mr. VINCENT. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What about George Slaff?

Mr. VINCENT. I don't remember. The men that urged me were the members of this committee—were on this appointed—this nominating committee, and I cannot recall who all the members were.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that all you have?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all, Mr. Vincent. Thank you very much for coming here.

Mr. VINCENT. Very well, Mr. Chairman. I want to say to you that I appreciate the opportunity of coming before a member of the committee and being questioned and an opportunity to answer questions. This is precisely what I think should have been done before publicity was given to charges as grave as have been made against myself and others, and I want to say that I think others have the same right, whether I know them or not know anything about them. I think they have the same right. I know very few of these other gentlemen with whose name mine was listed. I know some of them, and I know they are good citizens and I know they are thoroughly loyal and devoted to this Government.

Mr. THOMAS. If I were you I wouldn't say anything about some of the others. I listened to some of their testimony and I think it is just amazing that people belong to the radical organizations that they do. I listened to the testimony of Robert Morss Lovett, and I want to tell you that he did not miss any radical organization or any Communist front organization. When we got all through questioning him, I asked if there were some that we missed, and he gave us a few that we did.

Mr. VINCENT. He is what we call in our part of the country a "joiner"—one who joins all the lodges in town.

Mr. Chairman, I am not assuming to make a defense for anybody except in the particular that I think anybody who is charged with a very serious charge should have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. THOMAS. I agree with that.

Mr. VINCENT. That is all I am saying here now.

Mr. THOMAS. I fully agree with you, and I am very glad you came here today. That will be all. Thank you.

Mr. VINCENT. Very good.
(Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF WALTER GELLHORN, NEW YORK REGIONAL ATTORNEY AND ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please give your full name.

Mr. GELLHORN. Walter Gellhorn.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. GELLHORN. St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On what date?

Mr. GELLHORN. September 18, 1906.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What has your education been?

Mr. GELLHORN. I went to college at Amherst; have an A. B. degree in 1927; went to Columbia University Law School and received my LL. B. degree there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what year?

Mr. GELLHORN. In 1931.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What has been your professional experience?

Mr. GELLHORN. After I graduated from law school my first position was that of law secretary to Justice Harlan F. Stone, of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you serve in that capacity?

Mr. GELLHORN. I was with him for a year. Then I went into the office of the Solicitor General of the United States, in the Department of Justice—Judge Tom Thatcher was the Solicitor General then—and I was there for a year, and then I returned to New York and became a member of the law faculty of Columbia University in that year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is 1933?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; in the autumn of 1933. I have been a member of the faculty continuously since, though I am on leave now, and have during that period, except when in Government service, engaged in private consultation work. Among the Government positions I have held since then are those in the Federal Government from 1936, about June, as I recall it—no; I think it was later than that—at any rate, the summer of 1936 until September 1938, I was a regional attorney for the Social Security Board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The New York regional attorney?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; the New York regional attorney. And then commencing in June 1939, and extending until just the fore part of 1941 I was a director of the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure. I became regional attorney and assistant general counsel for the Office of Price Administration in January 1942, and that is the position I am now occupying.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your salary in your position with the Social Security Board?

Mr. GELLHORN. My recollection, Dr. Matthews, is that it commenced at \$5,600 and was \$6,200 when I terminated—62 or 65. At any rate, there was an increase of some sort during the period.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And with the Attorney General?

Mr. GELLHORN. \$7,500.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And your present salary?

Mr. GELLHORN. \$8,000.

Mr. THOMAS. I didn't hear the witness as to his present position.

Mr. GELLHORN. I am regional attorney and general assistant counsel of the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the New York region?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How extensive is the New York region?

Mr. GELLHORN. The region covers five States: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia. In addition to those Federal positions, I have had some temporary connections with State and municipal agencies spread over the years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who were your sponsors in your present position?

Mr. GELLHORN. I am not sure I understand that question. I did not make application for the position. I was asked to take it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know any persons who recommended you for your present position?

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't know whether Mr. Henderson and Mr. Ginsberg consulted—I was invited by them—I knew both of them in the periods in my prior work in Washington—and I don't know whether they consulted other people or not. I was asked to do it and after some consideration decided I would.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you apply for your position in the Social Security Board?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who asked you to take that position?

Mr. GELLHORN. The general counsel at that time was a fellow named Thomas H. Elliott—I suppose, Chairman, you know him. He was for a brief period one of your colleagues.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes.

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't know whether I was invited by Elliott or Governor Winant. My recollection is that it was the latter—Governor Winant. I may say in that connection, if it is a matter of interest, that I worked at Governor Lehman's request and some others here in New York State on problems relating to unemployment insurance which were of interest to the Social Security Board and had some contact with the Social Security Board. I imagine that was the genesis of that association.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On February 1, 1943, Mr. Dies, of Texas, made an address before the House of Representatives in Washington, and in that address he referred to you as follows [reading]:

Walter Gellhorn, assistant general counsel of the Office of Price Administration in the New York office, at a salary of \$8,000, was a lecturer this week at the Communist Party's Workers School.

Is that a correct statement of fact?

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't remember whether it was within the week of his address, Dr. Matthews, but it is true that I made an address at the Workers School. I don't know whether it is connected with the Communist Party or not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether that address was made on or about January 23, 1943?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; that is my recollection. I can confirm that in just a moment, if I may—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. GELLHORN. That is correct, January 23.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who invited you to deliver that lecture at the school?

Mr. GELLHORN. Would you like me to state this thing in consecutive fashion or question and answer form?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was it invited you to give the lecture?

Mr. GELLHORN. First, the invitation was addressed to me at the Office of Price Administration by Samuel Barron, signing himself as administrative secretary to the school.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the Workers School?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the invitation on the letterhead of the Workers School?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes, it was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you a copy of the letter or the letter itself.

Mr. GELLHORN. I have a copy of it, Dr. Matthews. I didn't take the original from the files.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was there something else you wanted to say about that engagement?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; I would like to tell the whole story.

Mr. THOMAS. Go ahead.

Mr. GELLHORN. And if agreeable to you, Dr. Matthews, I will leave with you a memo I addressed to the general counsel of O. P. A. when my attention had been called to that address by Congressman Dies.

Mr. THOMAS. We will include it in the record.

FEBRUARY 5, 1943.

Memorandum.

To: David Ginsburg, General Counsel, Washington, D. C.

From: Walter Gellhorn, regional attorney, region II.

My attention has been drawn to a recent address by Representative Dies, in which he denounced as Communists or otherwise undesirable a number of Government employees, including me. As to me, Mr. Dies is quoted as having said: "Walter Gellhorn, Assistant General Counsel of the Office of Price Administration in the New York Office at a salary of \$8,000, was a lecturer this week at the Communist Party's Workers School." (Congressional Record, February 1, 1943, p. 512.)

The implication is, of course, that I am in some way connected with that school, or that I have lectured there on the subject of communism. The actual fact is that I spoke at the Workers' School on January 23, 1943, as a representative of the Office of Price Administration on the subject, Price Control and Rationing. This is the first and only occasion on which I have either addressed or attended a session of the Workers' School.

The circumstances may be briefly stated. On December 26, 1942, the following letter was addressed to me by Samuel Barron, administrative secretary of the Workers' School:

WORKERS SCHOOL

35 East Twelfth Street, New York City. Algonquin 4-1190

William Weinstone, Director

DECEMBER 26, 1943.

Prof. WALTER GELLHORN,

Office of Price Administration Office,

Empire State Building.

DEAR PROFESSOR GELLHORN: The Workers' School is undertaking to organize a form series on the important subject of war economy, a vital part of which is the question of consumers' goods and problems. We would like an authoritative statement on this question.

The audience will be composed of trade unionists who have been bothered by the lack of clarity as well as discontent in their day to day contact with merchants, shopkeepers, etc. It would be a real contribution to the war effort to bring understanding to this large section of the American people. The meeting is scheduled for Saturday afternoon, January 16, 2:30 p. m.

We would appreciate the opportunity to have you state the case and answer what questions may come up. Since the date of the meeting is so close, we would appreciate an immediate answer from you whether you can undertake this engagement.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL BARRON,
Administrative Secretary.

As with all routine requests for speakers, invitation was referred by me to the head of the information division in the regional office, at that time Mr. Lester P. Faneuf. In due season Mr. Faneuf returned the invitation to me with a request that I accept it if I could fit the engagement into my existing schedule. Accordingly, on January 2, 1943, I responded to Mr. Barron as follows:

JANUARY 2, 1943.

Mr. SAMUEL BARRON,
*Administrative Secretary, Workers' School,
New York, N. Y.*

DEAR MR. BARRON: Forgive my delay in responding to your letter of December 26 inviting me to address a meeting at the Workers' School on January 16, subsequently changed to January 23.

I am glad to accept the invitation and shall await your further advice as to the exact time and place of the meeting.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER GELLHORN,
Regional Attorney.

The final item in this exchange of correspondence is dated January 16, 1943, and reads as follows:

WORKERS' SCHOOL

35 East Twelfth Street, New York City. Algonquin 4-1199

William Weinstone, Director

JANUARY 16, 1943.

Prof. WALTER GELLHORN,
Office of Price Administration, New York, N. Y.

DEAR PROFESSOR GELLHORN: I have just discovered that through some accident, your letter of January 2, in which you accepted the invitation to address a meeting sponsored by the Workers' School on January 23, was not answered.

I called your office on Friday, January 15, but you were unfortunately not in. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your acceptance. The meeting will take place at Webster Hall, 119 East Eleventh Street, at 2:30 on January 23.

I am sure that you will bring some clarity to offset the confusion with regard to the problems of the consumer, which are becoming more pressing than ever.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL BARRON,
Administrative Secretary.

You will observe that both the occasion and the arrangements differed in no aspect from the common place scheduling of public meetings to discuss Office of Price Administration matters. Among organizations which I have addressed on precisely the same basis as the Workers' School are the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, the New York State Conference of Mayors, the Rotary Club of Bronx County, the Workmen's Circle (said to be a Socialist affiliate), the New York State Bankers Association, the War Conference of the American Bar Association, the New York Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, the practicing Law Institute, the Consumers Councils of Baltimore, the Council of Trade Association Executives, and many others. I have also spoken on a number of radio programs in the same way and for the same purpose; that is, the education of the public concerning price, rationing, and rent regulations.

As for the Workers' School meeting itself, my audience was unfortunately a very small one, probably no more than 50. I have a transcript of the entire

discussion, which was recorded by a stenotypist. The chairlady introduced me as follows:

Well, we are very lucky this afternoon to have Professor Gellhorn, from the Office of Price Administration, speak to us on the problem of consumers and the war. Professor Gellhorn is the regional attorney for this district, district 2, and he has taken a lead in prosecuting all rent violators, and I believe he's also been very active in the black-market prosecutions. I am sure that what he has to tell us will be of tremendous interest."

I then proceeded to speak for some 40 minutes on the problems of Office of Price Administration regulations and their enforcement. The transcript is of course available if anyone should perchance be interested in it.

I forward you this information for such use as may seem to you to be proper.

Mr. GELLHORN. Congressman Thomas, the circumstances were these, as this list of letters indicate.

On December 26 this letter which I just mentioned from Mr. Barron was addressed to me. Let me read you its pertinent portions, if I may: "Dear Professor Gellhorn."

I may say, in passing, that is a title I don't use, but people who don't know me sometimes do.

DEAR PROFESSOR GELLHORN: The Workers' School is undertaking to organize a forum series on the important subject of war economy, a vital part of which is the question of consumers goods and problems. We would like an authoritative statement on this question.

The audience will be composed of trade unionists who have been bothered by the lack of clarity as well as discontent in their day to day contact with merchants, shop keepers, etc. It would be a real contribution to the war effort to bring understanding to this large section of the American people. The meeting is scheduled for Saturday afternoon, January 16th, 2:30 p. m.

We would appreciate the opportunity to have you state the case and answer what questions may come up.

Since the date of the meeting is so close, we would appreciate an immediate answer from you whether you can undertake this engagement.

That was received in my office as a perfectly routine request for speakers on O. P. A. problems, of which I receive a substantial number, and which I pointed out, in my memorandum to the General Counsel, I referred that request to the head of the information of the regional office.

Mr. THOMAS. What is his name?

Mr. GELLHORN. Lester P. Faneuf. He has since become a director of public relations for the Bell Aircraft and is no longer with us.

In due season, as this memorandum to the General Counsel states, Mr. Faneuf returned the invitation to me with a request that I accept it if I could put the engagement into my existing schedule.

On January 2 I responded to Mr. Barron, a copy of my letter is here, in which I said simply I would accept the invitation and would "Await your further advice as to the exact time and place of the meeting."

The final exchange of correspondence between Barron and me is dated January 16, also set forth here in full, which reads as follows:

I have just discovered that through some accident your letter of January 2, in which you accepted the invitation to address a meeting sponsored by the Workers' School on January 23, was not answered.

He gives me the time and place of the meeting and concludes:

I am sure that you will bring some clarity to offset the confusion with regard to the problems of the consumer, which are becoming more pressing than ever.

Then, as I indicate in this general memorandum to the General Counsel—while I am referring to this memorandum I am also giving these statements directly as part of my testimony under oath to you, Congressmen:

You will observe that both the occasion and the arrangements differed in no aspect from the commonplace scheduling of public meetings to discuss Office of Price Administration matters. Among organizations which I have addressed on precisely the same basis as the Workers' School are the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, the New York State Conference of Mayors, the Rotary Club of Bronx County, the Workmens Circle (said to be a Socialist affiliate), the New York State Bankers Association, the Aallegheny County (Pa.) Bar Association, the War Conference of the American Bar Association, the New York chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, the Practicing Law Institute, the Consumers Councils of Baltimore, the Council of Trade Association Executives, and many others.

And I may add that I have spoken on a number of radio programs with the same purpose and in the same way, to discuss the price, rationing, and rent controls for the Agency for which I work. As for the meeting itself, the audience numbered no more than 50, from the standpoint of one who is interested in getting across a message of O. P. A.—is uninteresting.

I spoke for perhaps 40 minutes on the problems of O. P. A. regulations and their enforcement, answered questions, and that was the sum of the whole thing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to ask you a theoretical question. If you received an invitation from the German-American Bund, would you have accepted its invitation to speak on O. P. A. questions under the auspices of the bund?

Mr. GELLHORN. With the greatest reluctance, Dr. Matthews. I would be glad to state what my own personal position on speaking engagements has been, if you care to have it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Can you answer that question?

Mr. GELLHORN. I should certainly accept it with the greatest of reluctance and unless directed to do so I should not do so.

The issue of speaking engagements came up it chanced very shortly before the occasion of this address concerning which you are now addressing me. It came concretely before me and under these terms: About six of the seven division heads in the regional office received simultaneously a form invitation to address what was described, if my recollection is correct, as a monster mass meeting on prices and rationing problems, which was being organized by the Harlem branch of the Communist Party. In our regional office the division heads, and Congressman, we have a running division, a price division, an information division, and my own, which is the legal division, and so on. The division heads have a very brief morning meeting five times a week, right at the start of business, simply to integrate our activities and to exchange views on policy matters. And on the day that this invitation was received by me, of the meeting of the Harlem branch, or district, or whatever it was called, of the Communist Party, I took it to this policy meeting in the morning and said that here was a speaking invitation of a type which I thought raised a policy question and which we ought to consider in a group, and went on to state my feelings that speaking invitations are not to be accepted from the Communist Party. And I might say by way of interpolation that if the issue, I think, was raised broadly from political parties as a

whole, I think we should also feel that we should not accept invitations from them, because as I put it, even though a representative of O. P. A. was at a meeting for the purpose of stating the official view, some people would argue he was there not as a representative of O. P. A. but because of the political auspices of the thing.

Mr. THOMAS. You don't mean to infer that the Communist Party is a political party?

Mr. GELLHORN. It is so described, Congressman. I am not trying to be philosophical about this.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you yourself believe it is?

Mr. GELLHORN. It purports to be a political organization and it is so recognized in that it runs candidates for office and appears in electoral campaigns.

Mr. THOMAS. You really believe that the Communist Party is a political party?

Mr. GELLHORN. If one defines political parties as I have.

Mr. THOMAS. You can answer it "yes" or "no," although I am not going to hold you to that kind of an answer.

Mr. GELLHORN. At least, as I understand the definition of a political party, it is a political party. It may also be something else. I am not speaking of that. As I take it it is a political party in the sense that it runs candidates, it maintains election campaigns, and has ballots counted at elections.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you say it may be something else, aren't you sure that something else overshadows its political nature?

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't have adequate information on that.

Mr. THOMAS. You have heard that the Communist Party believes in the overthrow of government by force and violence?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have heard it so described.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the Republican or Democratic Party does not advocate the overthrow of government by force or violence.

Mr. GELLHORN. Certainly not. I maintained in this group meeting that we should not accept that type of invitation and indicated my personal unwillingness to do so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the date of that meeting?

Mr. GELLHORN. It antedated this school meeting. It was sometime about the forepart of the year. I don't remember the date. The majority of that little group at that time, at least—the question has not been presented again—took the position that if a Government agency was asked to explain a Government problem to any group, so long as there was no confusion as to the function of the meeting, that is to say if the explanation of the Government's problem was not linked with something else, that it was the function of government to explain itself. The distinction that was made by the majority was that if it were at a time of an election campaign and there was any possibility for candidates for office being on the rostrum it would be a different story. But so long as the meeting was to have a different functioning, the discussion of rationing in this instance, then we could participate. I was in the minority.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many were at the meeting?

Mr. GELLHORN. As well as I recall it there were the full group—six or seven division heads. I mentioned that in response to your question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider the Communist Party a subversive organization?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have seen very strong evidence to that effect.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you read the Attorney General's decision in the Bridges' deportation case?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have read the newspaper accounts of it. I don't think I have seen the full text of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You recall that he states in the opinion, words to this effect:

The Communist Party from its inception in 1919 down to the present time has advised, aided, and advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Mr. GELLHORN. I have the impression.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is finding No. 1—

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the decision. Does the evidence that you have had occasion to see in your legal experience convince you that the Attorney General is correct in that statement?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have not had a great deal of evidence in that sense. I have never been connected with that organization. I think what I know about the Communist Party is what other intelligent people know who read the public prints.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On the basis that you may know, is it your considered opinion that the Communist Party is a subversive organization?

