

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

LAUTNER

*testified also June 21-1956*

HEARINGS

1956

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY  
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE  
UNITED STATES

MAY 29 AND JUNE 5, 1956

PART 26

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1956

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

- ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee
- OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
- THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri
- JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
- PRICE DANIEL, Texas
- JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming
- MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia
- ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
- WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
- WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
- ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
- EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
- HERMAN WELKER, Idaho
- JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

- OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
- JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
- THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri
- PRICE DANIEL, Texas
- WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
- ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
- HERMAN WELKER, Idaho
- JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

- ROBERT MORRIS, *Chief Counsel*
- WILLIAM A. RUSHER, *Administrative Counsel*
- BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

II

CONTENTS

Witness:	Page
Behrstock, Arthur	1452
Conal, Bernard	1445
Lautner, John	1423

III



**SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES**

**Soviet Redefection Campaign**

**WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1956**

**UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT  
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, D. C.**

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 11:05 a. m., in the caucus room, Senate Office Building, Senator Herman Welker presiding.

Present: Senator Welker.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel; William A. Rusher, administrative counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director; and F. W. Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator WELKER. The meeting will come to order.

Will you raise your right hand and be sworn?

You solemnly swear the testimony you will give before the committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LAUTNER. I do.

Senator WELKER. Proceed, counsel.

**TESTIMONY OF JOHN LAUTNER, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

Mr. MORRIS. Will you give your name and address to the reporter?

Mr. LAUTNER. My name is John Lautner, spelled L-a-u-t-n-e-r.

Mr. MORRIS. Where do you reside?

Mr. LAUTNER. Washington, D. C.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lautner has appeared before this committee before, and he has been asked to come back and testify under the general framework of Soviet activity in the United States, with particular references to the reorganizations of the Communist Party of the United States.

I wonder if you would tell us, for the record, by way of background, Mr. Lautner, what position you achieved in the Communist Party—what were your highest position or positions?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, I was a district organizer of the Communist Party for about 5 years, in the State of West Virginia.

I was head of the New York State Review Commission of the Communist Party.

Mr. MORRIS. What is the review commission?

Mr. LAUTNER. The discipline commission of the Communist Party in New York State, from 1947 up to the beginning of 1950.

And also a member of the National Review Commission of the Communist Party in 1948 and 1949, and the beginning of 1950.

Mr. MORRIS. And you separated from the Communist Party, under circumstances you have previously told us, in 1950?

Mr. LAUTNER. Yes. On the 17th of January 1950.

Senator WELKER. Would you mind putting the mike just a little closer to you, Mr. Lautner?

Mr. LAUTNER. I will.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, with those qualifications I would like to ask Mr. Lautner some questions about Communist Party organization.

Senator WELKER. Proceed, counsel.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder if you would tell, first, of your own experiences, the instances of Soviet control, that is control by the U. S. S. R., of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, let me rephrase it Soviet control. The Soviet is a form of state. And the very same group that controlled that particular state, that form of state, known as the Soviet, or U. S. S. R., that very group controlled the Communist International and, through the Communist International, gave leadership and guidance to all Communist Parties or so-called working class parties who adhere to the principles of Marxism-Leninism in each and every country where such parties were operating.

Mr. MORRIS. With particular reference to the United States, and particular emphasis on your own experiences, would you answer the same question?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, the Communist International had control over the policies, over the Communist Party of the United States of America, and sent representatives to this country to supervise and give leadership and guidance in unfolding and developing the policies of the Communist International in the United States.

Leaders of the Communist Party of the United States of America went to the Congresses of the Communist International held in Moscow from time to time and they were elected to the executive committees of the Communist International.

So in that way they drew upon the experiences of the warlike Communist Party, and the warlike Communist movement through the Communist International, helped the Communist Party of the United States of America in developing its program and policies in this country.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lautner, did you meet any Soviet representatives?

Mr. LAUTNER. I met in the course of my party membership two of them.

Mr. MORRIS. Who were they?

Mr. LAUTNER. One was a person known to me at the beginning by the name of "Edwards." Edwards later on turned out to be Gerhardt Eisler. And the other one was a person known to me at the beginning as "Alpi"—A-l-p-i—later on he was known to me as Fred Brown, and later on as Farucci Marini, M-a-r-i-n-i.

Mr. MORRIS. Were there any other Soviet representatives or representatives of any Soviet satellites you encountered during your experiences in the Communist Party?

Mr. LAUTNER. I have no recollection.

Mr. MORRIS. And could you tell us the circumstances through which this control was exercised from the practical point of view from where you were in the control commission and as a district organizer of the Communist Party?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, both: Alpi, as Edwards, was involved even in the organizational problems of party leadership in carrying out party policies over here; Edwards, I sat with him at least in three meetings in party councils.

At one meeting we were discussing some of the mistakes made by the party in the New York organization pertaining to the organization of the transport workers.

And another meeting Eisler sat in was on the question of developing a mass Communist Party press where he, in his speech, submitted the success of the German Communist daily, the Rote Fahne, and set that as an example for the Communist Party of the United States to develop that kind of official paper, mass paper.

And on the third occasion, he was in a meeting where the party was discussing the need and necessity to penetrate into the Armed Forces of the United States, specifically in the New York area, the National Guard units.

And at this meeting, too, he cited as an example the failure of the German Party in the early 1930's to pay attention and bore from within the Stahlheimer Organization, which later on became the base of the Nazi Party as a military organization.

These were the three meetings in which Gerhart Eisler participated.

Mr. MORRIS. Did he exercise control then?

Mr. LAUTNER. But definitely; his word was our authority in that meeting—in those meetings.

Then Alpi worked in the organizational department of the Communist Party of the United States from the first time I met him in Detroit in 1930—I am wrong—in the spring of 1931, where he informed me that there was a decision made in the department for me to go to Canada. And then later on he worked as an organizational specialist for the central committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A.

Later on he was a member of the nationality groups commission of the Communist Party. I was a member of that with him at the same time.

Later on, the Communist Party decided to send in a number of party leaders into one of the most important mass organizations of the party, the International Workers Order. Alpi and myself, Gerhardt and others were sent into this organization to strengthen its ideological leadership there. And then he functioned up to about 1948 or 1947, thereabouts, and left the country.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lautner, I wonder if you could tell us of your experiences with purges within the Communist Party?

Mr. LAUTNER. Yes.

Well, these purges took place from time to time. There were discussions in the party on the ideological differences, earliest purges in the struggle against Trotskyism in the early 1930's, the struggle against

the Radek deviationists in the party, the Bukharinites, Rakosi and Rajk, and these types of deviationists and their purge from the Communist Party.

Later on there were, in the late 1940's, a new wave of purges in the Communist parties in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Bulgaria, in Rumania.

I am perfectly well acquainted with the purges that took place in Hungary.

In the Communist leadership in Hungary there were 3 groups, 3 main groups.

One group was the domestic Communists who shared leadership in that party.

The other group was the so-called Communist leaders, who gravitated, during the Hitler days, toward the West. Among these were the Spanish veterans, the Communists who came back to Hungary.

And the third group was the Moscow gang, headed by Matthias Rakosi.

In these struggles in 1949, the Moscow group, Rakosi, Rajk, and others, succeeded in eliminating, in purging and liquidating, these two other groups.

And only recently, as late as 3 months ago, there is a new evaluation going on in the various Communist parties and Rakosi, the general secretary of the Hungarian Communist Party, has admitted publicly that these purges were a mistake, that they committed serious errors in conducting these purges and they are being rehabilitated, while they were hanged and shot at the time.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lautner, this particular purge had an indirect effect on you; did it not?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us how that came about, Mr. Lautner?