Mr. GELLHORN. It is my considered opinion that the Communist Party is more concerned with the feelings of a foreign country than our own. Whether that connotes a determination to overthrow our Government I don't know, but it certainly seems to me that it prefers the interest of the Soviet Union to the interest of the United States of America.

Mr. THOMAS. How old are you, by the way?

Mr. GELLHORN. Thirty-seven.

Mr. THOMAS. Are you married?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; I have two children.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you ever attended any other meetings other than the one, or addressed any other meetings other than the ones you mentioned there?

Mr. GELLHORN. Other than the organizations I have mentioned?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; I have attended and addressed many for the Price Administration. This a fair sample of their character. I have never attended before a session of the Workers School, either as a member or as a speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you ever addressed any meeting of an organization that would be in the same class as the Workers School?

Mr. GELLHORN. I addressed the Workmen's Circle, which I understand to be an affiliate. So far as I can recall, it is the only organization that might be considered to be on the left side.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you recall any others, meetings similar to the Workers School or the Workmen's Circle?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I am quite sure there has been no others. I have, however, addressed many meetings I did not list here—bar

associations and things of that sort. It was, I might say, in the early months of our functioning as it seemed to us best to appear before various groups and explain the program we were trying to develop.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said you had an invitation to address this Harlem Communist gathering.

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you accept that invitation?

Mr. GELLHORN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On what basis did you decline it?

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't think I gave any reason.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you decline because it was under communistic influence?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it subsequent to that declination that the heads of the O. P. A. had this meeting?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; it was before the meeting, in the face of the declaration of the majority that they thought we should accept invitations. I declined because of my personal distaste.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mean contrary to the majority's decision?

Mr. GELLHORN. The majority—the issue was not specifically whether I as an individual should accept, but merely whether representatives of the Office of Price Administration should in all circumstances decline that type of invitation. For all I know some representative of the Office of Price Administration may have participated in the meeting. I have no information on that subject. As I say, the invitations were addressed, it seems to me, rather indiscriminately, so it was not pointed in any way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What distinction do you draw in your own mind between the Communist Party and the Workers School?

Mr. GELLHORN. I know nothing of the Workers School except what it purports to be.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you make any inquiries as to its political connections?

Mr. GELLHORN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A previous witness before this subcommittee had a similar invitation, the same month, to address an audience of the Workers School; in fact, on the same program. He stated he turned the invitation over to his information in the division and that his information in the division promptly informed him that it was a Communist Party institution and he declined the invitation on that information.

Mr. GELLHORN. I had no such information. On the contrary the suggestion came to me to accept.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He declined the invitation after his name appeared in the Daily Worker as a speaker on the series. It would seem that your information division is not as well informed as the information division of the other Federal departments.

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; it is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you taken any steps to ascertain for yourself, subsequent to the raising of this issue, of your having spoken at the Workers School, whether or not it is directly a Communist Party school?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I have not. It seemed it was irrelevant to any issue before me. I have had no further invitation to speak there. I may say whether or not it was connected with the Communist Party, I would not, after this experience, accept another invitation from it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you see any of their literature?

Mr. GELLHORN. I assume, at the suggestion of this committee, although I don't know, several weeks ago I was asked to come down here and when Federal Bureau of Investigation Agent Bly interviewed me he asked me whether I had seen the announcement of my address on this occasion. I told him I had not, which was the fact. At the conclusion of his questioning me I asked whether I might see it as a matter of interest to me. He then showed me a brochure. That is my only familiarity with the announcements.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you been apprised that the Communist Party publicly states that the Workers School is an official trading school?

Mr. GELLHORN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you went to the Workers School, did you discover it was in the same building as the Communist Party?

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't know where the Communist Party is housed. It was at Webster Hall. Is that the place of the Communist Party? My lecture was at Webster Hall, on Eleventh Street.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The lecture was not delivered at the physical plant of the Workers School itself, but in a hall used by the Workers School?

Mr. THOMAS. Where was it?

Mr. GELLHORN. At a place called Webster Hall. I had no information where it did meet. I don't know where the Communist Party headquarters are.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the same series of lectures boxed together with you in the Daily Worker notice of your address were Bruce Minton and Gilbert Green. Bruce Minton is editor of the New Masses. His real name is Bransten. Gilbert Green is listed as executive secretary of the Communist Party.

Mr. GELLHORN. Dr. Matthews, if I may say this, I neither saw that publicity nor was responsible for its preparation, and as I indicated, I would like to leave with the Congressman or with you the résumé of the history of the whole thing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you engaged by the International Labor Defense to work on the *Angelo Herndon case*?

Mr. GELLHORN. I would scarcely state it, in those terms.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was the relationship that you had with International Labor Defense?

Mr. GELLHORN. I had no connection with them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In whose solicitation did you enter the *Herndon Case*?

Mr. GELLHORN. The *Angelo Herndon case*, if my recollection is correct, was active in the Georgia courts around 1934. Is that right, Mr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; that is approximately the time.

Mr. GELLHORN. Approximately that time. My first connection with the case came through one of my colleagues of the law faculty. A constitutional issue was involved in the *Herndon case*, Congressman. It had not been properly raised in the State courts by Herndon's coun-

sel. My colleague on the law faculty, who happened himself to be a Georgian, was asked, I think on that occasion because he was a Georgian, too, to go to Atlanta to present a petition for rehearing before the supreme court of that State in order to raise this constitutional issue which had been omitted from the presentation by Herndon's very incompetent counsel. He was unable to go and asked me to go in his stead for that purpose.

It was plain to me that as a youthful northerner I was not the best possible man to present the matter to the Georgia Supreme Court, but I did undertake to go to Atlanta to present the matter to one of the leading attorneys there, William A. Sutherland, who is a prominent practitioner both in Atlanta and Washington, and whom I have known for many years. I did so present the matter to him as a civil-liberties problem, and Sutherland then followed and appeared as counsel of record for the purpose of presenting this petition to the Supreme Court of Georgia.

In due season the case was in position to be presented to the Supreme Court of the United States. At that time the gentleman who had undertaken to present this constitutional issue was Whitney E. Seymour, who had been Assistant Solicitor General of the United States while I had been in the Solicitor General's office. He is a partner in the law firm of Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett in New York here. He asked me to work with him on the brief for presentation to the Supreme Court, which I did.

The matter was presented to the Supreme Court and after procedural battles, which are somewhat complex and uninteresting, the matter was finally decided favorably to the constitutional contentions being urged by Seymour.

I received no fee at any time for my work in this connection. As I thought then and do now it was a matter of public service.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I was interested in whether or not there had been some official connection with the International Labor Defense and you have stated that that was not the case.

Mr. GELLHORN. No; there was none.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You preferred not to give a categorical answer as to whether or not you thought the Communist Party was of a subversive character.

Mr. GELLHORN. If you term me as an expert witness on this matter, I may say I am not as expert as you are, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever issued any public statement or joined in the issuance of a public statement in which that matter was treated, the matter of the subversive character of the Communist Party?

Mr. GELLHORN. Not that I recall. I am quite clear on the contrary that I have issued no public statement to the effect that it was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you in January of 1939 join with a group of some 150 lawyers in signing a statement which was released under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild and which dealt with soviet communism?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have no recollection of it. If you show it to me I will be glad to refresh my recollection. I don't identify the statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The National Lawyers Guild in 1939 issued a booklet which purported to have been signed by you, along with some other lawyers.

Mr. GELLHORN. The same one?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is a 40- or 50-page booklet which deals with the Communist Party and the Dies committee.

Mr. GELLHORN. I have not the slightest recollection of that. If you have the booklet I would be interested in seeing it. I don't deny having done it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will read you some of the statements that you have purported to have signed [reading]:

The evidence indicates also that the Communists are opposed to nazi-ism, facism, and war, and believe that all Americans, regardless of political, social, and religious differences, should unite against them. The phrase "united front," in spite of the many suggestions of something subversive, appears to mean nothing more than common action of all Americans opposed to nazi-ism and facism to resist their advance.

The record, read for the facts alone, discloses nothing to show that the Communists have failed to follow the principles continued in the preamble of their constitution.

To quote another part of the document. [Reading:]

The words most frequently appearing in the record are Communist and communism, nevertheless, we are constrained to say that it fails to disclose any facts of probative value. * * *

Mr. GELLHORN. What document is this?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is the National Lawyers Guild.

Mr. GELLHORN. It says, "The words most frequently used" in the document.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The record. The record of the Dies committee hearings. [Continues reading]:

* * * to aid in determining whether the Communist Party falls within the scope of the Dies investigation, whether it is in fact un-American or subversive.

The record itself discloses that every one of the committee's witnesses is opposed to the Communist Party. But this is opinion, not facts. In the absence of facts, this can hardly be accepted as proof of the un-Americanism of the Communist Party by any responsible person.

Do you recall whether you did join in signing that?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have no recollection of it. I am not saying I did not. I don't recall the incident at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you an official of the National Lawyers Guild?

Mr. GELLHORN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long have you been a member of the National Lawyers Guild?

Mr. GELLHORN. I joined it at or close to its inception, which again, if my memory is correct, was about 1936 or thereabouts. I was asked by Morris Ernst and some of the others who were forming the thing to join at the beginning.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you signed any statements issued under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild?

Mr. GELLHORN. Very probably so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The passages which I read—

Mr. GELLHORN. I again say I don't recall those passages and I don't know what the occasion of the statements were or anything else about them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, the account that appeared in the Daily Worker of February 1, 1939, has the following to say [reading]:

Representative Vito Marcantonio, American Labor Party of New York, made a memorandum signed by the Lawyers public and announced that he had obtained permission from Speaker William B. Bankhead to distribute it to every Member of the House. He added that a copy was being presented to the Rules Committee which is now considering the Dies committee resolution.

Among the attorneys from all parts of the country who joined in blasting the un-American Dies committee were Frank P. Walsh, chairman of the New York State Power Commission, Prof. Walter Gellhorn, Arthur Garfield Hays, New York City Councilman Charles Belous, Assemblyman Oscar Garcia Rivera, Prof. Fred Rodell, Prof. Harry Shulman, Prof. Louis L. Jaffe, Edward Lamb, and many others.

Mr. GELLHORN. Of those, the only two I do not know are Garcia—the assemblyman, and I have met Lamb, but I don't know him well. I know all the others. But I would say I was in very safe company, because I am confident that not one of those gentlemen is in any sense a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say that holds for Edward Lamb of Cleveland?

Mr. GELLHORN. I said there were two of that group I can't speak of because I don't know them well enough to speak of them. Garcia Rivera and Lamb. I don't know anything about them. I do know the others and I would say that they are not Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have read you certain passages from this release issued under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild. I think you agree that those passages deal with the question of whether or not the Communist Party is or is not subversive.

Mr. GELLHORN. Having heard only snatches of the reading, I would say that dealt with the narrow question as to whether the record before the Dies committee established that fact.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you read the record of the Dies committee hearings?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I should say I have not. Not at all fully. I may have read snatches published here and there, but I have not made a study of the committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you be in a position to state what the record does contain?

Mr. GELLHORN. As of this time?

Mr. MATTHEWS. As of any time.

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I should think very improperly so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, if you did sign a statement to the effect that the record of the Dies committee hearings does not contain this or that evidence, your signature would not be based upon any first-hand personal knowledge?

Mr. GELLHORN. Clearly not. It would be based upon representations made to me by someone, and since I don't remember the circumstances of this, I don't know who presented the matter to me. I am sure, however, I would not sign such a statement unless it had been represented to me by someone in whom I had confidence that he had made a study and could tell me what was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would that confidence be complete if a study had been made by Representative Vito Marcantonio?

Mr. GELLHORN. I should not like this to be said for general quotation, but the answer would be "no."

Mr. MATTHEWS. I cite him because he is the man who released the statement, not that I know who wrote it and he released it and you happen to be one of the several persons to be singled out.

Mr. GELLHORN. My guess would be that they would single out people who would not be accused of being Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Despite the fact that this thing does say that the record of the Dies committee hearings does not show anything subversive, wouldn't the release be read to mean that those who signed it take the position that there is no good ground for calling the Communist Party subversive?

Mr. GELLHORN. I put to the Congressman's ruling whether it is possible for me to speculate on documents the contents of which I don't know. I truly don't feel I can very effectively answer that question.

Mr. THOMAS. I think you are right on that. If he doesn't know anything about the statements, he can't answer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. My point is this: It has not been so very long ago—4 years since this document was issued. It was issued under a circumstance that gave it a very wide coast-to-coast publicity. It was probably carried in a majority of the leading newspapers of the United States. It was placed on the desk of every Member of the House of Representatives. It was generally quoted—a publicized document. Now the witness ought to be able to remember whether he participated in the signing of that document.

Mr. GELLHORN. What was the occasion for the publication?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was an attack on the Dies committee and on the continuation of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you sign any document that had to do with the continuation of the Dies committee?

Mr. GELLHORN. Now, I honestly don't know, but I have no reason to doubt if my name appears that I did sign it. I am in a position, as many academicians of having things presented to be signed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you did sign it, you don't deny it. You did it not on the basis of personal information but by representations made to you by a person in whom you had confidence?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you been publicly associated in any capacity with the International Juridical Association?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; I am a member of its national body.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long have you been a member of the national body of the International Juridical Association?

Mr. GELLHORN. Again speaking from recollection rather than from verified knowledge, I should say 6 or 7 years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you attend meetings of the national committee?

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't think there are any, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever attended any board meetings or committee meetings of any kind under the auspices of the International Juridical Association?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; I have attended a very few meetings of the editorial board of the International Juridical Association Bulletin, and there have been, during the years of my connection with the organization, two or three, perhaps more, occasions in which members of the group who reside in New York have gotten together to discuss some

issue that was raised. The latest one that I recall, if you would like me to give an instance of my attendance, indeed one of the very few that I can recall, was a meeting to consider an attack that had been made on the International Juridical Association by Representative Starnes, of your committee, a Congressman, which we felt was mistaken and unfair. We met to compose a letter to Congressman Woodrum, because the statement had been made at a meeting of the subcommittee and the Committee of Appropriations, of which he was chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Woodrum was chairman?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think the record should show that Mr. Starnes was also on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; and that letter to Congressman Woodrum, which was composed at that time, is dated February 3, 1942, so I assume that the meeting was about that time. I don't recall having attended any meetings since then.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who were present at that meeting?

Mr. GELLHORN. There were present Mr. Nathan Green, who was a partner of the firm of Cook, Nathan & Lehman. Mr. Witt, I think, was there—Nathan Witt.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Carol Weiss King there?

Mr. GELLHORN. Mrs. King was there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Joseph Brodsky there.

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I don't think so. I am sure he was not. I have a vague recollection there was one other there in addition to myself, but I cannot think who it was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Joseph R. Brodsky?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have met him at meetings.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you satisfied, on the basis of your observation, that Joseph R. Brodsky is a Communist?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have no question about that. I think the party so declares.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gellhorn, in the letter which you composed along with others to send to Congressman Woodrum, I believe you named half a dozen more individuals who were on the national committee, or who are on the national committee of the International Juridical Association, with the indication, at least, if not a direct statement, that these individuals would certainly establish respectability of the organization.

Mr. GELLHORN. No. This letter to the Congressman contains no names at all. Would you care to see it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. GELLHORN. I would be glad to have that appear in the record, as well, if you wish.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know any appreciable number of members of the national committee of the International Juridical Association personally?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; I think I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Leo Gallagher, of California?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not Leo Gallagher has been a candidate for office on the Communist Party?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of record that Leo Gallagher has run for Senator in California.

Do you know David J. Bentall, of Illinois?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. David J. Bentall is professed to be a charter member of the Communist Party in the United States.

Do you know Isaac E. Ferguson?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, Isaac E. Ferguson was a charter member in the United States and was sentenced to 10 years in prison immediately after the World War.

Do you know Yetta Land, who is on the committee representing Ohio?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, Yetta Land is chairman of the Communist Party of the State of Ohio.

Do you know Maurice Sugar, of Detroit?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have met Mr. Sugar at some meeting or other, some convention or other. I don't know him other than that I identify him as counsel for the United Automobile Workers in Detroit.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not he has been a Communist or is a Communist?

Mr. GELLHORN. On the basis of what I heard of him, I would be surprised that that is so. But I have no information whatever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not he served a prison term in the First World War?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, Maurice Sugar served 2 years in prison as a draft dodger, his defense being on the ground of his socialistic convictions at that time, and since the World War he has been prominently identified with Communist affiliates, particularly the John Reed clubs.

Do you know Edward Lamb? I believe you stated you don't know him?

Mr. GELLHORN. I stated I met him. I don't know him well enough to know anything about him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had occasion to read the record or any part of the record of the investigation of Paul J. Kern by the City Council of New York?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have read the rather full newspaper accounts. I know Kern, so I was interested in them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you apprised of the fact that the committee on investigation found that Kern had been a frequent fellow traveler with Communist Party front organizations? Here again I am paraphrasing the committee's report.

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; I know that was one of the conclusions reached by the committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Irvin Goodman, of Oregon?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't know whether or not he was one of the leaders of the American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. GELLHORN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Irvin Goodman was a leader of the American Peace Mobilization and was publicly identified in that capacity.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Abraham J. Isserman?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have any personal views on whether Mr. Isserman is a Communist or a communist sympathizer?

Mr. GELLHORN. I imagine the latter. I have no information on the former. I know him to be a competent attorney. I have consulted with him on one or two labor matters.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know John P. Davis?

Mr. GELLHORN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Negro executive secretary of the National Negro Congress.

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, Davis has been identified, in sworn testimony of witnesses, as a member of the Communist Party.

I have gone over some of the names of the members of the national committee and have indicated in the case of a half dozen that there are public records of their being Communists. I take it that you do not question the fact that there is to some extent at least a Communist element in the International Juridical Association?