Mr. LAUTNER. In 1949, in the fall, when the Rajk case—R-a-j-k—who was accused of being an imperialist agent, a Titoite and whatnot, during that trial, in Hungary, my name came up through one of the witnesses. This witness alleged that I was the one who, during the war, introduced him to Titoites in Italy, in Bari, Italy, where I served in psychological warfare during the war.

That is true. I introduced a lot of people to a lot of people, and I was introduced to a lot of people in these days.

But in 1944—in 1943 and 1945, there was no issue of Titoism, there was a war, a World War going on. And the Titoites were fighting the Germans, just like were doing in Italy.

In the course of that period we were instructed—we had Army instructions—to develop a communications system and a new system for these newly integrated partisans, Yugoslav partisans who were pulled out of the hills and integrated into a new Yugoslav Army.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Lautner, for the purposes of the background of this record, what position did you have in psychological warfare?

Mr. LAUTNER. I was head of the Hungarian unit in Bari and I was an enlisted man—I was a sergeant.

Mr. MORRIS. Psychological warfare of the United States Army?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. At the same time you were an experienced Communist; were you not?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And what position did you have in the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. LAUTNER. At that time I had no position in the Communist Party, because the Communist Party made a decision at the beginning of the war that all those party members who will be drafted into the Army or serve in the Armed Forces, they are automatically out of the party, because they cannot fulfill the preliminary prerequisites of a party member—they cannot attend party meetings, they cannot pay dues, et cetera.

So I was not in the party, technically, at that time.

Mr. MORRIS. So if anyone should have asked you at that time if you were a member of the Communist Party, would you truthfully have stated that you were not?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right. But if anybody would have asked, "Are you a Communist," I truthfully would have stated, "Yes." And I did so.

Mr. MORRIS. At that time, were you in contact with Communist Party officials?

Mr. LAUTNER. Yes. From time to time I got letters from the United States; particularly, I was in communication with Gurley Flynn at this time.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you receiving any orders from Communists at that time?

Mr. LAUTNER. No.

Mr. MORRIS. In other words, you were really on your own as a Communist?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right. What I did receive was trends in the party and the driving toward the dissolution of the Communist Party, the Teheran decisions, the organization of the Communist Political Association, which later was characterized as a revisionist error on the part of Browder.

This type of information I did receive, while I was in the service.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you receive any assignments from the Communist Party during your service?

Mr. LAUTNER. No.

Mr. MORRIS. And how did you carry out your positions in psychological warfare as a Communist—did you do it completely on your own or did you take complete orders from the United States Government authorities?

Mr. LAUTNER. I was assigned to Allied Force headquarters, which was at first the Eisenhower headquarters at Algiers, and then later on it became the Allied headquarters in Casserta, headed by Marshal Alexander, who was the Chief of the Mediterranean Theater of Operation.

Our specific general who was in charge of psychological warfare was General McClure, and we received our instructions through channels from his headquarters.

Our main job there was to gather intelligence that came through the air raids of the various enemy stations, to gather that and assimilate that, edit it, and give out a daily report.

In addition to that, I was broadcasting for about 6 months to Hungary at that time, out of an Allied Force radio station, in Bari.

In addition to that I was also heading a leaflet-production unit that prepared leaflets for our 15th Air Force bombers when they went on missions so that they could drop these leaflets behind the enemy lines.

This was in the main my work.

Mr. MORRIS. It is your testimony, is it not, that in 1950, because of some contacts you had at that time, you were purged from the Communist Party?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right.

Instructions came to this country to get rid of me.

First, they tried to lure me behind the Iron Curtain. I, in all clear conscience, applied for a passport. Fortunately, I didn't get it because at that particular moment there was a diplomatic break between Hungary and the United States over the Vogeler case.

Mr. MORRIS. What case was that?

Mr. LAUTNER. Vogeler case.

Mr. MORRIS. Robert Vogeler?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right. I got a letter from Mrs. Shipley, in which she advised me that they cannot issue a passport to Hungary at this time. However, if I decide to go elsewhere in Europe, they are ready to issue a passport for me.

So that scheme of the party leadership over here to lure me behind the Iron Curtain didn't succeed.

So a few weeks later, another scheme was worked out to get me down to Cleveland, Ohio, where I had a very awful personal experience in a cellar with Communist Party leaders and thugs. And as a result of that, I am out of the party.

Mr. MORRIS. That was, Mr. Lautner, contemporaneous with the purge of Rajk in Hungary?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right. It was traced to that. In effect, there is no clearer demonstration of this fact, when I spoke to the Bureau about it in—

Mr. MORRIS. The Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right. My expulsion as it is stated in the Daily Worker, is a lie from the beginning to the end—that my expulsion was initiated from abroad, and this party had no alternative but to follow out that instruction. It was most clearly demonstrated in the Flynn case in New York, where I was on the witness stand for 31 days. I was 16 days cross examined in that case. If there was any brainwashing done, as an example, this was it.

For 3 whole days John McTernan, one of the defense attorneys in that case, for 3 whole days tried to break me down and prove that I was a Tito agent, that I had contacts with the Hungarian Titoites in Hungary.

I told him he was all wet.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you have any knowledge that the purge of Noel and Herman Field had something to do with the Rajk purge in Hungary?

Mr. LAUTNER. Definitely. In that cellar in Cleveland I was time and again asked what were my connections with Noel and Herman Field, while they were with the so-called Unitarian Overseas Service; did I in any way try to attempt to build liaison with them and their relief service, that they, the Communist Party, thought was a spy service behind the Iron Curtain at that time.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have some testimony which we will release later on which concerns this very episode, except that this other testimony relates to events that were going on abroad in connection with this very testimony that Mr. Lautner is giving us this morning. That is in connection with Herman Field.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Lautner, have any of these people who were purged at that time—the 1949 purge—been now rehabilitated?

I think you have told us to some extent. I wish you would give more details.

Mr. LAUTNER. How can you rehabilitate somebody who was shot and killed? You can establish maybe a mistake was made. And back in the thoughts of the Hungarian people there is still that lingering idea, well, they were branded as traitors of the cause; they were branded as Fascist mad dogs. They were branded as imperialist flunkies; there must be some element, some grain of truth in that.

You cannot rehabilitate completely even those that are alive. They already carry that stigma—that stigma of ostracism throughout their life. And there is no way to rehabilitate. And a decision by a party oligarchy will not rehabilitate these people in the truest sense of the word. Most of them are shot. Thousands of them were shot.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Lautner, does this rehabilitation campaign which is now taking place in the year 1956 of people who were purged in the year 1950, do you have any knowledge from your own observations as to the purpose and the manner of reorganization that is being effected?

Mr. LAUTNER. Yes. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Tell us about it, will you?

Mr. LAUTNER. First, since the death of Stalin, there was some evaluation about the incorrectness or the bad features of a so-called one-man leadership. The very nature of the Communist Party organization and structure demands a polarization of leadership. This so-called collective leadership at the present time is a transitory period. And eventually, a polarization will take place again, when one guy will jump out in the front and he will be another Joe Stalin.

However, an evaluation took place in order how to exploit some of the bad mistakes that were made under the Stalin regime, and how to capitalize, how to exploit some of these self-admitted mistakes, in order to put across again another line, another tactical line around which new forces could be gathered, a new realignment of forces could take shape. And that is exactly what is happening today.

Fortunately, those that study the strategy and tactics of the worldwide Communist movement in this instance, European labor leaders, right off the bat, finally and effectively, rejected any kind of a united front activity or united front action with Communist hierarchy or the Communist leaders.