Mr. GELLHORN. That I think is clear; that there are members of the association that are Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you any personal opinions on the question of Carol W. King with respect to whether or not she is a Communist sympathizer?

Mr. GELLHORN. No. I think it clear that she is not hostile. I don't know what her affiliations are.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What about Nathan Witt?

Mr. GELLHORN. I would think that he is not, but I have known him rather superficially. I had some official contacts with him when he was the executive secretary—I think that was his title—of the National Labor Relations Board. Perhaps half a dozen times in that connection. Since his return to New York I think I have seen him at the meeting I described in 1942. I don't recall having seen him—oh, no, I saw him on one other occasion. He called on me in my official capacity, he representing the C. I. O. unions in this State, and some matter that we are interested in in O. P. A.

My impression of him is that he is not a Communist sympathizer, but I admit he is very impressionable.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know when the International Juridical Association was formed?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; it was formed about 1932, wasn't it? I am not sure—yes, formed 10 years ago. This letter was written in 1942, so that it was formed in 1932.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What does the word "International" in the organization's title imply or indicate to you?

Mr. GELLHORN. It indicates a stillborn hope, I think, Dr. Matthews. At the time that the organization was initially formed, I understand that the hope was that there would be either branches of the association or again parts of the association in other countries so that there would be a bringing together of information on the fields of law in which the association was interested.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not other branches were actually set up in other countries?

Mr. GELLHORN. So far as I know, the "Inter" part of the "International" might as well be stricken out. I don't think they had any affiliates beyond this country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the record perhaps ought to show the history of the organization, if that is agreeable to you.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The fact, if I may, with respect to that, is a public record and may be included in the record at this point.

Mr. THOMAS. It is agreeable.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The International Juridical Association itself, despite what may be said in the letter was there, was organized in Portland in 1931. Mrs. King, Carol W. King, went to Europe, and among the enterprises in which she participated, was to participate in, was a setting-up of organizations of this kind, which was discussed and consummated. All of this is a matter of public record.

Mr. GELLHORN. It is a matter of which until this moment I have been unacquainted with.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you actually participate in supplying any factual information for the composition of that letter or were you present and simply gave your O. K. on the basis of presentations made to you?

Mr. GELLHORN. So far, I think there is nothing inconsistent with what you said. I confess I was ignorant of the genesis of the organization. But what this letter says, if I may tell it to the Congressman—

Mr. THOMAS. Go ahead; tell it briefly.

Mr. GELLHORN. That the function of the organization has been to devote itself to legal research with particular emphasis upon labor law and civil rights.

In the early years of its existence it served somewhat as a service bureau for lawyers who desired advice concerning pending cases in these fields of law. With the growth of activity in these areas on the part of the American Bar Association and other professional organizations, however, the association has had less and less occasion to engage in work other than that specifically related to its primary function which is the publication of a monthly bulletin.

That bulletin, Congressman, extended through 10 volumes. It was devoted exclusively to analyzing and discussing decisions of the courts and administrative bodies and the actions of the executive and legislative branches of Government affecting and involving labor and civil liberties.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By saying it was devoted exclusively to those things you named, would you imply that the bulletin never took up such questions as foreign policy within the past few years?

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't recall that it has done so, Mr. Matthews. Has it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. You will find, if you go back through your bulletins, that a great many extraneous matters are dealt with, and in every instance those extraneous matters fit very deeply into the Communist Party line of the moment.

Mr. GELLHORN. That I confess surprises me somewhat, because my interest in the bulletin has been in respects indicated here, and as I think you know, Mr. Matthews, the bulletin has earned a good deal of regard among the legal scholars.

I had occasion, by way of a self-defensive statement on an earlier statement in connection with the appropriation matter to O. P. A., to offer to the Committee on Appropriations a statement with respect to my connection with the International Juridical Association, and in that statement quoted some of the remarks that have been made about the bulletin by such people as Dean Garrison and Justice Frankfurter. I would like, if I may, Congressman, to ask you to include this letter in the record along with this discussion.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that the letter you referred to?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. That letter is already in the records of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. GELLHORN. Unfortunately, I think the record was closed by the time Mr. Woodrum received this.

Mr. THOMAS. We will include it.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

FEBRUARY 3, 1942.

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUM: The International Juridical Association is writing to you as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives which recently concluded hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1943. An untrue statement with reference to the association was made part of the record at the hearing on January 8, 1942. It appears at pages 823-830 of the printed transcript. This letter is addressed to you so that the true facts may appear in the records of your committee.

In connection with the interrogation of Mr. Herbert Weschler, executive secretary, Board of Legal Examiners, United States Civil Service Commission, concerning his membership on the national committee of the International Juridical Association, the Honorable Joe Starnes said (transcript, p. 826):

"Now, then, Chairman, I want to make this statement for the record, that Mr. Browder and many of the members—I mean charter members—of the Communist Party have stated * * * that the International Juridical Association, of which the gentleman (Mr. Weschler) says he is a member of the national board, has been and is a straight Communist Party auxiliary organization. * * *

"Neither I, nor any other responsible official of the International Juridical Association has any knowledge of this putative statement by Mr. Browder or by any other present or past spokesman for the Communist Party. Further, irrespective of whether any such statement was ever made, and irrespective of by whom it may have been made, such a statement would be wholly false."

It happens to be the fact that the International Juridical Association is not and never has been an auxiliary of, front for, or otherwise connected with the Communist Party, or any other party or organization. The funds of the International Juridical Association are self-obtained and its policies self-determined. The International Juridical Association is an unincorporated, nonprofit association formed 10 years ago and devoted exclusively to legal research, with particular emphasis upon labor law and civil rights. In the early years of its existence it served somewhat as a service bureau for lawyers who desired advice concerning pending cases in these fields of law. With the growth of activity in these areas on the part of the American Bar Association and other professional organizations, however, the association has had less and less occasion to engage in work other than that specifically related to its primary function, which is the publication of a monthly bulletin.

The Bulletin of the International Juridical Association has appeared in 10 volumes, and continues to be published each month. It is, and always has been, a legal publication devoted exclusively to reporting, analyzing, and discussing decisions of the courts and administrative bodies and the actions of the executive

and legislative branches of Government affecting and involving labor and civil liberties.

In its field the Bulletin has gained recognition as the leading legal publication. Its importance as a scholarly journal and as a source of otherwise unreported legal material is attested by the frequency with which its pages are cited by the law reviews.

The Bulletin is widely read and used by students and lawyers concerned with problems of labor and civil rights. It may be found in the library of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Congressional Library, and the library of the Department of Justice. Among other public subscribers are 28 State, court, and bar association libraries, as well as the libraries of every major university in the United States.

We respectfully request that this letter be printed in any addendum or appendix which may hereafter be printed in connection with your committee's hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1943. In any event, we request that this statement be spread upon the records of the subcommittee, to all of whose members a copy is being sent.

Respectfully,

NATHAN GREENE, *Editor.*

Mr. GELLHORN. Then if I may refer, because this is already in print, to the statement I mentioned a moment ago, which appears on pages 187 and 188 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, on the first supplementary national defense appropriation bill for 1943. The volume to which I refer is part 2 of those hearings, pages 187 and 188.

Mr. THOMAS. Are you finished there now?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I have in my hand this pamphlet which Mr. Matthews was using before when he listed certain members of the national committee, and you yourself referred to what Mr. Frankfurter and Mr. Garrison said about the International Juridical Association. This pamphlet is entitled "What Is the I. J. A.?" And it says:

For attorneys: A source of authentic and timely information, research, and guidance on problems of labor law and civil rights.

For law students: A living textbook of contemporary labor law in the making.

For laymen: A key to the actual legal facts behind the front page news of the day.

And in the same pamphlet under the "Highlights of the Past Year," it gives a paragraph of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I quote [reading]:

I. J. A. in cooperation with American Civil Liberties Union submitted brief amicus in United States Supreme Court in support of construction of act to permit picketing in absence of strike. Supreme Court reversed decision below, and upheld such construction.

And it gives a paragraph of the National Labor Relations Board—on the Black-Connery bill, more of the secondary boycott, one on social security, which says [reading]:

I. J. A. prepared searching analysis of problems presented by social security and old-age legislation and discussed Supreme Court decisions upholding Social Security Act.

And it refers to the *Herndon case* [reading]:

I. J. A. handled appeal in the earlier stages and cooperated with International Labor Defense in freeing Herndon.

It has a paragraph on the seamen's strike [reading]:

Charge of mutiny raised against crew of the S. S. *California* was retracted largely as result of a report on right of seamen to strike, prepared by I. J. A. and submitted to Department of Commerce.

It has a paragraph on the A. F. of L., a paragraph on the C. I. O., and a paragraph on criminal syndicalism [reading]:

I. J. A. prepared analysis of Sacramento, Calif., case, which was widely reprinted.

And one on labor injunctions; one on the United States Supreme Court [reading]:

I. J. A. issued pamphlet on Curbing the Courts.

And the last one is the *Lawrence Simpson case* [reading]:

I. J. A. prepared brief for submission to State Department by National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners on rights of American citizens brought to trial in German courts for political offenses.

Now I construe from this pamphlet that what the I. J. A. says the purpose of the organization is, is one thing, and what the highlight of the past year is, is quite different.

Mr. GELLHORN. Congressman, as you read—

Mr. THOMAS. Just a minute. Most of these have to do with purely labor questions and social questions and civil liberties questions.

Is it an organization which is "A source of authentic and timely information, research, and guidance on problems of labor law and civil rights?"

Mr. GELLHORN. Precisely, and all those things you read are illustrative of that, until the time that the American Bar Association commenced its publication of the *Civil Rights Review*, which I think was about 2 years ago, there was no legal periodical in the country which voiced itself, or fixed its eye on this particular law. That is what the I. J. A. was doing, and the need for it has clearly become less as others have expanded through experience on the subject. But those who were interested in the labor law found it impossible to get labor materials, and it is in an association with great regard for its work, as found by the fact when I point out in the communication to the Appropriations Committee the subscription list of the committee, which includes sixteen judges, among whom are two Judges of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. THOMAS. Who are they?

Mr. GELLHORN. Justice Frankfurter is one and I think Justice Black is the other. And 121 members among the Congress, the Department of Justice, the Harvard law school, with 49 college professors, including also corporations and agencies such as the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the United States Civil Service Commission, Columbia Broadcasting Association of America. It has been a very widely referred to periodical in the discussion of labor law matters.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gellhorn, are you aware of the fact that the American Civil Liberties Union voted that Communists were ineligible to speak on the National Committee of the Civil Liberties Union, on the ground they would be incompetent—

Mr. GELLHORN. I thought the resolution went further than that, that they should not serve on any committees.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On the ground that the Communists' position on civil liberties—

Mr. GELLHORN. Was too unstable.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would disqualifying them from acting in organizations that interested themselves in the maintaining of civil liberties.

Mr. GELLHORN. As I understood the action, it was because of the feeling that the Communist was not interested in civil liberties as such but interested in civil liberties for themselves, but didn't care much of a heck for civil liberties to other people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a member of the American Civil Liberties Union, did you approve of that action by its board?

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't recall whether the action was presented to the board.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you approve of it as a member of the organization?

Mr. GELLHORN. I felt that there was probably a good deal of justification for it. I will be frank to say that I have had this feeling about some of these matters of Communist participation in things I have been interested in. It has often been said that the Communists use their people for their own needs. I thought that some of the rest of us were very timid about using them when there was something that we could get from them, but I have no strong feelings that it was an unwise thing to do. I recall discussing it with Roger Baldwin, who was head of the Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you enter any protest against the action?

Mr. GELLHORN. I do not believe so, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not quite sure whether you stated you concurred in the action or whether you—

Mr. GELLHORN. I had a wobbly position about it—I don't know whether it was the necessary step to take. It certainly did not have the effect of unsettling the organization. There was strong feeling by non-Communists as well as Communists that it was an unwise thing to do. I have, however, continued my membership in the Civil Liberties Union and served on its committees.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What committees do you serve on?

Mr. GELLHORN. The last one I served on was its academic committee concerned with teaching matters.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would your view be the same with respect to the International Juridical Association as it was with respect to the American Civil Liberties Union; that is, an open question as to whether Communists should or should not be on such organizations?

Mr. GELLHORN. I think the cases are quite dissimilar, because the International Juridical Association, unlike the American Civil Liberties Union, is not a body of advocates. The Communists' lawyers, like Brodsky, are interested in labor-law problems, because they have represented labor unions, and so long as they are interested in the technical aspects of the subjects under study, I see no reason why they should not be interested.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who Lawrence Simpson was?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have a recollection that he was a seaman taken off a ship in Germany charged with having smuggled literature into the country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is your recollection any more specific on the literature?

Mr. GELLHORN. I am sure he was charged with smuggling communistic literature.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall whether or not he boasted he had smuggled large quantities of literature into the country?

Mr. GELLHORN. No.

Mr. THOMAS. What stand did this organization take in regard to that case?

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to the brief that the I. J. A. prepared to the State Department—

Mr. GELLHORN. That I think you will agree was an entirely troublesome thing. The Germans were bringing American citizens before their tribunals for fairly summary justice and the position taken was in support of the proposition that American citizens were not being given a fair trial.

Mr. THOMAS. I know nothing about the case. In fact, I don't recall ever hearing about it before. Did the case take place over in Germany?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; he was seized by the German authorities.

Mr. THOMAS. And he was seized as a result of his distribution of Communist literature?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct. There was no issue as to the fact of the bringing in of the literature. Lawrence Simpson has been a publicly voted member of the Communist Party. There was no secret made of that, nor is there any dispute of the fact that he was taking literature into the country, into Germany, on behalf of the Communist Party.

The representations made to Secretary Hull at the State Department by Osmond K. Frankel and some others considerably outraged the Secretary of State. The representations made to Mr. Hull convinced him at least that they were trying to agitate the point that the Secretary of the State Department was collaborating with the Nazis in an anti-Communist campaign; that the Department of State was not doing its duty by an American citizen. That was all a matter of public record at the time.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now the statement here indicates that the International Juridical Association prepared its brief for the National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners. Are you acquainted at all with that organization?

Mr. GELLHORN. I have received some of its circulars from time to time. In that sense, I am. Otherwise not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you aware of the fact that the Attorney General had described that as a subversive organization?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I am not familiar with that fact.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is this the first time that you heard that?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; this is the first time I heard that. Is that in connection with the *Bridges case*?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; with the interdepartmental memorandum which the Attorney General sent to the department heads for their guidance in dealing with the subversive activities of their subordinates. This is a photostatic copy of the Attorney General's memorandum. This was 1 of the 12 subversive organizations whose names the Attorney General sent to the departmental heads.

Mr. GELLHORN. Is that the inference that you are now suggesting, Mr. Matthews, that since the I. J. A. prepared a brief on the questions for this committee, which is described as a Communist affiliate, that, therefore, either the I. J. A. must be a Communist affiliate or is in some

other way engaged in reprehensible activity. If that is the conclusion you want to draw, I want to discuss it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is not my function to draw conclusions.

Mr. GELLHORN. Is that the purpose of the statements made, because if so I would like to state my own feeling about it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Go ahead; you are at liberty to make a statement.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; you can make a statement.

Mr. GELLHORN. My position is perfectly simple. I do believe in civil liberties as set forth in the constitutional guaranties, and it has been a civil libertarian position throughout that one would maintain a constitutional argument for civil liberties or the policy in support of civil liberties without reference to the identity of the subject which happens to give rise to the issue. For that reason the Civil Liberties Union, in the face of opposition from some quarters, has sustained the right, prior to the war, of unpopular organizations like the German-American Bund to have meetings; it would equally sustain the right for the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners to have meetings and engage in lawful activities, not, however, to support them in any unlawful activity. I personally espouse the prevailing civil libertarian position, even though I would be numbered as a lawyer in suitable circumstances to work for them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you believe that the crew of a steamship should be defended in its right to strike while the vessel is at sea?

Mr. GELLHORN. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Either as a matter of civil liberties or trade-union rights.

Mr. GELLHORN. No. Definitely not. The only issue of that sort in which I have ever expressed an opinion, which I personally still hold, though the courts have held to the contrary by now—when I expressed my opinion it was an open question—it was that the right to strike existed while the vessel was at harbor, but while the vessel was at sea I never thought it could be justified.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The next question you have already answered, whether or not the crew could strike while it was moored.

Mr. GELLHORN. That is a question of law, and which I say was not sustained by the court. An attorney here in New York, one of the members of Root, Clark & Ballentine, wrote a lengthy article on that subject which appeared in the Law Journal, which I read and agreed with.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you a member of the board of directors of the Open Road, Inc.?

Mr. GELLHORN. No; I think that organization is defunct now. In any event, I was a member of that board since 1929 or 1930, for a year or so, but I have not had anything to do with it since.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Your connection with it terminated some 10 years ago?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; I should think fully 10 years ago. More than that, I should say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was your impression of the Open Road that it was in any sense a propagandist organization as well as a travel organization?

Mr. GELLHORN. I should say clearly the contrary. It engaged in no activity other than the formation of trip plans for groups of every type and description.

Mr. THOMAS. Groups to go where?

Mr. GELLHORN. All over Europe. And in later years, this was after I left it, I think they expanded their activities to South America, as well. It started, Congressman, essentially as a student organization. This was in the time when we were naively of the belief that if all of us knew one another, we would not hate one another. And it started in terms of groups of college students going abroad to other countries for the summer. And there was a corollary organization with headquarters in Switzerland which was known as the International Students Hospitality Association which undertook to obtain introductions to people in the course of their travels, and so on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have no doubt, however, of the fact that the Open Road throughout its existence did specialize in trips to Russia?

Mr. GELLHORN. Throughout its existence? I wouldn't be able to answer that question because I have not been in sufficient touch with it. As a commercial matter that was a big money maker around 1929. My acquaintance with the Open Road became, began by virtue of my going on one of the trips, and when I became a member of the board of directors it became obvious that it was a nonprofit organization, except that the executive got paid a salary. And there were more people interested in conducted tours to Russia because of the difficulty in getting around Russia than to France and England, where people were able to get around and didn't need guides.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Frederick Vanderbilt Field the president of the organization when you were on the board of directors?

Mr. GELLHORN. He was on the board of directors. I am not certain that he was president, however.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you know him personally?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes. Very well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you had any recent contracts with him?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Extending over a period of recent years?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any contacts with him during his leadership of the American Peace Mobilization for a period of a year or more?

Mr. GELLHORN. I knew him as an individual. I didn't approve of that organization and had nothing to do with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You knew he was head of it?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And it was the organization that picketed the White House?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes. I disapproved firmly of the organization. While I like Frederick Field as an individual I disapproved of the organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what he is doing now?

Mr. GELLHORN. Yes; I do. I don't know the organization's title exactly, but he is secretary of the American Council for American Affairs, or something of that sort.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. Gellhorn, just one or two questions. How many people are employed under you in the O. P. A.?

Mr. GELLHORN. Do you mean specifically, in the regional office, or throughout the region? As the regional attorney I am the nominal head throughout the region.

Mr. THOMAS. How many in the regional office?

Mr. GELLHORN. There are about 50 attorneys and about 30 investigators. I would have to refresh my recollection of the exact figures. It is somewhere in that neighborhood.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you select those attorneys yourself or are they selected for you?

Mr. GELLHORN. No. In the regional office I have selected my own staff subject to approval, and at the present time, as you know, a selection, the selection for various classifications, is limited by the eligible lists to the Board of Regional Examiners.

Mr. THOMAS. If you want to take on another attorney, what is the procedure that you go through to take on an attorney?

Mr. GELLHORN. His application papers are submitted to the regional personnel office and the regional administrator must approve the selection. They are then forwarded to Washington and in every single instance the man who is selected has to be approved by the Board of Legal Examiners. Sometimes they do that by prior examination before approving his appointment. Sometimes they permit his entry on duty subject to later examination. Occasionally they approve on the basis of the paper record which is clear enough to warrant approval in advance.

Mr. THOMAS. How many persons are employed in the O. P. A., in this region, in all divisions of the O. P. A.?

Mr. GELLHORN. I really cannot even guess, in answer to that. I don't know.

Mr. THOMAS. Could you say approximately?

Mr. GELLHORN. I am sorry; I cannot. I have not the faintest idea.

Mr. THOMAS. In the New York office, how many are employed?

Mr. GELLHORN. In the regional office itself, you mean?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GELLHORN. I should think that there probably would be 350 or 400. I am really having to guess on this because I don't know the size of the other divisions.

Mr. THOMAS. One more question. When the invitation that was referred to before, came from the Communist Party, addressed to the O. P. A., addressed to individuals in the O. P. A. to speak at the Communist meeting, do you know whether that invitation was accepted by any person in the O. P. A.?

Mr. GELLHORN. No, I do not, Congressman. I really don't know. My guess is that the invitations were referred to the New York City office—you see we have a local office—as well as a regional office here, and whether anybody was sent from that office to attend, I don't know. I am quite sure, however, that no one of the senior officials did because I think I would have heard of it if they had.

Mr. THOMAS. Is there anyone or any way that you could check up and find out?

Mr. GELLHORN. I would be glad to try.

Mr. THOMAS. Try and check up and then advise Mr. Matthews, J. B. Matthews, in the Washington office of the Dies committee.

Mr. GELLHORN. I would be glad to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have a Joseph Brandt, an investigator, in your employ?

Mr. GELLHORN. We have had.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is he now on your staff?

Mr. GELLHORN. No. He was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he dismissed?

Mr. GELLHORN. He resigned. It was an induced resignation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On what grounds?

Mr. GELLHORN. Do you want this on the record?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who sponsored Brandt's employment?

Mr. GELLHORN. I don't know. I didn't employ him. The investigators, I don't bother with. I knew about his dismissal because it looked pretty bad. I don't recall how he got his job.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Could you, by examining the record of Brandt in your files, find out who sponsored him?

Mr. GELLHORN. I will try. I don't know whether it will show.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Could we have that information available?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. If you could get that information, supply it to Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is all.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all. Thank you very much for coming around.

(Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF HENRY GARFIELD ALSBERG, FORMER SENIOR FEATURE EDITOR, OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION, NEW YORK CITY

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. One of the main reasons for this hearing here in New York is that the chairman of this committee made certain charges which included your name, on the floor of the House, and in deference to you we have asked you to come here today in order to ask you questions, in order to give you an opportunity to correct any matter that you would like to correct. And I want to say that we decided to hold a hearing in New York so that you could lose just as little time as possible, and that you would not have to go all the way to Washington. So if you will make the questions as brief as possible, Mr. Matthews, and if you will make the answers as brief as possible, Mr. Alsberg, we will get through promptly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Please give your full name?

Mr. ALSBERG. Henry Garfield Alsberg.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Where were you born?

Mr. ALSBERG. New York City.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On what day?

Mr. ALSBERG. September 21, 1891.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you hold any college degrees?

Mr. ALSBERG. I am an A. B. of Columbia and LL. B. of Columbia University.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you attend any other colleges for courses.

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes. I was at Harvard, but I didn't get any degree.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you at Harvard?

Mr. ALSBERG. One winter, taking a postgraduate in comparative literature.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, there is testimony by this witness on pages 2886 to 2908, inclusive, in the hearings of this committee, and there are many facts brought out there, which I shall not ask the witness about again.

However, will you please state as briefly as possible, in outline form, what positions you held since you graduated from college?

Mr. ALSBERG. I practiced law for—I graduated from law school in 1903 and practiced law for about 4—4½ years, partly for myself and partly as an employee of other lawyers. One I might say was Nathan Bijur, late supreme court judge, and another one was Louis Henry Cohen, who was for a long time attorney for the Port of New York Authority. I was his managing clerk but I had an arrangement to do my own practicing at the same time. Then I decided I wanted to study and took a year or more off and went to Harvard for a year, and traveled a little. Then I started writing. Some of my things were accepted in various magazines. Then I became editor of the New York Post.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what year?

Mr. ALSBERG. I imagine about 1913, or 1912. I cannot tell. I have not got the records.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you the editor of the New York Post?

Mr. ALSBERG. Until the fall of 1918—fairly late.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Approximately 5 years?

Mr. ALSBERG. I suppose so. But like all these things, I have not got my records with me. I was editorial writer on editorial articles and did reviews and did some feature articles.

Mr. MATTHEWS. After 1918, what did do?

Mr. ALSBERG. I went to Europe, just in the beginning of 1919, for the New York Nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you represent the Nation in Europe?

Mr. ALSBERG. Well, it is hard to remember, but approximately 4, 4½, 5 years. At the same time I represented for a part of that time the New York World. Mr. Howard Bayard Swope employed me in Paris and I covered Central Europe for the World for several years, and I also represented the London Daily Herald for several years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did that take you down to 1924—25?

Mr. ALSBERG. About.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then what did you do?

Mr. ALSBERG. In the meantime I had come back and for a very short visit, and I had spent a few months in Mexico and wrote some articles for the New York Nation there. I also during that time, for about 10 months, I was doing famine relief in Russia, or post-famine relief in Russia for the American Joint Distribution Committee which was connected with the American Relief Administration.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And then after that what did you do?

Mr. ALSBERG. After that I came back—I can't give you the exact dates. In the first place I adapted a play which ran in the Neighborhood Playhouse for 2 years.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the name of that play?

Mr. ALSBERG. Dybbuk, and it ran—it went on the road to Chicago and various other places under the management of the Schuberts, and it was produced in London later.

My interest in the theater—at the time I made some money out of the play and I became one of the directors of the Out-of-Town Theater. I cannot give you exactly, but it was about 1925 or so, and stayed there roughly 2 years with them. There again I would have to consult dates. There is some records.

During this period and later I had several other jobs. I brought out, I edited a book of documents entitled "I Was in a Russian Prison," that took most of my spare time. It lasted 3 years, maybe 4. I also was engaged by Mr. Felix Warburg, of Kuhn Loeb, now dead, to write the history of the American Joint Distribution Committee work in Europe. That occupied a considerable part of my time and lasted pretty late on in the twenties.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your first Government position?

Mr. ALSBERG. My first Government position was in 1934, in March, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1934?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was that position?

Mr. ALSBERG. It was—I believe they called it editor of the Reports for the Federal Emergency Relief Administration.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your remuneration in that position?

Mr. ALSBERG. I started with \$2,600 and my pay was raised—and again I am not sure what it was at the end—but I think it was about \$3,600.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long were you editor of Reports for the F. E. R. A.?

Mr. ALSBERG. From March 1934, approximately, until the summer of 1935.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you go into any other Government position at that time?

Mr. ALSBERG. No. Well, afterwards; yes. I was appointed National Director of the Federal Writers Project.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What date?

Mr. ALSBERG. I think it must have been the beginning of August. Actual operations—1935. Actual operations didn't begin until September, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of 1935?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes. But I think my appointment was probably in the beginning of August because the end of the financial year came the end of June. June 30.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you hold that position?

Mr. ALSBERG. I held that position until early in August 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your salary as National Director of the Federal Writers Project?

Mr. ALSBERG. It varied. I think it started with about sixty-two or sixty-four hundred. I don't remember exactly. Then it was raised to, I think, seventy-four hundred and then it was—then the salaries of all the national directors of the art projects were cut to about sixty-four or sixty-five hundred. I don't know exactly. I don't remember exactly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you left the Federal Writers Project, what did you do?

Mr. ALSBERG. I—in the first place my—I had a very bad case of indigestion. I laid off for about 6 months until I got better. Part of the time I had been seeing the doctor before I left Washington. Then I began writing. I did some articles. I did some lecturing, and I have been at work on manuscripts for two books since then, one of which I am now negotiating with publishers. They seem to like it. I hope they will take it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your present employment?

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to ask a question. What were the subjects of these articles?

Mr. ALSBERG. They were about post-war problems, chiefly. One was for a magazine called Direction concerning these art projects and the handling of them.

Mr. THOMAS. You say you wrote articles and you made some lectures?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Where did you make those lectures?

Mr. ALSBERG. American Association of Colleges.

Mr. THOMAS. What did you lecture on?

Mr. ALSBERG. Literature. American literature, foreign politics, and somewhat about the Writers Projects. Mostly American literature.

Mr. THOMAS. Who did you lecture to?

Mr. ALSBERG. Students.

Mr. THOMAS. I mean classes in literature.

Mr. ALSBERG. Sometimes classes in literature and sometimes whole assemblies of students.

Mr. THOMAS. Were you paid for those lectures?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Approximately what sum did you receive per lecture?

Mr. ALSBERG. It is hard to say, because they paid all my expenses, but I think it was about \$75 per lecture, exclusive of the expenses. It was under the auspices of the Association of American Colleges.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is your present position?

Mr. ALSBERG. I haven't any for the present.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you employed anywhere?

Mr. ALSBERG. Not just now.

Mr. THOMAS. Since this time, though, you are employed in the Government?

Mr. ALSBERG. I was employed in the beginning of October, I think it was October 6, by the Office of War Information.

Mr. MATTHEWS. October 6 of last year?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What was your title in that position?

Mr. ALSBERG. Senior feature editor, I think it was.

Mr. THOMAS. Senior what?

Mr. ALSBERG. Senior feature editor. I am not sure that that is the title.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long did you hold that position?

Mr. ALSBERG. Until—I am trying to think—until, I can't give you the exact date. It was about—it was 3 weeks ago last Wednesday.

Mr. BIRMINGHAM. Was it April 6?

Mr. ALSBERG. That is when my formal resignation took effect. But I resigned 2 weeks before that, because they asked me to give them notice.

Mr. THOMAS. Right at that point, I think we ought to make it clear for the record what the exact date is.

Mr. ALSBERG. Two weeks from April 6.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is when you submitted your resignation?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would be about March 23 or 24?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Why did you resign?

Mr. ALSBERG. I resigned because I wanted to do my own work, chiefly.

Mr. THOMAS. I got the impression from your previous remarks that they asked you to resign.

Mr. ALSBERG. No. I am sorry, they didn't. They didn't ask me to resign.

Mr. THOMAS. Who did you submit your resignation to?

Mr. ALSBERG. To Mr. Edward Sammis, who was my chief.

Mr. THOMAS. Why did you resign?

Mr. ALSBERG. Chiefly to do my own work.

Mr. THOMAS. What kind of work?

Mr. ALSBERG. I wanted to finish this book which these publishers say they will take if I do some more work on the book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say "chiefly." Were there other reasons?

Mr. ALSBERG. That was the reason. I didn't feel my work was particularly essential to the war effort, otherwise I would have stayed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you receive any suggestions from anyone that you resign.

Mr. ALSBERG. No.

Mr. THOMAS. What salary did you get in that position?

Mr. ALSBERG. Forty-six hundred.

Mr. THOMAS. Forty-six hundred?

Mr. ALSBERG. Well, there was more, due to the increase that was voted.

Mr. THOMAS. Base pay for forty-six hundred?

Mr. ALSBERG. It may add roughly five thousand.

Mr. THOMAS. And you say you think you were not doing anything worth while?

Mr. ALSBERG. The O. W. I.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the oath like?

Mr. ALSBERG. It is a long printed thing. It is 10 years' imprisonment if you give any information of what you do.

Mr. THOMAS. Even to a committee of Congress?

Mr. ALSBERG. That I don't know. I think you ought to ask. I am perfectly willing to talk. I am not trying to conceal it. They made an awful big point of it.

Mr. THOMAS. I think they did rightly so, but I do believe that a committee of Congress, particularly in executive session, is able to determine what should be taken down in testimony and what should

not. And for a Government agency, I don't care what agency it is, to go against a committee of Congress in this respect, is making a great mistake.

Without telling any military secrets, I want you to tell the committee what kind of articles you wrote.

Mr. ALSBERG. I wrote articles on subjects of interest that were asked for by outpost employees. The O. W. I.—

Mr. THOMAS. Tell me one article that you wrote on one subject.

Mr. ALSBERG. I wrote an article on irrigation in America for the outpost in Cairo.

Mr. THOMAS. What was another one?

Mr. ALSBERG. I wrote two articles on Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. THOMAS. Two articles on Thomas Jefferson. What outpost wanted that?

Mr. ALSBERG. I don't know. I don't remember.

Mr. THOMAS. Were those articles used?

Mr. ALSBERG. The irrigation one was used and they told me the Jefferson articles would be used.

Mr. THOMAS. What other articles did you write?

Mr. ALSBERG. I collected material on our social security, on social welfare in America, which material was used.

Mr. THOMAS. What others?

Mr. ALSBERG. I wrote an article on American forestry, the history of American forestry. They had a handbook they were getting out, a handbook of information on America. I worked on that for a long time. I helped to plan it. When I came in they asked me to suggest it and I replanned it and I wrote the article on conservation in that book, as well as a heap of other things.

Mr. THOMAS. What are some of the other feature articles that you wrote?

Mr. ALSBERG. That took a month. That handbook only just was finished. I worked 6 weeks on that handbook because it is a big thing. I had to go over all the Government agencies.

Mr. THOMAS. Was this a handbook of Government agencies?

Mr. ALSBERG. Well, I was doing a good enough job, but they had other people. I found—when I took the job I thought I could finish my book evenings.

Mr. THOMAS. What were your duties in this job?

Mr. ALSBERG. To write articles, feature articles.

Mr. THOMAS. On what kind of subjects?

Mr. ALSBERG. All kinds of subjects.

Mr. THOMAS. You name some of them. Be very concrete now.

Mr. ALSBERG. I don't know. I am under oath not to talk. I don't mind talking, but I am under oath.

Mr. THOMAS. You are under oath right now.

Mr. ALSBERG. They put me under oath. They put you under oath when you come and when you leave.

Mr. THOMAS. Who put you under that oath?

Mr. ALSBERG. No; it was a handbook of all American education, labor, Army, and Navy—I didn't do the Army and Navy, somebody else did that.

Mr. THOMAS. The handbook is to be used by us abroad?

Mr. ALSBERG. It is to be used by the officials of the O. W. I. abroad. That was supposed to be confidential. I worked very hard on that.

I probably worked almost 2 months on that. I was busy on that. Then the schools in Honolulu wanted some popular information about America, and they wanted stuff about Washington.

MR. THOMAS. George Washington or Washington, D. C.?

MR. ALSBERG. No; about the city. Besides supervising the guide-book, I wrote a series of articles describing the White House, the Capitol, and the plan of Washington.

MR. THOMAS. Did you describe the Congress, too?

MR. ALSBERG. We didn't describe—we were not asked to describe institutions. I only described internal things.

MR. THOMAS. Did you describe the Capitol?

MR. ALSBERG. Chiefly the White House, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial—the Lincoln Monument.

MR. THOMAS. But you didn't spend much time on the Capitol?

MR. ALSBERG. I was called off probably on to something else. I don't remember. I wrote much about the Capitol except its location. I was not doing the complete job on Washington.

MR. THOMAS. Those were to be used in the schools of Honolulu?

MR. ALSBERG. So I was told. They had asked for that. The collection of material on social welfare in the United States occupied me 6 weeks, and I wrote a long article, and I saw the other day they have used the material in different ways—split it up.

MR. THOMAS. Where was the social-welfare material used?

MR. ALSBERG. It was demanded in several places abroad. I don't remember which, but they asked for this material. They were interested in this material. What we were doing in social welfare, child care.

MR. THOMAS. I would suggest to you, Mr. Matthews, that you ask the office of O. W. I. if they have any objection to our getting a copy of these various pamphlets.

MR. MATTHEWS. Let's be sure that they are identified in the record.

MR. THOMAS. I think they are.

MR. MATTHEWS. Sufficiently identified.

MR. THOMAS. Were there any other ones that you had?

MR. ALSBERG. There were odd jobs. They came to me for information, especially about what Government agencies were doing. I was used as a kind of reference, book of reference on a great many things.

MR. THOMAS. Were these pamphlets or booklets the kind of material you used in the Writers Project?

MR. ALSBERG. No; no; no; they had no relation to that.

MR. THOMAS. How did you happen to get this job?