However, there will be gullible sections of populations and some public leaders somewhere who will give a grain of consideration or a little faith that the Russian line as announced by Khrushchev has changed. Nothing changes. Only new tactics, new forms, are being employed today to achieve the very same objective that they originally set out to establish, that is, worldwide Communist domination.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you read the proceedings of the 20th Congress?

Mr. LAUTNER. Yes; I have it.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you any excerpts from that or what you just said?

Mr. LAUTNER. I have Khrushchev's report right here with me.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you put the pertinent portions of that report into the record, Mr. Lautner, please?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, these excerpts, first, come from point 5, with the head, "The Soviet Union in the Struggle for the Consolidation of Peace and Internal Security"—

Senator WELKER. What are you reading from?

Mr. LAUTNER. This is the official organ of the Communist Information Bureau. The name of it is, "For a Lasting Peace and a People's Democracy," and this is the February 17, 1956 issue.

The next heading says, under point 6, "Some Fundamental Questions of Present Day International Developments."

By the way, this is that famous 7-hour report that Khrushchev gave to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at the 20th Congress.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the date of that?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, that was the end, at the beginning of February, this issue.

Mr. MORRIS. 1956?

Mr. LAUTNER. 1956, yes.

Well, in speaking about a reorientation which was widely misinterpreted in this country and elsewhere, that the Soviet line changed, well some of these excerpts from the very same person who made that report, contradict that kind of an evaluation. I just want to cite a few of them here.

At one point Khrushchev quotes Lenin and he quotes the following excerpt from Lenin:

All nations will arrive at Socialism. This is inevitable. But not all will do so in exactly the same way. Each will contribute something of its own in one or another form of democracy or one or in another form of variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Our enemies—  
says Khrushchev—

like to say that we Leninists advocate violence always and everywhere. True, we recognize the need for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into socialist society. There is no doubt that in a number of capitalist countries the violent overthrow of the dictatorship of the bourgeois and the sharp aggravation of the class struggle connected with this are inevitable.

Then he further says:

Leninism teaches that the ruling classes will not surrender their power voluntarily and the greater or lesser degree of intensity which the struggle may assume, the use or the nonuse of violence in the transition to socialism, depends on the resistance of the exploiters, on whether the exploiting class itself resorts to violence, rather than the proletariat.

He is trying to reiterate the old argument and the old accusation that it is not the Communist who resorts to violence but it is the bourgeois, who would not give power over peacefully to them.

Then further down, he says:

In countries where capitalism is still strong and it has a huge military and police apparatus—

Mr. MORRIS. You are coming to the United States?

Mr. LAUTNER. It sounds like the United States. We will come to that.

and police apparatus at its disposal, the reactionary forces will, of course, inevitably offer serious resistance. There the transition to socialism will be attended by a sharp class revolutionary struggle. Whatever the form of transition to socialism, the decisive and indispensable factor is the political leadership of the working class headed by its vanguard. Without these there can be no transition to socialism.

In other words, you must have a strong Communist Party as a vanguard.

And transitions can take different shapes and forms. In countries where there will be a resistance, we will fight them.

And that is the United States.

Now, what does Khrushchev mean that you can, under certain conditions—under certain conditions, there is a possibility? There are two "ifs" of peaceful transition. And Mikoyan in his report to the 20th—

Mr. MORRIS. Will you spell that, please?

Mr. LAUTNER. M-i-k-o-y-a-n—cites the example of Czechoslovakia, right after the Second World War.

What happened in Central Europe? Anybody who knows a little contemporary history knows that after the defeat of fascism and Hitlerism, there was a political vacuum in central Europe. There were a number of exiled governments, like the Polish and Czechoslovakian Governments in London. Those that were in power during the Hitler regime in central Europe, they were compromised. The new forces that were to come up as political factors in the post second-war period, never had a chance, because the Moscow boys came back right on the backs of the Red army and through the force and threat of the Red army ground up all anti-Communist democratic forces in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Bulgaria, and by 1948-49, they established their sole domination—the domination of the Communist or workers parties, the one party system.

And the state or form which they organized was known as the People's Democracies, in Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

So these were the conditions on which Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and others are trying to build now that, under certain conditions it is possible, but if those conditions are not present, force and violence, the old tried and tested Marxism-Lenin doctrine, is still applicable, and the only doctrine that is applicable in the transition to socialism by the Communist Party.

Mr. MORRIS. That is according to the minutes of the 20th Congress?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is stated very clearly by Khrushchev.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lautner, I wonder if you would tell us of the reorganization of the Communist Party that you were engaged in in 1950 when you were expelled from the Communist Party?

Mr. LAUTNER. Yes.

Well, the reorganization actually began in 1948—1948, in September. The Communist Party in this country was under attack. The top leadership, the national board, headed by Dennis Foster, and others, were arrested and indicted for violating the Smith Act.

At that time I was called into a meeting with Bob Thompson who was a member of the board and two other members of the New York

State secretariat, where Thompson gave a report that Foster, who was in Europe in 1946 and 1947, made a survey on this particular problem, the very problem, with the international leadership, and in his report he related some of the experiences that the other parties have on the other side when they were under attack.

And on the basis of Foster's report, there was a contraction of practically 90 percent of the membership in these parties when they were under attack on the other side.

Mr. MORRIS. What do you mean by contraction?

Mr. LAUTNER. Contraction—by 90 percent of the party membership strayed away and about 10 percent remained. And this 10 percent was the party, the organized force that carried on activities under any and all conditions, whether fascism or nazism or any kind of repression.

So in 1948, September, at this meeting, Bob Thompson raised the question, "Now, we still have a little chance—we are under attack—to find that 10 percent of the membership that would be most effective, if it integrated now, in carrying out party activities as an organized group under any and all conditions."

And we worked out a plan over there which was known as the three system, the Troyka system, based on the old Russian underground and other undergrounds in Europe.

Mr. MORRIS. Let me see if I understand: The party reappraised the whole situation?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. They found they were going to take out 10 percent, which 10 percent would be reliable under all circumstances?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. With respect to the remaining 90, what did they do with them?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, at that point, that was not even considered. That was not the problem at that moment. At that moment the problem was how to find the 10 percent first. Certain criteria was set up, who shall be integrated into the 10 percent.

Mr. MORRIS. These people who were selected were the most reliable ones?

Mr. LAUTNER. The first criterion was absolute devotion and loyalty to the party under any and all conditions.

Second, ability.

Third, being in a mass organization, or in a trade-union movement where there is a lot of elbow room, where one can work and carry on Communist activities.

Under these criteria that integration of 10 percent began, about late fall in 1948. And at the time I left the Communist Party in 1950, 17th of January, this phase of work was accomplished, checked in the New York State organization of the Communist Party, where approximately 3,000 party members were integrated into the underground out of a paper membership of about 30,000 at that time.

Mr. MORRIS. In 1950 there was a membership of 30,000 in New York State and they selected 3,000 of the most loyal and disciplined and efficient members and they processed them into an underground?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. And you helped—you were a party to that processing?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, that was my main work, to integrate with the so-called vertical structure, certain horizontal features, like finances, party presses, hiding places, contact places, making available paper for printing, giving deposits to small jobbers in the printing industry, to increase their volume of paper supply, a communication system.

These were some of the features that we blended in with that underground at that time. That was my main function in that period of time.

Mr. MORRIS. And it is your testimony with respect to the other 27,000, it was just not part of your assignment?

Mr. LAUTNER. A lot of them drifted away. And then there was a legal party functioning on the top. In the 1950 December convention, they elected some additional alternate members of the national committee to those that were the national committee members of 13, and they carried on their activities on the surface. Most of them went underground, who were not prosecuted, and they just marched back recently like a good platoon on orders to submit themselves to prosecution again. There is another reason for that.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us about that, Mr. Lautner—you just made a reference there?