MR. ALSBERG. I had gone up there in—I don't know exactly what time—sometime—

MR. THOMAS. Up where?

MR. ALSBERG. Sometime last spring, to the office up here.

MR. THOMAS. In New York City?

MR. ALSBERG. And put in some kind of application. And then I was notified about 4 or 5 months afterward to come up.

MR. THOMAS. Whom did you see here?

MR. ALSBERG. I saw Mr. Stanley.

MR. THOMAS. Mr. Stanley?

MR. ALSBERG. Yes.

MR. THOMAS. Did you have any endorsements to your application; anyone endorse your application?

Mr. ALSBERG. No. Not at the time. I just made the application.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you have anyone sponsor your application?

Mr. ALSBERG. No, sir. I didn't ask anyone to sponsor it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you give any references?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes. I gave references. Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. THOMAS. That is Harry Hopkins?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes. Reed Harris, who had been my assistant. Let me think who else there were.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you give Frankfurter as a reference?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes; I gave Frankfurter as a reference.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you know whether they ever checked up on those references?

Mr. ALSBERG. I have not the slightest idea. They didn't tell me.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A few days before you resigned were you visited and questioned by any representatives of any Government agencies?

Mr. ALSBERG. I don't know. About 2 weeks before I was asked to come to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you go?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To the meeting of the representatives of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you give testimony before the representatives?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it sworn testimony?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that about 2 weeks before your resignation?

Mr. ALSBERG. It might have been more than that. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was not much more than 2 weeks, was it?

Mr. ALSBERG. I don't remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was sometime in March?

Mr. ALSBERG. I don't know, it might have been in February.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did any other representative of any Government agency visit you?

Mr. ALSBERG. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the fact that you had been called in for questioning by the Civil Service Commission influence you to resign?

Mr. ALSBERG. No. Frankly that did not. But I suppose self-consciously I did not want to go through with the same procedure I had been through for 2 years in Russia. Not civil service in particular, but I worked under this investigation of the Woodrum committee, and it might have had some influence on me. I didn't want to go through it again. Chiefly it was the fact that I had a very favorable report on my book and I didn't see any way of finishing it except to really get down and do it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have any independent income or independent position?

Mr. ALSBERG. There is a little income, a small income—my father's mother's estate, which, however, for some years shows a deficit. It consists of some old houses which in some years don't bring in anything.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Approximately how much would that income be, in the course of a year?

Mr. ALSBERG. As I say, in this last year there was not any.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is there anything at the present time?

Mr. ALSBERG. I can't tell you, because I had had to add it up against expenditures and taxes. It is very small.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you already signed a contract—

Mr. ALSBERG. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS (continuing). For the publication of either one of these books?

Mr. ALSBERG. No; but I have had very encouraging reports.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have had no publisher definitely say that he would sign a contract?

Mr. ALSBERG. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you managed through your past positions and writings and lectures to save any considerable sum of money?

Mr. ALSBERG. I have enough money to carry me through, oh, along for a year or so, until I can finish this book.

Mr. THOMAS. Will it take you a year to finish this book?

Mr. ALSBERG. No; but I mean I have enough funds to carry me through. I always managed to sell some articles to get some kind of a job to support me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know Arthur Goldschmidt?

Mr. ALSBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is his position?

Mr. ALSBERG. I cannot answer definitely. He was in the Power Commission when I knew him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is still an attorney for the Power Commission—general counsel.

Mr. ALSBERG. I definitely don't know, because I have not seen Arthur Goldschmidt, well, it is almost a year, and then I only saw him in Washington for a few minutes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long have you known him?

Mr. ALSBERG. I only know Arthur Goldschmidt since I was in the F. E. R. A.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. THOMAS. In view of the fact that you are no longer with the Government, and in view of the fact also that we have a great deal of testimony in the hearings of the Dies committee, I can see no reason why we should continue with hearings today, unless you have any special statement that you want to make.

(Witness excused.)

(Whereupon the committee adjourned.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1943

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:40 a. m. in room 543, House Office Building, the Honorable Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

Present: Hon. Martin Dies, Hon. Joe Starnes, and Hon. Noah M. Mason.

Also present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, secretary and chief investigator for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will go into a subcommittee composed of the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Starnes; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mason; and myself, for the purpose of hearing Mr. Lacy.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM S. B. LACY, CHIEF OF THE FOREIGN INFORMATION SECTION, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lacy, on the membership list of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which we obtained from the headquarters of the organization in Washington and which was identified under oath by the secretary of the organization as a genuine membership list, there appears the name of William S. B. Lacy. It gives his address as 2556 Massachusetts Avenue NW. Were you a member of the organization?

Mr. LACY. I was not, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever apply for membership in the organization?

Mr. LACY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Lamberton ever contact you about becoming a member of the organization?

Mr. LACY. He did not, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did anyone?

Mr. LACY. No, sir. May I interpose here. I asked for the literature of the league and, so far as I am aware, that was the only connection I had with the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You simply asked for the literature?

Mr. LACY. That is right. I simply had a suspicion and I wanted to know.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action?

Mr. LACY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your present position?

Mr. LACY. I am Chief of the Foreign Information Section which serves the Office of Price Administration, the War Production Board, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Office for Emergency Management.

The CHAIRMAN. What are your feelings about communism, nazi-ism, and fascism? Briefly.

Mr. LACY. Well, sir, I have been a student of comparative government for 15 years. I believe I can identify the party line whether it be from the Kremlin or the Brienner Strasse or from Rome. I have never failed to oppose those political doctrines in word or in action and in whatever degree of intensity I found them. When I felt someone was unwittingly serving the purpose of the Communist line, I tried to straighten them out.

The CHAIRMAN. You find that being listed as a member of this organization is a detriment?

Mr. LACY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You know that your letter was placed in the record?

Mr. LACY. Yes, sir. I believe it is. I feel more satisfied with the way you are doing it now.

Mr. STARNES. You lived at the address given on Massachusetts Avenue?

Mr. LACY. That is my address and was at the time.

Mr. STARNES. Were you convinced that it was a Communist front organization and that it followed the party line?

Mr. LACY. Yes, sir. I think I did.

Mr. STARNES. You were not in sympathy with it?

Mr. LACY. Most certainly not. My friends, both here and in Virginia, would be glad to say that I oppose that line.

Mr. STARNES. You have no sympathy with the Communist Party or with its activities or future in this country?

Mr. LACY. No, sir; and I have never in any way been sympathetic with the Communist Party or the Communist line. I am afraid I have been regarded by some of my good liberal friends as an awful conservative, but never a pink.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have any idea as to why your name was listed as a member?

Mr. LACY. I believe it was because I requested literature for which I paid. I remember the same time I used to try and pick up a magazine—a Spanish Fascist thing—because I intended and still intend to devote my life to foreign affairs as I do now and I do not want to be caught napping.

Mr. STARNES. You believe in this form of government?

Mr. LACY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. You believe in a free enterprise?

Mr. LACY. I do with no qualifications whatsoever.

Mr. STARNES. Fine.

Mr. MASON. When did you graduate from the University of Colorado?

Mr. LACY. In 1932.

Mr. MASON. Did you major in government?

Mr. LACY. Yes, sir; government and international relations.

The CHAIRMAN. What he needs is some action by the committee to be filed with the Civil Service Commission and the F. B. I.

Mr. MASON. I am very satisfied to do so. I would offer a motion that we have the Secretary furnish this gentleman with a letter setting forth the facts—that he came in and explained the situation and the committee is convinced that he was not a member of the organization.

Mr. STARNES. Did you ever pay any money for that literature?

Mr. LACY. I do not ever recall doing so.

Mr. STARNES. You said in your letter: "I presume that my name was included on the list because I received the League's literature for which I paid the required price."

Mr. LACY. Since I wrote that it has occurred to me that that must have been right.



INDEX

	Page
Abraham Lincoln Battalion.....	3455
Abraham Lincoln Brigade.....	3261, 3455f, 3460
Adamic, Louis.....	3143f, 3190
Adams, Edward.....	3293
Adams, John.....	3182
Adams, Leonie.....	3163
Addams, Jane.....	3134, 3178, 3180
Addis, Thomas.....	3188
Affiliated Summer Schools for Workers.....	3008f, 3344, 3351
Aiken, Janet Rankin.....	3190
Alabama Farmers' Union.....	3086
Alfred, Helen.....	3188
Algren, Nelson.....	3032
All-American Anti-Imperialist League.....	3100, 3305, 3311f, 3314, 3507f
Allen, Robert S.....	3520
Allport, Gordon.....	3239, 3244
Alsberg, Henry Garfield.....	3574
Amalgamated Clothing Workers.....	3053, 3071f, 3168, 3173, 3340f, 3485, 3529
American Bar Association.....	3565f, 3568
American Civil Liberties Union.....	3063, 3292, 3314, 3318, 3334, 3520, 3568f, 3571
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.....	3243, 3245ff, 3297, 3332, 3338, 3363
American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born.....	3141ff, 3144, 3190, 3331, 3338, 3514, 3517f
American Committee for the Struggle Against War.....	3134
American Congress for Peace and Democracy.....	3243, 3250, 3297
American Council Against Nazi Propaganda.....	3385
American Council of Learned Societies.....	3188
American Council on Soviet Relations.....	3523
American Economics Association.....	3188
American Educational Labor Service.....	3344
American Federation of Government Employees.....	3071ff
American Federation of Labor.....	3007, 3024, 3036, 3071f, 3074ff, 3171, 3173, 3196f, 3204, 3206, 3232, 3234, 3342, 3485, 3487, 3495ff, 3533, 3568
American Federation of Teachers.....	3033, 3036, 3074ff, 3086, 3252, 3277f, 3280, 3343, 3494
American Fellowship Forum.....	3122
American Friends of the Soviet Union.....	3375, 3377
American Friends of Spanish Democracy.....	3261, 3515
American Fund for Public Service.....	3012, 3022, 3502f
American Joint Distribution Committee.....	3575f
American Labor Party.....	3248, 3460, 3560
American League Against War and Fascism.....	3100ff, 3103, 3124, 3134, 3318, 3336, 3338, 3349, 3360, 3376f, 3518f
American League for Peace and Democracy.....	3098f, 3101, 3134, 3243, 3249ff, 3292, 3363, 3369, 3371, 3375, 3377, 3380f, 3388, 3393f, 3396, 3404, 3049ff, 3412ff, 3476f, 3479, 3481, 3483, 3499, 3514, 3526, 3583.
American Legion.....	3033
American Negro Labor Congress.....	3100, 3305
American Newspaper Guild.....	3071f
American Peace Mobilization.....	3142, 3248, 3448f, 3475f, 3512f, 3516, 3563f, 3572
"American Policy Toward Russia Since 1917".....	3095, 3145
American Political Science Association.....	3191

	Page
American Relief Administration	3575
American Rescue Ship Mission	3332, 3338
American Smelting & Refining Co.	3480
American Socialist Party	3158
American Society of International Law ..	3191
American Student Union	3072,
3099, 3140, 3243, 3251f, 3297, 3349, 3360f, 3468, 3515,	3519
American Workers Party	3041, 3068f, 3225ff, 3231,
American Workers Socialist Party	3070
American Youth Act	3252
American Youth Conference	3071
American Youth Congress	3071f, 3099, 3251f, 3297, 3381, 3499,
Amlie, Thomas R	3252
Amsterdam Congress (<i>see</i> Amsterdam World Congress Against War) ..	3135, 3179f
Amsterdam World Congress Against War (<i>see</i> Amsterdam Congress) ..	3133f, 3403
Amiter, Israel	3354
Anderson, Sherwood	3105, 3148, 3163, 3179, 3190
Anderson, Thomas	3543
Andrews, Bill	3030, 3067
Andrews, Elmer	3529f, 3531f
Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Science	3469
Anti-Imperialist Congress	3302, 3326
Anti-Nazi Literature Committee	3188
Antonini, Luigi	3460
Arkansas Commonwealth College	3081
Arkansas Conference for Economic and Social Justice	3049
Arkansas Federation of Labor	3033, 3074
Arkansas Legislative Committee	3067
Arkansas State Legislature	3015, 3018, 3050
Armstrong, Frank	3169
Armstrong, L	3167
Arnold, John (alias for Abraham Chapman) ..	3391
Arnstein, Samuel	3221
Artists Union	3349
Artussio, Hugo Fernandez	3461
Arvia, Newton	3105, 3147f, 3163, 3188
Associated Negro Press	3321
Association of American Colleges	3577
Astor, Lady	3167
Atkinson, Henry	3371
Auhagen, Frederick	3122
Author's League	3188
Backall, M.	3119, 3174
Bacon, Charles S	3188
Bail, Alex	3311
Bailey, Margaret	3179
Baker, Charles	3404, 3506
Baker, Jacob	3503
Baldwin, Roger	3026f, 3080, 3190, 3303, 3305, 3311, 3317, 3326, 3502,
Baltimore Public Forum	3013
Bancroft, Frank C	3188
Barber, Philip	3176
Barbour, W. Warren	3507
Barbusse, Henri	3134, 3179, 3403
Bardacke, Gregory	3179
Barker, Robert B	3411
Barnes, Harry Elmer	3190
Barnett, John	3034
Baron, Sam	3458
Barret, George	3221
Barron, Samuel	3536, 3550ff
Barsky, Edward K	3324
Basshe, Emjo	3148, 3163
Battle, George Gordon	3190
Bayer, Theodore	3470
Beach, Joseph Warren	3515

	Page
Beard, Charles A.....	3021, 3192, 3252, 3357
Beard, Mary R.....	3357
Beatty, Bessie.....	3188
Bechtold, Eugene.....	3135f, 3182
Beck, Joe E., Jr.....	3051
Becker, Maurice.....	3163, 3188
Bedacht, Max.....	3176, 3354
Belfrage, Cedric.....	3086
Belous, Charles.....	3560
Benjamin, Herbert.....	3073
Benson, Elmer.....	3252
Bentall, David J.....	3262, 3563
Benton.....	3011, 3065
Berger, Meta.....	3188
Berger, Victor L.....	3158
Bergman, Walter.....	3086
Bergum, Edwin Berry.....	3190
Berle, Adolph.....	3537, 3543, 3545f
Berne, Lewis Alan.....	3190
Bernstein, Philip.....	3190
Bernstein, Samuel.....	3430
Bethune, Mary McLeod.....	3190
Biddle, Francis.....	3073,
	3099, 3202, 3248, 3295f, 3312f, 3323, 3330f, 3362, 3375f, 3378,
	3388, 3394, 3533.
Bijur, Nathan.....	3575
Birk, Louis P.....	3188
Bishop, George.....	3086
Bisson, Thomas Arthur.....	3188, 3467
Black, Henry.....	3030, 3051, 3055, 3067
Blackwell, Alice Stone.....	3188, 3190
Blair, Francis Preston.....	3374
Blake, Katherine Devereaux.....	3188
Blattner, N.....	3167
Blitzstein, Marc.....	3188
Block, Anita.....	3188
Blor, Ella Reeve.....	3028,
	3031, 3033f, 3037f, 3040f, 3046f, 3068, 3315, 3348f, 3522
Blumenstock, Dorothy.....	3128
Boaz, Franz.....	3190, 3246, 3248, 3329
"Bolshevism, Fascism, and the Liberal State".....	3092
Boncer, W. M.....	3072
Book Shop Association.....	3439, 3441f
Borders, Karl.....	3171, 3346f
Bosch, John.....	3086
Bourke-White, Margaret.....	3361
Bowen, Stirling.....	3188
Boyer, Richard.....	3188
Brady, Robert A.....	3188
Bragg, Mrs. M.....	3119, 3174
Bragg, Raymond.....	3119, 3174
Brand, Millen.....	3188
Brandeis, Louis D.....	3080
Brandeis, Mrs. Louis D.....	3080
Brandt, Joseph.....	3573f
Bransten, Richard (alias Bruce Minton).....	3557
Breedlove.....	3072
Breines, Simon.....	3188
Brewster, Dorothy.....	3188, 3292
Bridges, Harry.....	3073, 3100,
	3118, 3130f, 3139, 3202, 3204, 3248f, 3261, 3312f, 3507, 3555, 3570
Briffault, Robert.....	3188
British Communist Party.....	3139
British Esperanto Association.....	3300
British Independent Labor Party.....	3491
British Labor Party.....	3489, 3495
Brodsky, Joseph R.....	3562, 3569

	Page
Bromberg, J. E.....	3188
Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.....	3551 3553
Brooks, Van Wyck.....	3190
Brookwood Labor College.....	3023f, 3197, 3215, 3223, 3230ff, 3233f, 3342ff, 3354ff, 3358, 3485f, 3493ff, 3496f
Brophy, William.....	3407, 3480
Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.....	3485, 3496
Brown, Heywood.....	3190, 3403
Browder, Earl.....	3045, 3099, 3101, 3107, 3125, 3129, 3132ff, 3143, 3176, 3178f, 3205f, 3230, 3259, 3290f, 3306ff, 3310, 3315, 3323, 3326, 3330, 3335, 3349, 3354, 3378, 3427, 3452, 3459, 3475, 3519, 3566.
Browder, William E.....	3107
Brown, Bob.....	3055
Brown, Charley.....	3035
Brown, George Warren.....	3086
Brown, Harold.....	3011, 3051f, 3065
Brown, John.....	3305
Brown, Rose.....	3055
Brown, Slater.....	3148, 3163
Bruun, Geoffrey.....	3192
Bryan, Horace.....	3033, 3074f, 3086
Buck, Robert.....	3340f
Budenz, Louis Francis.....	3213, 3219, 3226, 3350, 3354
Burck.....	3035, 3046
Burgum, Edwin Berry.....	3188
Burke, Fielding.....	3163, 3188
Butler, J. R.....	3032, 3048f
Butler, Nicholas Murray.....	3155
Cadden, Joseph.....	3251
Cahn, Bernard.....	3541
Caldwell, Erskine.....	3148, 3163
Cannon, James P.....	3069
Cantril, Hadley.....	3239, 3244
Cantwell, Robert.....	3148, 3163
Carnegie Foundation.....	3073
Carnegie Fund.....	3012, 3053, 3485f
Carr, Charlotte.....	3253
Carson, Isabella.....	3054
Carusi, Ugo.....	3443
Caspary, Vera.....	3188
Cécil, Lord Robert.....	3369
Celler, Emanuel.....	3190
Central Labor Unions.....	3071
Chamberlain.....	3166
Chamberlain, John.....	3255f
Chambers, Maria Cristina.....	3188
Chambers, Robert.....	3188
Champion.....	3360, 3368f, 3379f
Champion of Youth.....	3511
Chan, Hanshu.....	3475
Chapman, Abraham (alias John Arnold).....	3391
Chappell, Winifred L.....	3104f, 3147f, 3163
Chase, Stuart.....	3255f
Chess, Ann.....	3179
Chevalier, Haakon.....	3188
Cheyney, Edward P.....	3190
Chiang Kai-shek.....	3306ff, 3310
Chicago Citizens Committee.....	3170
Chicago Defender.....	3119, 3174
Chicago Federation of Labor.....	3168, 3170f, 3340f
Chicago League Against War and Fascism.....	3138
Chicago Review.....	3119, 3174
Chicago Student Congress Against War.....	3135
Chicago Workers School.....	3127f
Chicago Workers School Forum.....	3126f
China Aid Council.....	3371

	Page
China Today.....	3474f
Christian Social Justice Fund.....	3011ff
Chuck, Steve.....	3169
Church Peace Union.....	3370
Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder.....	3290f, 3297
Civil Rights Review.....	3568
Clark, George W.....	3174
Clark, Joe W.....	3119
Class Mark.....	3446f
Cleghorn, Sarah.....	3190
Clement, S. N.....	3152
Cleveland Educational League.....	3453
Close, Upton.....	3178ff
Clurman, Harold.....	3188
Coates, Robert M.....	3188
Cochrane, William F.....	3012
Codema, Bill.....	3221
Cohen, David.....	3541
Cohen, Joseph.....	3179
Cohen, Lester.....	3148, 3163, 3188
Cohen, Louis Henry.....	3575
Coleman, Lucien E.....	3051
Colman, Louis.....	3148, 3163
Common Sense.....	3275, 3280
Commoner.....	3086
Commons, John R.....	3020, 3484
Commonwealth College.....	3004,
3007f, 3010, 3012f, 3017ff, 3020ff, 3023ff, 3026f, 3031ff, 3034ff,	
3037f, 3041ff, 3044, 3046ff, 3048ff, 3051ff, 3054ff, 3057ff, 3060ff,	
3064, 3066ff, 3071, 3073ff, 3076f, 3079f, 3082f, 3085, 3105, 3120,	
3349.	
Commonwealth College Association.....	3026, 3030, 3049, 3052, 3086
Commonwealth College Fortnightly.....	3032ff,
3035ff, 3039, 3041, 3043f, 3046, 3058ff, 3067, 3074f, 3081	
Communist, The.....	3361
Communist International.....	3042,
3069f, 3125, 3134, 3158, 3164f, 3186, 3422f, 3470	
Communist Manifesto.....	3429, 3435
Compere, Ralph.....	3033
Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America.....	3514
Conference on Pan American Democracy.....	3243, 3253f, 3297, 3324f, 3338, 3498
Conference for Progressive Labor Action.....	3069,
3213f, 3216, 3219, 3225ff, 3228f, 3350ff, 3353f, 3495, 3497	
Conference for Progressive Political Action.....	3208f
Congress Against War.....	3323, 3337
Congress of American Revolutionary Writers.....	3378, 3426
Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union.....	3211f, 3224f, 3229
Congress of Industrial Organizations.....	3007,
3029, 3196f, 3204, 3352, 3487, 3534, 3568	
Congress of the League Against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism.....	3303f
Conroy, Jack.....	3032f
Consumers Councils of Baltimore.....	3551, 3553
Consumers' League.....	3026
Consumers' Research.....	3215
Consumers Union.....	3243f, 3292f
Cooney, Prentiss.....	3529
Coonley, John C.....	3089
Cooper, H.....	3119, 3174
Co-Operative Book Shop.....	3439
Cooperative Distributors, Inc.....	3227
Cooperative League of Washington.....	3438, 3441f, 3451
Committee for Cultural Freedom.....	3187
Committee to Defend America by Joining the Allies.....	3141
Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War.....	3512f
Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.....	3228
Committee on Fair Employment Practices.....	3272
Committee of the Illinois State Senate.....	3092

	Page
Committee for Industrial Organization.....	3408
Committee for Industrial Unionism.....	3072
Committee of the International Chamber of Commerce.....	3170
Committee for National Morale.....	3291, 3294
"Committee on Public Information".....	3177
Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo.....	3243
Cope, E. F.....	3354
Copenhaver, Eleanor.....	3179
Corey, Lewis.....	3148, 3163
Corsi, Edward.....	3190
Costello, E. J.....	3340
Costigan, Howard.....	3190
Council for Pan-American Democracy.....	3240, 3254, 3333, 3335, 3338, 3461, 3498f
Council for Protection of Foreign-Born.....	3142
Council of Trade Association Executives.....	3551, 3553
Counts, George S.....	3179, 3190, 3252
Covello, Leonard.....	3190
Cowell, Henry.....	3148, 3163
Cowley, Malcolm.....	3092ff, 3113, 3148, 3163, 3192, 3261, 3475
Coy, Harold.....	3066, 3086
Coy, Mildred Price.....	3051
Coyle, Albert.....	3341
Cranston, Alan.....	3386f
Crawford, A. B.....	3152
Crawford, Bruce.....	3032, 3105, 3147f, 3163
Crawford, Kenneth.....	3534
Cressey, George B.....	3188
Crichton, Kyle S.....	3163, 3188
Criminal Syndicalist Act of Illinois.....	3182
Crouch, Paul.....	3315
Crump, L. C.....	3072
Cullen, Countee.....	3163
"Culture and the Crisis".....	3094, 3104, 3106, 3108ff, 3111f, 3114, 3141, 3163
Cunningham, Clarice.....	3055
Cunningham, Kathleen (<i>See: Kate Richards O'Hare</i>).....	3051
Cunningham, William.....	3030, 3055, 3058, 3067
Cush, E. P.....	3211, 3221
Daily Worker.....	3022,
	3042, 3046, 3059, 3070f, 3104, 3106f, 3109f, 3113, 3126f, 3133f,
	3141, 3212, 3219f, 3222, 3224, 3229, 3261, 3291, 3304f, 3307f,
	3310, 3314, 3319ff, 3322f, 3336, 3338, 3341, 3360, 3375, 3377,
	3388f, 3391f, 3396, 3398f, 3401, 3411, 3422f, 3425, 3435f, 3446,
	3452, 3456, 3459, 3476f, 3483, 3503f, 3517f, 3521ff, 3542, 3556f,
	3560.
Dale, Thelma M.....	3440
Daly, J. Joseph.....	3167
Dana, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.....	3134, 3148, 3163, 3179
Darcy, Sam.....	3336
Darling, John.....	3072
Daughters of the American Revolution.....	3255
Davenport, Robert.....	3440
Davies, Joseph.....	3135
Davis, Jerome.....	3086, 3190
Davis, John P.....	3086, 3564
Dawson, Ellen.....	3221
de Kruif, Paul.....	3188
de la Mora, Constantia.....	3333
Dearborn, Ned H.....	3245
Debs, Eugene V.....	3024, 3200
Defense Advisory Committee.....	3197
De Ford, Miriam Allen.....	3148, 3163, 3188
Dehn, Adolf.....	3105, 3148, 3163
Deiss, Jay.....	3440
Delaney, Atley.....	3057, 3065
Dennis, Lawrence.....	3122f
Denny, Charles R., Jr.....	3088, 3235, 3296, 3366
DePriest, Oscar.....	3169

	Page
Descendants of the American Revolution	3255, 3297
Dewey, John	3155, 3190
Dewey, Thomas	3257, 3259
Dial Press	3419
di Donato, Pietro	3188
Diggs, Edwin L.	3179
Dilling, Elizabeth	3092, 3106, 3127
Dimock, Marshall E.	3190
Direction	3577
Dobyns, Fletcher	3171
Dodd, Bella V.	3280
Dodd, William E., Jr.	3188, 3366
Dodge, Stanley D.	3188
Don, Sam	3389
Donaldson, Virginia	3032, 3034, 3036, 3042ff, 3045f, 3068
Dore, E. F.	3199
Dos Passos, John	3105, 3148, 3163, 3190, 3501
Doughty, Howard N., Jr.	3148, 3163
Douglas, Dorothy	3188, 3190
Douglas, Paul	3253
Douglass, Harl R.	3190
Dozenberg, Nicholas	3418
Draper, Muriel	3188
Dreiser, Theodore	3105, 3148, 3261, 3332
Dryden Press	3419
Dubinsky, David	3529, 3531
Dubois, W. E. B.	3320
Dun & Bradstreet	3528
Dunn, James	3520
Dunn, Ch. C.	3167
Dunn, F. S.	3192
Dunn, Leslie C.	3188, 3190
Dunn, Robert W.	3314
Dunne, William F.	3309, 3314
Eastern States Cooperative Wholesale	3227
Eddy, Harriet G.	3188
Edises, Bertram	3440
Edwards, Thyra	3181
Efron, David O.	3461
Egbert, Lawrence	3420
Eighth Annual Conference of the Teachers and Workers Education	3354f
Eling, Robert	3221
Eliot, George Fielding	3461
Elliott, Thomas H.	3549
Ellis, Clyde	3050
Elmer, Gustave	3395
Elmhurst Fund	3011f
Elmhurst, Mrs. Leonard	3011f, 3053
Ely, Hanson E.	3177
Emergency Exchange Association	3408
Emerson, Haven	3260
Emerson, Thomas I.	3546
Employers Plumbers Association	3452
Engel, Fanny	3430
Engineer's Journal	3340f
Englestein, David	3033, 3036, 3075
Epstein, Abraham	3493
Equality	3388, 3390f, 3394, 3396, 3398
Ernst, Morris	3503, 3559
Exiled Writers Committee	3422, 3429, 3436
Express and Station Employees	3496
Fahy Book Shops	3462
Fahy, Jack Bradley	3453
Fahy, Walter J.	3462
Fairchild, Henry Pratt	3188, 3253
Fairchild, Mildred	3188, 3190
Fair Labor Standards Act	3529

	Page
Fall.....	3154
Faneuf, Lester P.....	3551f
Farley, James.....	3309
Farm Board.....	3153
Farmer-Labor Party.....	3072, 3171, 3209
Farmer-Labor Party of Pennsylvania.....	3208
Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union.....	3049
Farmers National Committee for Action.....	3034, 3349
Fascist Party.....	3122
Faure, Ellie.....	3035
Fearing, Kenneth.....	3188
Federal Emergency Relief Administration.....	3054
Federal Workers School.....	3450
Federal Writers Project.....	3576f, 3580
Federated Press.....	3041, 3340f, 3348
Feise, Ernest.....	3190
Ferdinandson, G.....	3167
Ferguson, Isaac E.....	3563
Field, Alice Withrow.....	3188
Field, Frederick Vanderbilt.....	3475, 3572
Field, Sara Bard.....	3188
Field, William O., Jr.....	3188
Fielstra, Garret.....	3444, 3447
Fifteenth International Brigade.....	3455
Fight.....	3393f, 3398
Fight Against War and Fascism.....	3338
Filene, Edward.....	3486
Filene Fund.....	3486
Fineman, Irving.....	3188
Finnish Workers Federation.....	3349
Fischer, Marjorie.....	3188
Fisher, Arthur.....	3096
Fisher, Dorothy Canfield.....	3250
Fisher, Irving.....	3253
Fitzpatrick, John.....	3171
Five-Year Plan.....	3186, 3191
Fletcher, John.....	3305
Fletcher, John Gould.....	3032f
Flores, Angel.....	3188
Fly, James Lawrence.....	3242, 3245, 3293, 3296
Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley.....	3224, 3291, 3314
Folsom, Franklin.....	3258, 3332, 3430
Forblade, Henry.....	3179
Ford, James W.....	3104, 3106, 3111f, 3118ff, 3121f, 3124, 3147f, 3162f, 3174, 3316, 3330, 3354
Foreign Policy Association.....	3122, 3188, 3468ff, 3478
Forrest, R. P.....	3221
Forward America.....	3262f
Foster, William Z.....	3041, 3045, 3104, 3106, 3111f, 3118, 3147f, 3162f, 3205f, 3230, 3313, 3315, 3341, 3354, 3427, 3502
Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers.....	3378, 3436
Fox, Mary.....	3318
Fraenkel, Osmond K.....	3292, 3570
Franco.....	3332
Frank, W. K.....	3192
Frank, Waldo.....	3141, 3148, 3163, 3188, 3190
The Frankfort Zeitung.....	3318
Frankfurter, Felix.....	3566ff, 3581
Franklin, Francis.....	3071f
Fraser, Alex.....	3353
Frazier, Lynn J.....	3072, 3379
Free, Lloyd.....	3239, 3244
Freeman, Joseph.....	3133f, 3178, 3425
Freight Handlers.....	3496
Friday Magazine.....	3450
Friede, Donald S.....	3190
Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.....	3261, 3495, 3515

	Page
Friends of the Chinese People.....	3474f
Friends Service Committee.....	3327
Friends of Soviet Russia.....	3225
Friends of the Soviet Union... 3092, 3099, 3130, 3135f, 3138, 3181f, 3363,	3510
Frierson, E. P.....	3119, 3174
Fruchtman, Edward.....	3541
Frueh, Alfred.....	3105, 3148, 3163
Frye, Peter.....	3034
Fulks, James.....	3054
Funaroff, Sol.....	3424
Fund for Public Service.....	3053
Gag, Wanda.....	3188
Gallagher, Leo.....	3179, 3562f
Galleani, Humberto.....	3142
Gannes, Harry.....	3314, 3461f
Gardner, Warner W.....	3501
Garland, Charles.....	3502
Garland Fund.....	3012, 3022, 3053, 3502f
Garrison, Lloyd.....	3540, 3566f
Gassner, John W.....	3257
Gebert, Bill.....	3169
Geer, Will.....	3257
Geiser, Carl.....	3134, 3178f
Geizer, Meyer.....	3220
Gellert, Hugo.....	3188
Gellhorn, Walter.....	3548
General Motors.....	3151
Gerber, Albert.....	3541
German-American Bund..... 3218, 3317f, 3364, 3394f, 3516, 3553,	3571
Gessner, Robert.....	3188
Gideonse, Harry.....	3506
Gilman, Elizabeth.....	3011, 3013
Ginsburg, David.....	3549f
Gitlow, Benjamin.....	3099
Godwin, Murray.....	3148, 3163
Gogenback, Ralph.....	3132
Gold, Ben.....	3291, 3314
Gold, Michael.....	3259, 3378, 3425
Golden, Clinton S.....	3086, 3224, 3502
Goldman, Albert.....	3119f, 3174
Goldman, Marcus I.....	3439, 3480
Goldschmidt, Arthur E.....	3407, 3582
Goldschmidt, Elizabeth Wickenden.....	3411
Goldsmith, Moe.....	3428
Gomez, Manuel.....	3304f, 3312, 3508
Goodhue, F. M.....	3011, 3065
Goodman, Irvin.....	3563f
Goodsell, Willystine.....	3188
Gordon, Eugene.....	3163, 3391
Gordon, Mac.....	3178
Gosis, Dat.....	3096
Gould, Kenneth.....	3379
Graham, Frank P.....	3190, 3245
Granden, Thomas.....	3373
Granger, Lester.....	3086
Grattan, Hartley.....	3092
Graves, Harold, Jr.....	3091
Graves, Mortimer.....	3188
Gray, Abe.....	3169
Gray, John H.....	3188
Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights. 3328, 3330,	3338
Green, Gilbert.....	3557
Green, Irving.....	3311
Green, John.....	3029, 3085
Green, Nathan.....	3562, 3567
Green, William.....	3036, 3075, 3157, 3197, 3232, 3259
Greenlimb, P. E.....	3167

	Page
Gregory, Horace.....	3148, 3163
Gropper, William.....	3188, 3261
Grose, W. R.....	3463
Gross, Diana.....	3169
Groth, John.....	3379
Gruca, J.....	3167
Grudin, Louis.....	3148, 3163
Gutknecht, John.....	3538f, 3544
Haas, Francis.....	3531
Haessler, Carl.....	3033, 3040f, 3068, 3086, 3119f, 3137, 3174, 3182
Hague, Frank.....	3155
Hall, H. L.....	3167
Hallett, Winslow.....	3070
Halperin, Maurice.....	3188
Hamilton, Al.....	3129, 3175
Hamilton, Frank.....	3119, 3174
Hamm, Elmer.....	3034
Hammett, Dashiell.....	3332, 3378
Hands Off China.....	3306ff, 3309f, 3338
Hardman, J. B. S.....	3086
Harper, Louis.....	3119
Harper, Lucius.....	3174
Harper, Samuel Northrop.....	3096
Harris, Gerald.....	3086
Harris, Lem.....	3086
Harris, Reed.....	3581
Harris, Sydney Justin.....	3192
Harris, Thomas L.....	3393
Hart, Henry.....	3430
Hartman, Sarah.....	3072
Hartshorne, Edward, Jr.....	3179
Hastie, William H.....	3541
Hathaway, Clarence.....	3098, 3259, 3376, 3378, 3474
Haydon, A. Eustace.....	3115, 3174
Hays, Aline Davis.....	3292
Hays, Arthur Garfield.....	3306, 3560
Haywood, Bill.....	3201, 3203f
Haywood, William D.....	3198
Heald, Allen.....	3541
Health and Hygiene.....	3293
Hearing, William G.....	3220
Heicher, W. H.....	3192
Hemingway, Ernest.....	3190f
Hemisphere.....	3455
Hemisphere Corporation.....	3455
Henderson, Donald.....	3026ff, 3086, 3134, 3178f, 3190, 3251
Henderson, Leon.....	3498, 3529, 3549
Hendley, Charles J.....	3280
Henry Holt.....	3096
Herndon, Angelo.....	3032, 3086, 3379, 3481f, 3557f, 3567
Herriot, Eduard.....	3102
Herrmann, John.....	3034, 3148, 3163
Hewitt, Fred.....	3232
Hicks, Granville.....	3027, 3086, 3141, 3148, 3163
Highlander Folk School.....	3005, 3021f
Hill, A. J.....	3119, 3174
Hill, James Wheeler.....	3394f
Hillman, Sidney.....	3190, 3195ff, 3253, 3529, 3531
Hillquit, Morris.....	3158
Hinds, R.....	3167
Hirsch, Alfred H.....	3032
Hocking, William.....	3261
Hofstadter, Sam.....	3155
Holley.....	3538
Holmes, Eugene.....	3440
Holmes, John Haynes.....	3190, 3318, 3327
Holmes, Sybil.....	3028, 3030