Mr. LAUTNER. In 1948 our main consideration was to organize the underground to enable the party to function under any and all conditions and to give leadership to this party. So that this myth of leadership was upheld. It was not even a myth. It was a reality.

When Dennis and the others reported to serve sentence, Gil Green, Bob Thompson, and Henry Winston remained fugitives.

In the party it was a clear indication that this leadership is giving leadership in that particular period, that there is a continuity of leadership in the Communist Party which is very important in the eyes of the party membership.

In addition to these three—

Senator WELKER. Just a minute. You say they remained fugitives. What happened there—they jumped bond?

Mr. LAUTNER. They went underground.

Senator WELKER. They went underground?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right. Instead of reporting to serve sentence—they were sentenced in the first case—instead of reporting like Dennis, Gates, Ben Davis, and the others did, they remained underground—they didn't report.

Senator WELKER. And they forfeited their bond?

Mr. LAUTNER. They forfeited their bond. I think it was \$20,000 each.

Senator WELKER. Who furnished that bond; do you know?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, I think at that time it was the CRC, the Civil Rights Congress, which was another front organization for the party in collecting funds, to make funds available for these legal defenses, and for other purposes.

Senator WELKER. You mean to tell the committee then that these men who didn't accept their sentences, didn't serve their sentences at first, the party actually controlled them and asked them to go underground?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is correct.

Senator WELKER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right.



Mr. MORRIS. Before departing any further, Mr. Lautner; with respect to the people who would raise funds in the Civil Rights Congress, would any of those, with respect to the 30,000 Communist Party members in 1950, New York, would the other underground people be engaged?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, you see, there is no sharp separation between one who was in the legal party or one who was in the underground. There were instances that party leaders were up in the open party and they were also in the underground. There were instances where the underground person was a respectable trade-union leader.

So it is a fluid situation. What there is, there is a compact, organized force of 3,000. That is the only implication. An organized force of 3,000 party members who carry on as an organized force under any and all conditions, even if the legal party is dissolved.

As far as financing, the manifold activities of the Communist Party, that came from both sources. A lot of money was channeled into the underground for underground purposes.

I, for example, was asked to make up a list of 20 people in the spring of 1949. At that time the New York State organization of the Communist Party proposed a budget of \$650,000 for the New York organization alone. A certain amount of this money had to be channeled into the underground. I was asked to prepare a list of 20 names, party and nonparty people. And the primary consideration in the selecting of these names would be, whether this individual to whom anywhere from \$10,000 to \$20,000 would be entrusted as party funds, would this individual change his loyalty to the party for \$10,000 or \$20,000. That was the key question there.

Others were asked to prepare such lists.

And I found that at 1 point 3 whole lists of 20 people were given to Bill Norman, the executive secretary of the New York organization. And we left it up to him to select his 20 people out of 60 recommendations—out of 60 names, where to place money for the underground.

So there was an interchange. It depended on what was more important at the moment as far as finances were concerned. There was no sharp separation there.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lautner, how do you interpret the reemergence from the underground of the Communist leaders who are coming into surrender?

Mr. LAUTNER. Dennis and the others served their sentence. And they came back into civil life. They were on probation for a while. And so somewhere around last January or so, that probation ended. They were ready and free to act again as Communist Party leaders.

For 4 or 5 years you had this situation where the underground leadership gave leadership to the whole party, political leadership. You cannot continue that.

There is only one leadership in the Communist Party. So the word went out and these underground leaders, those that were not apprehended in the meantime, like Bob Thompson and Sid Stein, just came marching back and reporting to the authorities ready to stand trial or ready to serve their sentences.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that movement out of strength or weakness?

Mr. LAUTNER. That was a calculated movement out of their organization strength.

Mr. MORRIS. Out of strength or weakness?

Mr. LAUTNER. They determined when, who shall report back, they determined what shall happen.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have been taking testimony on a proposed amendment to the Smith Act. The bill has gone from Internal Security to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Last week there was a conference of attorneys general out in the West—I think it was in Santa Fe—and there the issue came up as to whether the individual States would join with the Federal Government in asking for this amendment to the Smith Act.

The attorneys general last week supported the Bridges-McCarthy bill, which is the name of the bill that is now before the Judiciary Committee and about which we have been taking testimony.

Now last week there were just a few attorneys general, I think the attorneys general of California, New Jersey, and New York, opposed the position of the Federal Government and opposed the Bridges-McCarthy bill. At least, one of them voiced the opinion that the Communist Party does not attack and does not have as its target the various State governments and there is no conspiracy by the Communists against the State governments.

(A letter to Chairman Eastland from Herbert B. Cohen, attorney general of Pennsylvania, regarding this matter and enclosing statements of himself and other attorneys general, together with the pertinent resolutions of the National Association of Attorneys General, were ordered into the record at a meeting of the subcommittee on May 10 and appear at the end of this testimony.)

Mr. MORRIS. We have here a man who was district organizer. He had the position of the control officer, one of the control officers of the Communist Party of New York State.

I would like to ask him to testify on that particular point.

Does the Communist Party—did it, while you were one of the State officials, attempt to conspire against the State?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is correct. First of all, the State government, as well as the Federal Government, is considered in the thinking and evaluation of the Communist Party leadership, as a political upper structure, a political upper structure that safeguards the vested interests. That is the way they put it.

Now, I personally feel that there are a lot of legal questions involved. I am not an attorney. There are a lot of legal questions involved, in this whole issue of State rights versus Federal rights.

Mr. MORRIS. Without getting into that, Mr. Lautner, was there any conspiracy on the part of the Communist Party with respect to the State government?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, all Communist Party activities, in order to achieve the basic aims of Marxism and Leninism, are directed against all State as well as Federal authority and Federal Government. There is no misunderstanding or no mistake about that because they are both part of the Communist terminology, the upper structure.

Senator WELKER. Are you basing that statement upon your own experiences?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is right. That is right.

Senator WELKER. Will you tell us any experiences you had on that?

Mr. LAUTNER. I was teaching Marxism and Leninism for a number of years in Communist Party schools.

And it is a very simple proposition. There is an economic foundation in society. The relationship to that economic foundation determines a class relationship. Those that own the means of production, and the means of transportation are one particular class. They have their class interests.

Those that do not own the means of production only work in factories and in transportation, are a class and they have their separate interests.

On this economic foundation a structure is built. That structure has two parts. It is an ideological structure, the battle for the minds, and a political structure.

Both of these upper structures on this economic foundation, safeguard that relationship at the base, at the point of production.

In other words, the bourgeois state as they say it, economic capitalism, that controls the state machine, also controls the Federal Government, the Federal machine.

So when you fight against the bourgeois, when you fight against monopoly and imperialism, you fight against the same state machine as well as the Federal machine. There is no mistake about that.

I did not want to go into the legal, as I said, controversy, state rights versus Federal rights.

But I also feel that because of the very monolithic nature of the Communist leadership, and the very discipline and authority that is being exercised in the Communist movement, I think a dispersed type of an approach would defeat any attempt to cope with this problem. I think there is long overdue a need for a centralized group to study this movement in all its manifestations, with all of its ramifications, and give the benefit of their study to the authorities, so that they can intelligently handle the problem.

These are very skillful propagandists, they are dedicated professional revolutionists. If you spit them in the face, they will just turn around and will say, "It is raining," and they will try to prove that it is raining. That is the kind of people that you deal with.