	Page
Hook, Sidney	3148, 3163
Hoover, John Edgar	3395, 3398
Hopkins, Harry	3581
Horner, Henry	3182
Horton, Miles	3005
Hosiery Workers Union	3053
Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union	3533
Houghteling, James L.	3299
Hour, The	3385
Houston, Charles H.	3190
Howard, Sidney	3105, 3147f, 3163
Howard, W. V.	3086
Huberman, Leo	3361
Hughes, Langston	3141, 3148, 3163, 3255, 3261, 3379f, 3477
Hull, Cordell	3520, 3570
Hurst, Fannie	3190
Hyde, Maxwell	3105, 3148
Ickes, Harold	3257ff
Igo, William I.	3086
Illinois Criminal Syndicalist Law	3172
Illinois Emergency Relief Commission	3169, 3171
Illinois Federation of Labor	3171
Illinois National Guard	3169
Illinois State Senate Committee	3107, 3111
Imes, William Lloyd	3190
Independent Labor Party	3317
Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America	3006, 3009, 3081, 3084
Industrial Workers of the World	3195, 3197ff, 3200ff, 3203f
Ingersoll, Ralph	3347f, 3360, 3362ff
Insull, Samuel	3155
Inter-Church World Movement	3485
Inter-Democracy Federal Union	3191
International Association of Machinists	3204, 3206, 3208, 3232, 3418
International Committee for Amalgamation in the Metal Trades	3207f
International Information Bulletin	3069
International Juridical Association	3561f, 3564ff, 3567ff, 3570
International Juridical Association Bulletin	3561
International Labor Defense	3100, 3117, 3130, 3174, 3313ff, 3316, 3319, 3321, 3338, 3349, 3362f, 3410f, 3482, 3509, 3517, 3557f, 3567.
International Labor Office	3487
International Ladies Garment Workers' Union	3053f, 3531
International Literature	3431
International Magazine	3429
International Peace Campaign	3369f, 3375
International Press Correspondence	3470
International Publishers	3095ff, 3182, 3259, 3360
International Red Aid	3315, 3509
International Red Cross	3417
International Release Committee for Thaelmann	3470
International Students Hospitality Association	3572
International Typographical Union	3086, 3485
International Union of Revolutionary Writers	3431
International Workers Order	3071f, 3117, 3129ff, 3174ff, 3243, 3256f, 3297
Irwin, Elizabeth	3257
Irwin, Inez Haynes	3190
Isaacs, Stanley M.	3190
Israel, Edward L.	3190
Isserman, Abraham J.	3564
Jackson, Gardner	3254, 3392f
Jackson, Robert H.	3257ff, 3537, 3542f, 3545f
Jaffe, Louis L.	3560
James Rowe Fellowship	3113
Jan Wittenber Defense Committee	3137f, 3182
Janowicz, Vladimir	3114f, 3117f, 3167, 3173f

	Page
Jensen, Peter	3221
Jewish Morning Freiheit	3349
John Brown Memorial Association	3305f
John Reed Club	3182, 3259, 3424, 3426, 3437
Johns, Orrick	3148, 3163
Johnson, Arnold	3041, 3070
Johnson, Charles S.	3086, 3190
Johnston, William H.	3208
Jones, Joe	3031ff, 3035, 3037, 3039f, 3042ff, 3046
Jones, Llewelyn	3182
Jones, William N.	3163
Josephson, Barney	3431
Josephson, Leon	3431
Josephson, Matthew	3141, 3148, 3163
Joslyn, C. S.	3152
Kallet, Arthur	3292f
Kappe, Walter	3296
Karl Borders Committee on Unemployment	3171
Karnot, Stephen	3176
Karr, David (alias David Katz)	3383, 3398
Katz, David (alias for David Karr)	3384
Keating, Edward	3531
Kelley, Mrs. Francis	3372
Kelley, P.	3169
Kellogg-Briand Pact	3186
Kellogg, Paul	3528
Kelly, Mrs.	3380
Kelly, Mrs. Francis	3372, 3380
Kenny, Robert W.	3538
Kent, Rockwell	3190, 3261, 3332
Kenyon, Dorothy	3245, 3247
Kern, Paul J.	3563
Kilpatrick, William H.	3190
King, Carol Weiss	3190, 3260f, 3562, 3564f
Kirov, Sergei M.	3181
Kirtley, Guy	3086
Kjar, Nels	3169
Kleeck, Mary Van	3190
Klineberg, Otto	3190
Knopf, Alfred A.	3096, 3166
Knox, Ben E.	3167
Koch, Lucien	3004, 3105, 3133
Koch, Raymond	3055
Kohn, Hans	3192
Kolar, Julia Church	3256
Korenman, Irving R.	3176
Koyner, Joseph	3541
Krebs, Richard (alias Jan Valtin)	3390
Kreymborg, Alfred	3148, 3163
Krivitsky, Walter	3395
Kronenberger, Louis	3362
Krumbein, Charles	3176
Ku Klux Klan	3364
Kuhn, Fritz	3296, 3394f, 3397
Kunze, G. Wilhelm	3395
Kurasch, Martin A.	3541
LaBeau, Henry	3167
Labor Action	3228, 3230
"Labor Age"	3214, 3216, 3229, 3350ff, 3490ff, 3493
Labor Defender	3319, 3435
"Labor Herald"	3204f, 3207, 3228
Labor Party	3071, 3495
Labor Research Bureau	3349
Lacy, William S. B.	3583
Ladies Garment Workers' Union	3529
Lake, Richard	3179
Lamb, Edward	3560, 3563

	Page
Lambert, R. E.	3366
Lamberton, Harry C.	3481, 3534f, 3583
Lamont, Corliss.	3134, 3179, 3375
Lamson, W. O.	3167
Land, Yetta.	3563
Lardner, Ring W., Jr.	3332
Larkin, Oliver W.	3190
Lash, Joseph P.	3099, 3140, 3251f
Laski, Harold.	3324
Lasser, David.	3073
Lasswell, Harold D.	3127ff, 3130, 3138, 3143, 3145f
Latimer, Ira.	3179
Law Institute.	3551, 3553
Lawes, Lewis.	3252, 3259
Lawrence, Markham.	3095
Lawson, Elizabeth.	3086
League Against Imperialism.	3316
League of American Writers.	3243,
3257ff, 3297, 3362f, 3377f, 3426, 3429f, 3435, 3515ff, 3519	3502, 3524
League for Industrial Democracy.	3520
League for Mutual Aid.	3102, 3125f, 3164, 3180, 3186, 3191
League of Nations.	3106f, 3163
League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford.	3117, 3174
League of Struggle for Negro Rights.	3015
Legislative Committee of the State of Arkansas.	3549
Lehman, Herbert H.	3425
Leigh, Colston.	3091
Leigh, Robert D.	3070, 3098, 3187, 3303, 3443, 3452, 3496, 3503
Lenin.	3190
Leonard, William Ellery.	3379
Lerner, James.	3190
Lerner, Max.	3190
Lesinski, John.	3190
Lev, Alexander.	3470
Lever, Emil John.	3193, 3351f, 3354
Levinson, David.	3176
Lewis, John L.	3352, 3363, 3460
Lewis, Kathryn.	3460ff, 3499
Lewis, Ted.	3451
Libby, Fred.	3024
Liebstein, Jacob.	3427
Lindeman, Eduard C.	3086, 3190
Lipton, Lawrence.	3182
Literary Club.	3424
Little, John.	3254, 3461f
Llano Cooperative Colony.	3010, 3047, 3052, 3076
Loeb, Kuhn.	3576
Lopez, Marina.	3254f, 3461f, 3499
Lorwin, Louis.	3020
Louisiana Farmers' Union.	3086
Lovestone, J.	3427
Lovestoneites.	3311
Lovett, Robert Morss.	3115f, 3129, 3174f, 3179, 3190, 3501, 3547
Lovett, Sidney.	3190
Lowenthal, Blanche.	3119, 3174
Lowrie, John M.	3438, 3467
Lozowick, Louis.	3148, 3163
Lumpkin, Grace.	3027, 3086, 3148, 3163
Lund, Wendel.	3488
Lundeen, Ernest.	3072, 3092, 3136, 3181, 3209f, 3219, 3221, 3224
MacCallum, J. A.	3086
MacCracken, Henry N.	3190
Machinists Journal.	3232
Mackie, Matt.	3035
MacLean, Malcolm S.	3190
MacLeish, Archibald.	3190, 3522
Maltz, Albert.	3257

	Page
Manahan, H. M.	3072
Mandel, Benjamin	3428
Mangold, William P.	3519
Mann, Thomas	3187
Manning, Rosalie	3248
Manship, Paul	3190
Manson, Anne	3072
Marcantonio, Vito	3190, 3292, 3560
Margold, Nathan R.	3538f, 3541f
Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America	3029
Marine Transport Workers Industrial Union	3198f
Maritime Union	3081
Markoff, Abraham	3421
Martin, R.	3167
Martin, Walker	3086
Marx, Karl	3056, 3070, 3283, 3443
Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute	3428f, 3435
Mason and Moore	3416
Massachusetts State Legislature	3028f
Mathews, Stella	3034
Matthews, J. B.	3092, 3100, 3136, 3178ff, 3181, 3522f, 3527
Maurer, James	3497
Maxton, James	3316f
McAvoy, Clifford T.	3254, 3333
McCaskill, J. W. (see McCaskol, J. W.)	3174
McCaskol, J. W. (see McCaskill, J. W.)	3119
McClellan, Patrick	3308f
McClone, Junius	3072
McConnell, Francis J.	3190, 3250, 3260
McCoy, Frank R.	3478
McFadden, Bernarr	3083
McGoldrick, Joseph	3408
McIntyre, Gordon	3086
McKellar, Kenneth	3496
McKenna, Thomas	3120, 3137, 3174, 3182
McKenzie, William	3220
McNamara, James	3533
McNamara, Tom	3398
McWater, Miss T.	3119, 3174
McWilliams, Carey	3190
Mead, James	3461
Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy	3363
Medical Bureau of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy	3323f, 3338
Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy	3260, 3297
Medical Society of New York State	3152
Meiklejohn, Alexander	3008, 3018, 3086, 3190, 3251f
Mercury	3348
Mergenthaler Linotype	3416
Merriam, Charles E.	3128
Messerole, Darwin J.	3292
Metal and Steel Workers Industrial Union	3172
Methodist Federation for Social Service	3105, 3147, 3349
Mexican Department of Education	3240
Michels, M. J.	3167
Midwest Daily Record	3138
Miles, Vincent	3033
Miller, Bert	3428
Miller, M.	3167
Miller, Marcus	3050f, 3054
Miller, Spencer	3233f
Millikan, Robert A.	3245
Millis, Walter	3192
Milwee, Minor	3050f
Ming, Robert W., Jr.	3541
Mink, George	3431
Minor, Robert	3129, 3132, 3175f

	Page
Mins, Anne G.....	3436
Mins-Hamp Machine & Tool Corporation.....	3416
Mins, Henry Felix, Jr.....	3417
Mins, Henry Felix, Sr.....	3416
Mins, L.....	3435
Mins, Leonard E.....	3415, 3435
Mins, S.....	3435
Minton, Bruce (alias for Richard Bransten).....	3557
Mitchell, H. L.....	3049, 3058
Molotov, V.....	3140
Mouroe, Paul.....	3190
Montevideo Congress.....	3460ff, 3499
Montgomery, Sarah V.....	3451
Montgomery Tuberculosis Association.....	3453
Moody, Charles.....	3411
Mooney, Tom.....	3086, 3159
Moore, Richard E.....	3305, 3309
Moore, T. A.....	3382
Morgenthau, Henry.....	3420
Morris, Newbold.....	3245
Morris, Stanley.....	3541
Morrow, Felix.....	3148, 3163
Moser, Frank.....	3221
Moses, George H.....	3462
Moskowitz, Charlotte.....	3017f, 3023f, 3035, 3046, 3055
Mowrer, Edgar Ansel.....	3192
Muller, Herman.....	3179
Mussolini.....	3269
Muste, A. J.....	3041, 3069, 3213f, 3224ff, 3227, 3229f, 3233, 3342, 3350, 3352, 3354, 3496ff
Narodni Glasnik.....	3387
Nation.....	3192, 3247, 3348, 3521
National Action Conference for Civil Rights.....	3509
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.....	3169, 3300, 3305ff, 3310f, 3315, 3322f, 3325, 3327, 3329, 3333, 3337
National Bar Association.....	3544
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.....	3032, 3362, 3518, 3568, 3570f
National Committee of Independent Voters for Roosevelt and Wallace.....	3392
National Committee for People's Rights.....	3362f, 3518
National Committee for the Student Congress Against War.....	3514
National Consumers' League.....	3071
National Council of the League of American Writers.....	3361
National Defense Advisory Committee.....	3196
National Democratic Committee.....	3155
National Education Association.....	3286, 3289
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.....	3243
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.....	3330, 3336, 3338, 3483, 3508f, 3535
National Labor Relations Act.....	3019, 3541
National Labor Relations Board.....	3440, 3487f, 3498, 3532, 3534, 3564, 3567
National Lawyers Guild.....	3537ff, 3540ff, 3543ff, 3547, 3551, 3553, 3558ff
National Metal Trades Association.....	3204
National Mooney Council of Action.....	3521
National Negro Congress.....	3410f, 3564
National Recovery Administration.....	3005, 3029, 3057f, 3063, 3529
National Resources Planning Board.....	3109
National Security League.....	3177
National Student League.....	3103, 3139f, 3251, 3399, 3402ff
National Unemployed League.....	3069
National Urban League.....	3305
National War Labor Board.....	3006, 3009
National Writers' Congress.....	3519
National Youth Administration.....	3252, 3346f, 3411f
Nationalist Party.....	3185
"Native Son".....	3451
Nearing, Scott.....	3038, 3068, 3133f, 3178ff, 3314

	Page
Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union.....	3172
Nef, Walter.....	3199
Neff, Walter Scott.....	3280
Negro Liberator.....	3059
Neibuhr, Rienhold.....	3190
Neilson, William Allan.....	3190
Nelson, Eleanor.....	3448
Nelson, Oscar.....	3170f
Nestor, Agnes.....	3171
New America..... 3262ff, 3265ff, 3268f, 3271f, 3277, 3297	3297
New America News.....	3185
New Economic Policy.....	3420
New Leader.....	3341
New Majority.....	3338, 3360f, 3363, 3411, 3428, 3436f, 3452, 3483, 3515, 3519f, 3557
New Masses..... 3142, 3137, 3182, 3256, 3291, 3324ff, 3327, 3330f, 3338, 3360f, 3363, 3411, 3428, 3436f, 3452, 3483, 3515, 3519f, 3557	3069
New Militant.....	3042
New Pioneer.....	3113, 3158, 3164, 3192, 3247, 3348, 3459, 3503, 3520
New Republic..... 3113, 3158, 3164, 3192, 3247, 3348, 3459, 3503, 3520	3176, 3349
New Theater League.....	3158
New York City Board of Aldermen.....	3391
New York Daily Freiheit.....	3551, 3553
New York State Bankers Association.....	3551, 3553
New York State Conference of Mayors.....	3154
Newberry.....	3447f, 3450ff
News Letter.....	3129, 3175
Nicholson, Joseph W.....	3372
Niles, David.....	3072
Norfolk Central Labor Union.....	3072
Norfolk Educational League.....	3072
Norfolk Labor Journal.....	3086
Norman, Edward N.....	3243, 3260f, 3498
North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy..... 3243, 3260f, 3498	3325, 3446
North, Joseph.....	3354f, 3494
Norton, Helen.....	3233
Nunn, William.....	3168
Nygart, Emil.....	3510
Oak, Liston M.....	3190
O'Brien, Patrick H.....	3332
O'Connor, Harvey..... 3220,	3190
O'Day, Caroline.....	3427
OGPU.....	3025
O'Hare, F. P.....	3010f, 3024f, 3051f, 3065
O'Hare, Kate Richards (See: Kathleen Cunningham)..... 3010f, 3024f, 3051f, 3065	3259, 3378
Olgin, M. J.....	3190
Olson, Culbert L.....	3031, 3033, 3035, 3038ff, 3068
Omholt, Andrew..... 3031, 3033, 3035, 3038ff, 3068	3169
O'Neil, John.....	3243
Open Letter in Defense of the Communist Party.....	3141
Open Letter on Soviet Union.....	3240, 3571f
Open Road..... 3240, 3571f	3148, 3163
Ornitz, Samuel..... 3148, 3163	3190
Orton, O. M.....	3167
Osby, Laura.....	3416
Otis Bliss Manufacturing Co.....	3534
Owen, Cecil.....	3179
Owen, Jack.....	3345, 3348, 3359f, 3363f, 3386, 3521
PM..... 3345, 3348, 3359f, 3363f, 3386, 3521	3035
Pach, Walter.....	3172
Packing House Workers' Industrial Union.....	3255f
Paddock, Robert L.....	3034, 3042
Page, Myra..... 3034, 3042	3071
Painters', Seamen's, Tobacco Workers', and Government Employees' Union.....	3154
Palmer, A. Mitchell.....	3292f
Palmer, Dewey.....	3245
Park, Marion.....	3245