I give you one example: They dissolved the Communist Information Bureau in the last few weeks now. Well, why did they do that? To create the impression that their intentions are really peaceful. And they do not want the Communist Information Bureau, anyway; it has already outlived its usefulness.

But at the same time, Khrushchev warns the worldwide Communist movement and its leadership in the Pravda, the official organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, only a few days after the dissolution of the Cominform, and he says—this is a quote that the New York Times carried from the Pravda, and I read the exact quotation:

Simultaneously with the demotion of Joseph Stalin, steps were taken to liquidate the Communist Information Bureau. Pravda asks you, however, it needs to establish suitable links with friends and parties oriented towards socialism—meaning Communist Party. And the Pravda also makes clear that—the ending of the Communist Information Bureau in no way means a weakening of links between Communist Parties.

These are the exact words from the Pravda.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read that again?

Mr. LAUTNER. And Pravda also makes it clear that "the ending of the Communist Information Bureau in no way means a weakening of links between Communist parties."

Mr. MORRIS. May I come back to the position of State contentions with the Communist Party.

Massachusetts had indicted Prof. Dirk J. Struik. Because of the Supreme Court decision in the Steve Nelson case, the case against Struik had been dropped. Do you think at that particular level, a professor in an individual State, that that is the fit subject for a State effort to suppress the Communist activity within its borders?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, I think and I feel that the State has a right to protect itself against subversion. There is no question about that.

Well, as I said before, these are a lot of legal problems, legal questions involved. I am not competent enough to deal with or to even comment on these problems. But I feel that the State has a right for its own protection to defend itself, and defend the people that they represent in that State, because the State is the duly elected body of people who represent the views and aspirations of the people of that particular State. They have that right. I think they should.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lautner, the last time you testified, you gave us some testimony about Constantin Radzie, who was a member of the control commission of the Communist Party of New York State; did you not?

Mr. LAUTNER. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. That was in 1952, I believe; was it not, Mr. Lautner; or 1953?

Mr. LAUTNER. We were up in New York at that time?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; 1952.

Mr. LAUTNER. 1952; yes—or 1953.

Mr. MORRIS. At that time it was disclosed that Constantin Radzie, even though he was a member of the control commission of the Communist Party and, therefore, one of the leaders of the Communist Party, had been naturalized in the United States and had stated in his application papers that he had never been a member of the Communist Party and denaturalization proceedings were commenced against him; were they not?

Mr. LAUTNER. That was said. Well, I don't know whether he took his citizenship paper out or not. All I know is that he was a Communist Party member, since I was, in 1929, and if he took his citizenship papers out after 1929, and if he so alleged that he was not a member of the Communist Party, or of any group that tries to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence, then he was mistaken. He was wrong. He was not telling the truth.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know what happened to that denaturalization proceeding?

Mr. LAUTNER. I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. To your knowledge do you know whether he has been deported?

Mr. LAUTNER. I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. Was he denaturalized?

Mr. LAUTNER. I have no idea—I don't know what happened to him.

Mr. MORRIS. Since Mr. Lautner has testified, Mr. Chairman, previously, about a Peter Rhodes, I wonder if you will tell us who Peter Rhodes is?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, when I graduated from War Department Military Intelligence Training School during the war in 1943, spring, I was immediately shipped overseas with a small group of other soldiers. And we were assigned to Allied Force Headquarters in Algiers, to Eisenhower's headquarters. And we were assigned to Psychological Warfare Branch.

The person who was in charge of all monitoring units of Psychological Warfare Branch was a person by the name of Peter Rhodes. He was a civilian, he was with OWI. And he was our boss, as far as our assignment and work was concerned. He gave us a number of orientation lectures outside of Algiers at "L. B. R."

And then later on I was assigned to the Balkan unit, up the Adriatic coast. And he came around there from time to time visiting the various units of Psychological Warfare Branch in the Mediterranean theater of operation. He was a simulated lieutenant colonel and he was our chief in this war period.

He introduced me in Algiers to some of the international leaders of the Veterans of the International Brigade. Through them I got introduced to some of the French deputies who were in Algiers, Communist deputies at that time, Florimond Bonte and the others, and he also introduced me to a woman who was the general secretary of the Algerian Communist Party.

We never spoke about his party membership.

When I came back I had a discussion with John Williamson, who was a member of the national board and labor secretary of the party, and I told him about my experiences with this person. So he was laughing. He says, "I know him."

Then I checked through Dorothy Loeb, who was a section organizer of a sensitive section in New York organization in the party. Peter Rhodes was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, when Winston Burdett testified a year ago he, too, mentioned Peter Rhodes. We have been making a rather concerted effort to try to locate Mr. Rhodes, by way of asking about this particular testimony, to find whether he is a competent witness to testify about the Communist conspiracy in the United States. To date we have not been successful.

Do you have any idea where he is at all?

Mr. LAUTNER. I have an idea. He was married to a Belgian woman. And I don't know—recently I heard that he was out of the country, he was either in France or Belgium.

The last time I saw him was in 1946. He lived in Knickerbocker Village downtown, had an apartment there, and I went up there a couple of times to see him.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lautner, you were district organizer in West Virginia, were you not?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. At that time, did you have people in the political parties of West Virginia?

Mr. LAUTNER. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Without going into any names, will you tell us generally about that, Mr. Lautner?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, since the miners, in the main, were in the Democratic Party in West Virginia, especially in the heavily populated coal areas like Beckley and Logan and Williamson, it was our task to go where the miners were, going to the Democratic Party. And we had, in the party—the chairman of the West Virginia State Youth Committee of the Democratic Party, was a party member.

We elected finally one party member into the State assembly, State representative, through the Democratic Party.

We made other attempts. We failed there. But we were in the Democratic Party. We had a little toehold.

Mr. MORRIS. But the Communist Party does take that activity which you have just described, infiltrating both Republican and Democratic Parties, to your own knowledge—you know that from your own experiences?

Mr. LAUTNER. That is correct. Not to do so would be branded as sectarianism.

Mr. MORRIS. Not to do what?

Mr. LAUTNER. Would be branded as sectarianism which is an error.

Mr. MORRIS. Is there anything else, Mr. Lautner, that you feel would help us, this Internal Security Subcommittee, at this time, which is analyzing Soviet activity as it expresses itself through the organization and reorganization of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. LAUTNER. Well, offhand, I have—

Senator WELKER. Any further questions?

Mr. LAUTNER (continuing). No contribution to make.

(On the basis of earlier testimony by Mr. Lautner, supplemented by other records in the subcommittee files, the staff has prepared a word picture of the activities and characteristics of an ubiquitous Communist agent, who operated in the United States for two decades, and who is most frequently referred to as J. Peters. This document appears as appendix I of this volume.)

Senator WELKER. Any further questions, Counsel?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have something here for the record. I thought we could put into the record today—I have been trying to get some verification of it—it is not exactly established yet but we received a letter from Australia this morning in which the man who wrote the letter, who was the secretary of the Australian Committee for the Cultural Freedom, had read in the Newsweek, May 21, 1956, that Mr. Vladimir Mikheev, who was the subject of hearings before the House committee, and that he wanted to point out to this committee that there were 14 witnesses who gave testimony before the Petrov Royal Commission in Australia about the activities of Mikheev when he was in Australia.

This man who wrote the letter to us said that he was then the Tass correspondent in the South Pacific area and was the first Tass correspondent in Australia.

I would like that, Senator, subject to our verifying that it is precisely the same man that this man says he is—I would like that to go into the record in connection with our inquiry into the Tass News Agency which is now underway by this Internal Security Subcommittee.

Senator WELKER. It will be permitted but it is a great deal of hearsay. We will take it for whatever value it contains. It will be permitted at this point.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandell has prepared, Mr. Chairman, excerpts from the testimony of the Royal Commission, on this point, and I would like to offer them for the record at this time.

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The material was marked "Exhibit No. 278" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 278

(The following references to Tass are taken from Report of the Royal Commission on Espionage, dated 22nd August 1955, issued by the Commonwealth of Australia:)

Tass: This is the abbreviation for Telegrafnois Agenstvo Sovietskavo Sojuga (Telegraphic Agency of the Soviet Union), the organ of the Soviet Government which is concerned with the collection and dissemination of news (p. 19).

An illustration of the importance which the Moscow Centre attached to this rule of secrecy (which was designed, amongst other things, to minimize the risk of compromising the Ambassador or the Embassy should M. V. D. activities become known) is given in the Moscow Letter No. 6 of 25th November 1952, paragraph 12. The paragraph is in these terms:

"Concerning the Motor Car.

"Both you and Antonov knew the cover story for the purchase of the motor car. In accordance with this cover story all the employees of the Embassy, Pakhomov's acquaintances, and the counter-intelligence have every reason for considering the car to be the property of the Tass agency. The authorization for the purchase of the motor car was given in an unciphered communication in the name of the directorate of the Tass agency. Therefore, Antonov's statement to the Ambassador that he knows nothing about the motor car, that no one told him anything about it in the Tass agency, and that the motor car belonged personally to Pakhomov (which you likewise confirmed to the Ambassador), we consider to be an infringement of the rules of secrecy, which occurred because of an oversight on your part. Your and Antonov's statement to the Ambassador caused the exposure of Pakhomov as our cadre worker.

"In the situation which has now arisen, the motor car should be left in Canberra and it should be used for operational purposes after you or Kislytsin have obtained a driving license.

"Taking into consideration Antonov's statement that he refuses to take the car because he is afraid to drive a motor car in Sydney, we recommended to Antonov that, pending a final decision, he should take a course of driving lessons and that for this purpose he should use £15 out of the resources of your M. V. D. section" (pp. 87 and 88).

274. Pakhomov, who held the overt post of Tass representative, was an M. V. D. worker who had already returned to the U. S. S. R. Antonov, who was also an M. V. D. worker, had relieved him as Tass representative (p. 88).

275. The Letter is of interest also from other points of view. It illustrates the care taken by the Moscow Centre to preserve its activities and the identity of its workers in Australia from the knowledge of our Security Service by procuring the Moscow Directorate of the Tass Agency to send Pakhomov the "cover story" by a communication "in clear" in the belief that communications with Australia were the subject of censorship examination, and in the hope and anticipation that the communication would thus come to the knowledge of our Security Service and lull any suspicions they might have that Pakhomov, the overt Tass representative, was concerned with espionage activities. The Letter shows also that the M. V. D. Resident had funds at his disposal separate from the ordinary Embassy funds (pp. 88 and 89).

277. During Makarov's Residency, Mosov (code name "Tekhnik") was the Tass representative in Australia. He was an M. V. D. worker under Makarov and subsequently, for a short time, under Sadovnikov. In August 1950 he returned to the U. S. S. R. (p. 89).

281. In June 1950 Pakhomov (code name "Valentin"), another M. V. D. worker, arrived to replace Nosov as Tass representative and to work under Sadovnikov (p. 89).

283. In April 1951 Sadovnikov was recalled to Moscow. An unfavorable report concerning his conduct as an Embassy official which had been made by the Ambassador was the reason for his recall. But he did not know this, and believed that he was merely going on leave and would return after a short interval. Before his departure he was instructed by the Moscow Centre that Pakhomov would act as temporary Resident during his absence and that Mrs. Petrov would take over the M. V. D. cipher work and papers, including the ciphers. This she did (pp. 89 and 90).

284. Pakhomov, however, who had arrived in Australia only in June 1950, had had little opportunity to accustom himself to Australian ways of life or to make acquaintances. From the M. V. D. point of view he was under the further disadvantage that he lived in Sydney and had no diplomatic immunity (p. 90).

285. Pakhomov remained temporary Resident until the end of 1951, when Petrov was appointed temporary Resident in his place. Thereafter, Pakhomov acted as an M. V. D. worker under Petrov, who was promoted to the rank of Colonel during 1952. From the time of Petrov's appointment as temporary Resident, Mrs. Petrov, who had been Pakhomov's cipher clerk and technical assistant, acted as Petrov's cipher clerk and technical assistant (p. 90).

286. Petrov remained temporary Resident until April 1954, when he left the Soviet service. From early in 1953 he had known that he was to return to the U. S. S. R. and to be relieved of his position as temporary Resident. In fact, he was relieved by Kovalenok (code name "Stoun"), an M. V. D. cadre worker, who arrived in Sydney on the 3rd April 1954 as temporary Resident. It was intended that an M. V. D. worker more senior than Kovalenok would later come to Australia as permanent Resident. It is worthy of note that in Moscow Kovalenok had served in the Fourth Directorate of the M. V. D., which was concerned with the training of espionage agents for work in an "Illegal Apparatus" and procuring their entry into foreign countries. This is significant in view of the desire of the Moscow Centre to create an "Illegal Apparatus" in Australia (p. 90).

291. ANTONOV (code name "Ignat") arrived in June 1952. His overt work was that of Tass representative in succession to Pakhomov. Antonov's principal M. V. D. duties—as laid down by the Moscow Centre—were to make the acquaintance of and "study" journalists, Members of the Parliament, and others who were thought to be of interest to the M. V. D. Like Kislytsin, his inadequate understanding of English handicapped him. Antonov left Australia with the members of the Embassy after Petrov's defection (p. 91).

(f) When Sadovnikov left Australia in 1951 Pakhomov, who still remained responsible for the Tass work and had been in Australia for only a few months, was suddenly called upon to take over the control of Sadovnikov's Apparatus, and both he and Sadovnikov believed that this was merely a temporary expedient (p. 96).

564. There is also a reference to Maclean in one of the G Series of documents, namely, the Enclosure to the Letter of 10th November 1949 (G. 3). It reads:

"Maclean—journalist, sympathetically disposed towards us, a very well informed man. In 'T's' opinion, he will give information."

"T" stands for "Tekhnik," the code name of Nosov, a Tass representative and an M. V. D. worker under Makarov and later under Sadovnikov (p. 159).

691. It is apparently the world-wide Soviet practice for Tass representatives to be recruited espionage agents. It certainly was so in Australia, where Nosov, Pakhomov, and Antonov—in succession the Tass men here—were all active M. V. D. cadre workers (p. 193).

692. The "study" of journalists for the M. V. D. was primarily the task of the Tass representative, who could without exciting attention mix freely with journalists and would be naturally accepted by them as one of themselves. He is thus in the way of gaining access to such information as they have and may be able to use them as at least unwitting informants (p. 193).

697. Miller told us that in 1943 he had—with the consent of his employer—made an arrangement with Nosov, whom he believed to be merely a Tass representative, to supply Nosov with news which might be of interest for him to cable to Tass. For these services, Miller said, Nosov, with the knowledge and approval of the proprietor of the "Daily Telegraph", paid him a weekly sum of £2. Miller told us that he had earlier been a member of the Communist Party but had ceased to belong to it in 1942 because he disagreed with its policies. There was, he said, nothing improper in the arrangement made by him with Nosov, and such an arrangement to supply information of interest to correspondents of overseas newspapers is, we were told, a common practice in newspaper offices (p. 194).

720. Although, as we have previously pointed out, O'Sullivan must have known that the Tass representatives was an official of a Soviet Government organ, he said that he had no knowledge that Pakhomov was an M. V. D. worker. He said that he gave Exhibit H to Pakhomov with the purpose solely of assisting the latter to influence journalists to publish Soviet news (p. 198).