	Page
Parker, Carl	3055
Parmelee, Maurice	3092f
Partisan Review	3423ff, 3427, 3437
Patterson, William L	3326, 3330
Peace Mobilization	3517
Pearson, Drew	3398
Pecora, Ferdinand	3544f
Pennsylvania Federation of Labor	3208, 3211, 3497
People's Front	3125
Perazich, George	3179
Perkins, Frances	3139
Perlman, Selig	3020
Peterson, O. F.	3119, 3174
Pevzner, Sam	3257
Pfeiffer, H. W.	3167
Phelps, Wallace	3424
Philadelphia Labor Institute	3489, 3491
Philip, Andre	3284
Phillips, Ch. S.	3167
Phylax Club	3119, 3174
Pickens, William	3190, 3300
Pickler, E. L.	3072
Pilsudski	3418
Polier, Shad	3441
Political Prisoners Defense Organization	3228
Pollak, Catherine H	3357
Pope, Arthur Upham	3291f
Porter, Jim	3072
Porter, John W.	3541
Porter, Paul	3007
Portsmouth Central Labor Union	3072
Poulnot, B. F.	3086
Power Institute of the Academy of Sciences	3432
Pressman, Lee	3084, 3541, 3547
Prestes, Luiz Carlos	3333ff
Price, Ernest B.	3190
Price, Mildred	3055, 3066
Prisoners' Relief Fund	3319, 3338
Progressive Education Association	3240
Progressive Miners' Union	3352f
Proletarian Party	3030
Puzevich, J.	3167
Radin, Max	3190
Raeside, Andrew	3072
Railroad Brotherhood	3168, 3173
Railroad Workers' Industrial League	3172
Railway Clerk's Journal	3232
Rakowski, Daniel	3167
Ramsey, David (alias: Herbert Rosen)	3360f
Randau, Carl	3363
Randolph, A. Philip	3086
Randolph, Mildred	3072
Raskob, John J.	3155
Rautenstrauch, Walter	3190, 3332, 3513
Red International of Labor Unions	3208
Red Network	3092, 3172
Reed, Bob	3057, 3065
Reed, Mrs. Fernando	3443, 3445f
Reed, John	3563
Reed, Nancy	3444f, 3451
Reese, Curtis	3137, 3182
Reeve, Carl	3038f, 3315
Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign	3380, 3514
Reich, Bill	3033, 3041, 3068, 3070
Reich, Harry	3292
Reid, Paul	3371
Rein, David	3541

	Page
Reissig, Herman	3190, 3436f
Reiwach, Solomon	3035
Resettlement Administration	3017
Reuther, Victor G.	3086
Reynolds, Bertha C.	3086
Reynolds, Robert R.	3394
Richmond Central Labor Union	3072
Richor, R. V.	3532
Richter, H. M.	3119, 3174, 3182
Riemer, Mortimer	3541, 3547
Riley, Gerald	3543
Risley, Eleanor	3033
Rivera, Diego	3035, 3046
Rivera, Oscar Garcia	3560
Robeson, Paul	3336
Robinson, Reid	3082
Roche, John J.	3528
Rockefeller Fund	3486
Rockefeller, Nelson A.	3487
Rocky Mountain Fuel Co.	3528
Rodell, Fred	3560
Rodgers, Ward	3032f, 3058
Rodman, Selden	3262
Rogers, Pauline	3210, 3222
Rolfe, Edwin	3424
Roosevelt, Eleanor	3324, 3327
Rorty, James	3148, 3163
Rosen, Herbert (alias for David Ramsey)	3361
Rosenthal & Co.	3384f
Rotary Club of Bronx County	3551, 3553
Rote Fahne	3427
Roth, Rudolph	3411
Ruml, Beardsley	3108f, 3145f
Rushmore, Howard	3389
Russell, Charles Edward	3190
Russell Sage Foundation	3349
Russian National Mutual Aid Society	3176
Ryan, Edward, Jr.	3230f, 3353f
Ryan, John A.	3190
Rye, John G.	3050f, 3064
St. John, Vincent	3201
Saltzman, Rubin	3176
Sammis, Edward	3578
Sanford, Marvin	3035, 3047, 3055
Saposs, David	3214, 3484
Saul, Oscar	3257
Saylor, Abner J.	3202
Schachtman, Max	3069, 3314
Schaffarman, Eugene	3179
Schappes Defense Committee	3380f
Schappes, Morris	3280, 3381
Scherer, Marcel	3510
Schiffer, Paul	3122
Schindler, Pauline	3032
Schlauch, Margaret	3179
Schlossberg, Benjamin	3341
Schlossberg, Joseph	3341
Schneider, Isidor	3148, 3163, 3259, 3378
Schneiderman, Rose	3190
Schneiderman, William	3139
Schoene, Lester	3543
Scholastic Magazine	3379
Schulkind, Adelaide	3190
Schuman, Frederick L.	3087f, 3105, 3119, 3121, 3163, 3190, 3241f, 3268
Science and Society	3428, 3430, 3435
Scott, Byron	3252
Scottsboro Case	3154, 3320ff, 3326, 3329

	Page
Scudder, Vida D.....	3190
Seaver, Edwin.....	3148, 3163
Second International.....	3159, 3180
Second United States Congress Against War.....	3125
Seldes, George.....	3190, 3332
Selsam, Howard.....	3280
Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.....	3408, 3413
Senior, Clarence.....	3460, 3462
Sentner, William.....	3023, 3032, 3086
Sergent, Fred.....	3170
Seventh World Congress.....	3102
Seymour, Whitney E.....	3558
Shaffer, Nathan.....	3176
Sharp, Malcolm.....	3540
Shaver, J. L.....	3050f
Shaw, Harry.....	3181
Sheean, Vincent.....	3192
Shepherd, L. H.....	3051
Sher, Robert E.....	3399
Shipbuilding Commission of the National War Labor Board.....	3006
Shipbuilding Union.....	3028
Shieler, Guy Emery.....	3190, 3250
Shulman, Harry.....	3560
Siders, Fred.....	3221
Silverman, Harriet.....	3221f
Simmons, Conklin.....	3169
Simon & Schuster.....	3419
Simons, A. M.....	3021
Simpson, Herman.....	3163
Simpson, Lawrence.....	3568ff
Simpson, Norman.....	3148
Sinclair, Upton.....	3510
Sirokin, William.....	3221
Slaff, George.....	3541, 3547
Smith, Edwin.....	3498, 3534
Smith, Jessica.....	3469f
Smith, Neilson.....	3318
Smith, Tucker.....	3023f, 3227, 3497
Smith, W. I.....	3072
Social Democratic Party of Germany.....	3489
Social Frontier.....	3272, 3282f
Social Science Research Council.....	3486, 3489, 3492
Social Security Act.....	3019, 3541
Social Work Today.....	3188, 3243
Socialist Labor Congress.....	3493
Socialist and Labor International Congress.....	3489, 3492
Socialist Organization.....	3463
Socialist Party.....	3022, 3030, 3047, 3070f, 3082, 3085, 3156ff, 3161, 3171, 3366, 3404, 3456ff, 3459f, 3464
Socialist Party of France.....	3489
Society for Ethical Culture.....	3329
Society of Reconciliation.....	3180
Sons of the American Revolution.....	3255
Southern Tenant Farmers Union.....	3019, 3032f, 3047ff, 3057ff, 3063
Soviet Military Intelligence.....	3427
Soviet Russia Today.....	3138, 3141, 3145, 3185, 3452, 3469f, 3479, 3510f, 3514, 3520
Spanish refugee relief campaign.....	3261, 3328, 3338, 3436
Special Commission To Investigate the Activities Within the Commonwealth of Communistic, Fascist, Nazi, and Other Subversive Organizations, So-called.....	3028
Speer, Robert K.....	3280
Spitzer, Norman.....	3179
Spivak, John.....	3259, 3378
Spofford, William B.....	3292
Springling, Martin.....	3115, 3174
Squire, Brown.....	3167

	Page
Srbobran	3387
Standard Aircraft Corporation	3418
Standard Oil	3151
Stanfield, C. Alpheus	3086
Stavis, Lorton	3541
Stefansson, Vilhjalmur	3190
Steffens, Lincoln	3104f, 3147f, 3163, 3471, 3519
Stern, Bernhard J.	3190, 3471
Stevens, Edmund	3178f
Stewart, Donald Ogden	3190, 3332
Stewart, Maxwell	3190, 3471
Stock, Ed	3220
Stone, Harlan F.	3548
Stone, I. F.	3521
Strachey, John	3139, 3424f
Strand, Paul	3190
Strawn, Silas H.	3170
Stripling, Robert E.	3388, 3397f
Strong, Anna Louise	3273f
Strong, Edward	3379
Struik, Dirk J.	3190
Studebaker, John W.	3534f
Student Antiwar Congress	3404
Student Congress Against War	3133ff, 3178f, 3403f
Student League of the University of Chicago	3117, 3174
Student Review	3399, 3402ff
Students League for Industrial Democracy	3140, 3251
Sugar, Maurice	3563
Sunday Worker	3361, 3363
Survey Graphic	3348
Sutherland, William A.	3558
Swiecki	3167
Switz, Robert Gordon	3431
Swope, Howard Bayard	3575
Sybil Holmes committee	3028
Tabouis, Genevieve	3372
Tallentire, Norman H.	3314
Talmadge, Eugene	3032
Tasker, Robert	3190
Taussig, F. W.	3152
Taylor, C. Fayette	3190
Teachers' Union	3343
Teare, J. Thomas	3167
Technische Hochschule of Berlin	3415
Thaelmann, Ernst	3470
Thatcher, Tom	3548
Theatre Guild	3188
Third International	3064
Third World Power Conference	3432
Thomas, Ben	3221
Thomas, Clara	3221
Thomas, Norman	3023, 3133, 3142, 3157, 3164, 3251f, 3456f, 3460, 3502
Thomas, T. J.	3051
Thompson, Dorothy	3257
Thompson, John B.	3513
Thompson, Louise	3176
Thompson, Perry C.	3119, 3174
Thorn, Harvey B.	3016
Thruber, James	3190
Tietjens	3299
Timbres, Rebecca Janney	3190
Tippett, Thomas H.	3214, 3230, 3339
Todd, T. Wingate	3260
Toledano, Lombardo	3363f
Trachtenberg, Alexander	3096f, 3107, 3259
Trade Union Conference for United Action	3230, 3352
Trade Union Educational League	3205ff, 3341

	Page
Trade Union Unity League.....	3117f, 3130, 3171f, 3174, 3206
Trades and Labor Council.....	3340
Transradio Press Service.....	3385
Trease, Geoffrey.....	3433
Trotsky, Leon.....	3046, 3069, 3120, 3167, 3303
Trotskyites.....	3070
Tuffs, Joseph.....	3347
Tunis, John R.....	3379
Tunstall, Carolyn.....	3072
Twentieth Century Fund.....	3486
Twigg, William.....	3182
Umhey, Fred.....	3531
Unemployed Council.....	3171, 3173
Unemployment Council of New York.....	3349
Union Theological Seminary.....	3245
United American Spanish Aid Committee.....	3261, 3332
United Automobile Workers.....	3563
United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers of America.....	3086
United Council of Working Class Women.....	3349
United Electrical, Radio, Machine Workers of America.....	3086
United Federal Workers of America.....	3408, 3410, 3447f
United Front.....	3030, 3059
United Jewish Appeal.....	3453
United Mine Workers of America.....	3086, 3340f, 3343, 3352
United Office-Professional Workers Union.....	3292
United States Cartridge Co.....	3532
United States Commission on Industrial Relations.....	3484
United States Congress Against War.....	3134, 3322, 3338
United States Steel.....	3151
United Students Peace Committee.....	3460
Unpublished Letters of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels to Americans.....	3435
Untermeyer, Jean Starr.....	3190
Untermeyer, Louis.....	3190
Uphaus, Willard.....	3086
Urban League.....	3169, 3323
Urey, Harold C.....	3190
Valtin, Jan (alias for Richard Krebs).....	3390, 3431
Van Doren, Carl.....	3190
Van Gelder, Philip.....	3085
Vanguard Press.....	3503
Van Veen, Stuyvesant.....	3190
Velliver, George.....	3221
Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.....	3261
Villard, Oswald Garrison.....	3190
Vincent, Craig S.....	3532
Vincent, Merle D.....	3527
Vincent, Merle D., Jr.....	3532
Vincent, William C.....	3532
Virginia State Workers Educational Conference.....	3071
Voorhis, Jerry.....	3252
Wachowiak, A.....	3167
Wade, Martin J.....	3025
Wadell.....	3062
Wagenknecht, Alfred.....	3314, 3509
Wahl, David R.....	3437f
Wakefield, Lowell.....	3389
Walker, Charles.....	3148, 3163
Walker, Elmer.....	3007
Wallace, Henry A.....	3257f
Wallace, Margaret.....	3450
Walling, Metcalf.....	3530
Walsh, Frank P.....	3560
Walsh, J. Raymond.....	3190
Walsh, William Henry.....	3190
War Conference of the American Bar Association.....	3551, 3553
Warburg, Felix.....	3576
Ward, Gordon.....	3086

	Page
Ward, Harry F.	3125, 3190, 3251, 3262, 3271, 3292, 3371f, 3519
Ward, Lem	3257
Ward, Lynd	3190
Ware, Hamilton	3038f
Ware, Herta	3031, 3033, 3035, 3037ff, 3040
Washington Book Shop	3409ff, 3437ff, 3440ff, 3443, 3446, 3451f, 3483
Washington Committee for Democratic Action	3410f, 3449, 3481, 3499, 3532ff, 3535, 3544, 3584
Washington Co-Operative Book Shop	3439, 3441, 3481
Washington Friends of Spanish Democracy	3411, 3498
Watson, Goodwin	3091ff, 3135, 3145f, 3236, 3373
Watson, Morris	3190, 3248
Watts, Harvey	3221
Weatherwax, Clara	3190
Weber, Max	3190
Wechsler, James	3359f, 3379
Weckruf und Beobachter	3296
Weekly Review of Official Foreign Broadcasts	3090
Weiner, William	3176
Weinstock, Louis	3231, 3353f
Weintraub, David	3348
Weisbord, Albert	3310f, 3314
Weisbordites	3311
Weisenberg, Hansel	3170
Weiss, Louis	3348
Wendt, Gerald	3190
Wentworth, Edward C.	3314
Weschler, Herbert	3566
West Virginia Mine Workers Union	3350
Western Unitarian Conference	3119
Weyand, Ruth	3541
Weyl, Nathaniel	3134, 3178f, 3399
Wheeler, Donald	3440
Wheeler-Healey Act	3529
Whitaker, Robert	3148, 3163, 3190
White, David McKelvy	3436
White Guard	3183f
White Terrorists	3183
Whiteside, A. D.	3528f
Whitney, Charlotte Anita	3314
Whitten, Richard	3024f, 3034
Wieck, Agnes Burns	3349
Wieck, Edgar	3349
Wieck, Edwin	3349
Wilbur	3154
Wilkinson, Vivian	3308f
Willard Straight Foundation	3012
Williams, Albert Rhys	3190
Williams, Aubrey	3346, 3372, 3412
Williams, Claude	3005, 3021f, 3047ff, 3050
Williams, William Carlos	3190
Williamson	3152
Williamson, Ernest H.	3119, 3174
Williamson, John	3119, 3174
Wills, John	3167
Willys-Overland Corporation	3194
Wilson, Edmund	3148, 3163
Winslow, C. A.	3260
Winter, Ella May	3148, 3163, 3190
Wise, James Waterman	3190
Wise, Justine	3261
Wise, Stephen S.	3329, 3368
Wiseman, Irving	3081
Witt, Nathan	3562, 3564
Wittenber, Jan	3137f, 3182
Wobblies (See: Industrial Workers of the World)	3200

	Page
Wolf, Ann Landy.....	3541
Wolfe, Bertram D.....	3309
Woll, Matthew.....	3157, 3342
Wollner, Herbert.....	3420
Women's Republican League.....	3468, 3479
Women's Trade Union League.....	3171
Wood, L. Hollingsworth.....	3190
Woodford, Michael.....	3029
Woodrum, Clifton A.....	3562, 3566, 3581
Woody, Thomas.....	3179
Wooley, Mary E.....	3190
Workers' Advisory Committee.....	3168
Workers' Alliance.....	3033, 3071, 3073, 3099f
Workers Forum.....	3126
Workers International Relief.....	3117, 3174
Workers' Library Publishers.....	3106f, 3349, 3360f, 3363
Workers Party.....	3030, 3069
Workers' Republic.....	3222
Workers School.....	3005, 3045,
	3129, 3327, 3338, 3349, 3421, 3435, 3536, 3549f, 3552f, 3555f
Workers Unemployment Insurance Bill.....	3176
Workers' Voice.....	3173
Working Class Union.....	3032
Workmen's Circle.....	3551, 3553, 3555
Works Progress Administration.....	3005f, 3008, 3531
World Congress Against War.....	3178, 3403
World for Peace and Democracy.....	3394
World Revolutionary Propaganda.....	3128, 3130
Wright, Alexander.....	3071f
Wright-Martin Aircraft Corporation.....	3418
Wright, Quincy.....	3096
Wright, Richard.....	3190, 3291, 3451f
Wright, Thomas.....	3262, 3271f
Yakhontoff, Victor.....	3475
Yard, James.....	3137, 3182
Yarris, Betty.....	3222
Yergan, Max.....	3190, 3291
Young.....	3252
Young America.....	3262
Young, Art.....	3190, 3291
Young Communist League.....	3254, 3311, 3349, 3360, 3379f, 3389, 3460
Young Communist Review.....	3360
Young Men's Christian Association.....	3071, 3245, 3291, 3323
Young, Owen D.....	3155
Young Women's Christian Association.....	3071
Youngman, Albert Stanley.....	3439
Zeuch, William.....	3010f, 3017f, 3051f, 3065, 3077
Ziegler, Phil E.....	3496f
Zimmerman, Charles S.....	3190
Zucker, Dora.....	3179
Zugsmith, Leane.....	3190, 3363