721. We think it is most improbable that Pakhomov would have disclosed to O'Sullivan that he was an M. V. D. worker, or that O'Sullivan would have known it, but O'Sullivan's excuse for giving Pakhomov Exhibit H does not explain what appears to be a design to hide the fact that he was its author. Writing in the third person, he inserted some particulars about himself—including an indefinite statement of his age. Nor does his excuse seem to afford an explanation of the references in it to persons believed by O'Sullivan to be connected with our Security Service (p. 198).

722. Whatever O'Sullivan's purpose may have been in supplying Exhibit H, it is clear from the Moscow Letters that the document was got by Pakhomov for M. V. D. purposes, and that after its dispatch to Moscow the Centre took a keen interest in O'Sullivan and regarded him as a promising prospective agent who as a result of his secret meetings with Pakhomov and of his supplying Exhibit H was "on the small hook". That interest became intensified after O'Sullivan became Press Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition in April 1953 (p. 198).

In addition to these M. V. D. workers or collaborators on the Embassy staff, the following Tass representatives in Australia were M. V. D. workers:

- (i) Nosov ("Tekhnik")
- (ii) Pakhomov ("Valentin")
- (iii) Antonov ("Ignat") (p. 297).

Paragraph 7 of Letter No. 5 of 27 September 1952 to Canberra.

The information set out in para. 7 of your Letter No. 4 of 28.8.52, should have been notified to us by you by cable. Please take this into consideration and in future inform us immediately about similar happenings.

We agree that Antonov should not go any more to the editorial office of the "Tribune", (°1). In so far as materials supplied by the Information Bureau and Photo Chronicle (°2) through Tass, intended for the Australian press, are official (°3) and are examined by censorship (°4) upon receipt, it appears expedient to us that Antonov should come to an arrangement with the editorial office of the "Tribune" (°5) that a technical worker should be sent to him for such material when necessary (p. 371).

9. Petrov stated that Exhibit H had been handed to him in February 1952 by one Pakhomov, the then representative of the Tass Agency and said to be a cadre-worker of the M. V. D., who had told him that the document had been supplied to him late in 1951 by a journalist named Fergan O'Sullivan then on the staff of the "Sydney Morning Herald" (p. 420).

12. The testing of the authenticity of Exhibit J proceeded as follows:

The Petrovs had stated—

- (a) that it was typed during three successive days in April or May 1953, at a time when Petrov was in the Canberra Community Hospital, and had been given by its author to one Antonov, the then representative of the Tass Agency and also said to be a cadre-worker of the M. V. D.
- (b) that it was typed in the Soviet Embassy at Canberra.
- (c) that it was typed by Lockwood (p. 420).

#### CONCLUSIONS

The following characteristics of Tass demonstrate its illicit character as a conspiratorial agency:

(1) Its Russian staff has consisted largely of Soviet Military Intelligence personnel who are not professional journalists and who operate under aliases and false credentials.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no more questions of Mr. Lautner, Mr. Chairman.

The following words and phrases are handwritten on the original at the places indicated:

- (°1) "edit. of the Tribune."
- (°2) "inform. bureau and photo chr."
- (°3) "offic."
- (°4) "censorship."
- (°5) "editorial office Tr." (p. 371).

Senator WELKER. Thank you very much for appearing.  
And the meeting is now suspended.  
(Whereupon, at 12:10 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)  
(The letter from Herbert B. Cohen, attorney general of Pennsylvania, with related documents, referred to at p. 1435 read as follows):

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Harrisburg, July 18, 1956.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: The attorneys general of California, Delaware, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, and Rhode Island, have authorized me to transmit the enclosed statements to you as an expression of our dissent to the actions of the National Association of Attorneys General at its 50th annual meeting (1956).

Very truly yours,

(Signed) HERBERT B. COHEN,  
Attorney General.

STATEMENT OF POSITION ON RESOLUTION 14 OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL 50TH ANNUAL MEETING, 1956

#### SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

The undersigned members of the National Association of Attorneys General, believing that the security of the Nation and of each of the States will best be served by uniform Federal investigation, control, and prosecution of subversive activities and having dissented from the action of the association at its 50th annual meeting (1956) endorsing Federal legislation to permit enforcement of State penal statutes in this field, adopt this statement as their formal expression of dissent from such action of the association and desire that this formal expression of dissent be made known to the presiding officers and appropriate committee Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Edmund G. Brown, Attorney General of California; Joseph D. Craven, Attorney General of Delaware; Thomas M. Kavanagh, Attorney General of Michigan; Miles Lord, Attorney General of Minnesota; Grover C. Richman, Jr., Attorney General of New Jersey; Harvey Dickerson, Attorney General of Nevada; Herbert B. Cohen, Attorney General of Pennsylvania; William E. Powers, Attorney General of Rhode Island.

#### RESOLUTION 14. SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

The National Association of Attorneys General, 50th annual meeting, 1956

Be it resolved by the 50th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, That this association endorses the enactment of Federal legislation authorizing the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities involving State or National Governments or either of them; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretariat is requested to forward copies of this resolution to the presiding officers and the appropriate committee chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

## STATEMENT OF POSITION ON RESOLUTION 15 OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL, 50TH ANNUAL MEETING, 1956

## RULES OF CONSTRUCTION TO GUIDE THE SUPREME COURT

The undersigned members of the National Association of Attorneys General, believing that the delineation of the proper spheres of activities of the Federal and State Governments is properly a function of the Supreme Court of the United States and not one to be circumscribed by legislative enactment and having dissented from the action of the association at its 50th annual meeting (1956) approving enactment by the Congress of legislation attempting so to circumscribe this judicial function, adopt this as a formal expression of their disapproval of such legislation (in particular, H. R. 3 and S. 3143, now pending in the 84th Cong.) and their dissent to such action of the association, and desire that this formal expression of disapproval and dissent be made known to the presiding officers and appropriate committee Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the sponsors of the above-named bills.

Edmund G. Brown, Attorney General of California; Joseph D. Craven, Attorney General of Delaware; Thomas M. Kavanagh, Attorney General of Michigan; Miles Lord, Attorney General of Minnesota; Grover C. Richman, Jr., Attorney General of New Jersey; Jacob K. Javits, Attorney General of New York; Harvey Dickerson, Attorney General of Nevada; Herbert B. Cohen, Attorney General of Pennsylvania; William E. Powers, Attorney General of Rhode Island.

## RESOLUTION 15. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION TO GUIDE THE SUPREME COURT

The National Association of Attorneys General  
50th Annual Meeting, 1956

Whereas members of this association have expressed alarm on several occasions in recent years over the increasing tendency of the Supreme Court of the United States to hold that enactments by Congress operate to exclude or supersede any State laws on the same subject matter and to preempt the field for Federal occupancy; and

Whereas such exemptions of Federal power by judicial interpretation have impinged and continue to impinge directly upon the powers reserved to the States and the citizens thereof by the 10th amendment to the Constitution, and thus present a real threat to the continued independence and integrity of the States: Now, therefore be it

*Resolved by the 50th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General,* That this association approves the enactment by Congress of legislation to clarify its intent that no future act of Congress shall be considered to exclude any State laws on the same subject matter unless such congressional act contains an express provision to that effect, nor shall such congressional act invalidate a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such act unless a power expressly granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States is involved; and be it further

*Resolved,* That this association extends to the Members of Congress who have introduced H. R. 3 and S. 3143, now pending in the 84th Congress, its sincere appreciation for sponsoring legislation designed to accomplish the objectives set forth above, and the secretariat is requested to bring this resolution to the attention of the presiding officers and to the appropriate committee chairmen of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States as well as to the sponsors of the named bills.

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES  
Soviet Redefection Campaign

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956

UNITED STATES SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE  
TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE  
INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL  
SECURITY LAWS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:40 a. m., in room 318, Senate Office Building, Senator William E. Jenner presiding.

Present: Senator Jenner.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel; William A. Rusher, administrative counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director; Robert McManus, research analyst; Jonathan Mitchell, consultant to the committee; and F. W. Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator JENNER. Mr. Conal, will you come forward, please.

Do you swear the testimony you give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CONAL. I do.

Senator JENNER. Proceed, Mr. Morris.

## TESTIMONY OF BERNARD CONAL, ACCOMPANIED BY LEONARD BOUDIN, HIS ATTORNEY

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Conal, will you give your full name and address to the reporter, please?

Mr. CONAL. Yes. Bernard Conal, 203 West 90th Street, New York.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your present occupation, Mr. Conal?

Mr. CONAL. Community analyst, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Community analyst. Would you speak up, please?

Mr. CONAL. Community analyst.

Mr. BOUDIN. Could we hold the questioning until the pictures are over.

Senator JENNER. Take your pictures, gentlemen, and then we will proceed.

Mr. BOUDIN. Mr. Chairman, could we proceed with the hearing? I am not interested in the photographers taking pictures.

Senator JENNER. Yes. Please take your pictures so that we can go ahead.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us what a community analyst is, Mr. Conal?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir. I analyze the composition of the population, its conditions, its problems, their similar purchasing habits, their electoral proclivities, and so forth, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, will you tell us what companies you have been associated within that work that you have just described for us.

Mr. CONAL. What companies I have been associated with?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. We mentioned some of them in executive session.

Mr. CONAL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. I think it would be more expeditious if you told us which ones you were associated with and at what periods of time.

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir. I had my own company, the Voters Research Institute, in 1945 through 1947, and then I was associated with the American Management Council.

Mr. MORRIS. The American Management Council?

Mr. CONAL. Council, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, was Palmer Weber working with you at that time?

Mr. CONAL. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you work in this kind of work with Palmer Weber at any time?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir; in Community Inventories.

Mr. MORRIS. Community Inventories?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. When was that?

Mr. CONAL. That was subsequent to American Management Council.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. Specifically when was it?

Mr. CONAL. It was 1951-52.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Now, what was Community Inventories doing at that time in 1951 and 1952 when you were working with Palmer Weber?

Mr. CONAL. We were primarily interested in—that is, the firm was interested in—obtaining clients on market analysis or electoral analysis for plant-location work and so forth. These were the main interests of the firm at the time.

It was not a successful operation, sir, and as a consequence the chief owner of the firm, Mr. Wheat—

Mr. MORRIS. What is his name?

Mr. CONAL. Wheat.

Mr. MORRIS. W-h-e-a-t?

Mr. CONAL. W-h-e-a-t. That is right—liquidated it.

Mr. MORRIS. In what year?

Mr. CONAL. That was 1953.

Mr. MORRIS. 1953. Was that after Palmer Weber testified before this subcommittee?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. You know, of course, do you not, that Palmer Weber testified before the Internal Security Subcommittee and when asked about his membership in the Communist Party, he invoked his privilege against incrimination. Do you recall that, sir?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, I think so.

Mr. MORRIS. And Weber was working with you at that time in Community Inventories?

Mr. CONAL. That is right, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, in this connection were you doing any work like this for the political parties?

Mr. CONAL. At what time, sir?

Mr. MORRIS. In 1951, 1952, and 1953, I think, is the period we are talking about.

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir. We had clients—it was called the Connecticut Committee, sir. It was a committee of businessmen that was interested in the analysis of the electorate in Connecticut. Many of the leaders of this committee were businessmen, industrialists, and so forth, who were interested in, most of them, I would say, in the condition of the Republican vote.

We made what were community analyses covering what is broadly called the social-economic problems, issues, electoral issues, and so forth, of the voters throughout the State.

Mr. MORRIS. And now, had you done that earlier?

Mr. CONAL. I beg your pardon?

Mr. MORRIS. Had you done that kind of work earlier?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. For another period of time?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. What period of time did you do that previously?

Mr. CONAL. Well, I think that in the period of 1945-46, and also subsequently in 1947, I made such analyses for Mr. Wallace.

Mr. MORRIS. That is Henry Wallace?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. The Political Action Committee?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you do that at any time subsequent to 1947 and 1948—between 1948 and 1951?

Mr. CONAL. I don't recall. I did this work for Mr. Wallace through 1947 and 1948.

Mr. MORRIS. And whom did you work for in 1949 and 1950?

Mr. CONAL. Well, I went into the American Management Council in 1950.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, were they doing surveys like this for the political parties?

Mr. CONAL. No, sir. The American Management Council was a dormant research organization of a law firm that was interested in tax analysis and in pensions, I think, too.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, what law firm was that, Mr. Conal?

Mr. CONAL. I think the firm was then called Simon & Shur.

Mr. MORRIS. Simon, S-i-m-o-n?

Mr. CONAL. And Shur.

Mr. MORRIS. Spell "Shur."

Mr. CONAL. S-h-u-r.

I don't recall the full name of the firm. The contents of this work—some of this was, they would have certain research aspects, like market research. They had a company, a client of theirs that was interested in getting an analysis of its distribution, the distribution of its sales force and its cost of production as against its cost of sales.

We would make analyses like that for a pharmaceutical firm that was interested in an analysis of its cost-sales distribution, and so forth. They were the ones who obtained the Connecticut committee as a client.

I believe it was the Connecticut committee in 1951 for which we made these various analyses of the issues on a completely objective, non-partisan basis.

Mr. MORRIS. And you would supply the results of your surveys to the people who hired you to give it to them?

Mr. CONAL. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And it is your testimony that you carried out those surveys in a dispassionate, careful way?

Mr. CONAL. Absolutely.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, where were you born, Mr. Conal?

Mr. CONAL. I was born in Belfast, Ireland.

Mr. MORRIS. Pardon?

Mr. CONAL. In Belfast, Ireland.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. And when did you come to the United States?

Mr. CONAL. 1924.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. And have you worked for the United States Government?

Mr. CONAL. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you worked with any congressional committees in Washington?

Mr. CONAL. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your employment during the war?

Mr. CONAL. I was war activities director for the CIO.

Mr. MORRIS. War activities director for the CIO?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir; all of the activities of the CIO connected with raising funds for Red Cross and for the various organizations and for obtaining contributions to it of various kinds. I think I received a citation from the Red Cross for it.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you—

Mr. BOUDIN. Excuse me a second, Judge Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. How long were you war activities director for the CIO?

Mr. CONAL. Up until, I think, the beginning—1943. I was asked by Mr. Hillman, because I was considered an expert in community—

Mr. MORRIS. "Hillman" is Sidney Hillman?

Mr. CONAL. Mr. Sidney Hillman, yes. (Continuing)—whether I would undertake the analysis of the CIO activity—of the PAC's activity at that time in the city, and I functioned for that then.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, give us the terminal dates for that employment, would you, as war director?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir. I left—after the election campaign, I was over there in that year, and after, I think, a vacation, I came back and I subsequently tendered my resignation there, and the actual terminal date was March of 1945.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. And you started in 1942, you say?

Mr. CONAL. In 1941, I think.

Mr. MORRIS. 1941. Now, what did you do prior to 1941?

Mr. CONAL. Well, I was at WPA for a period of time, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. What part of WPA?

Mr. CONAL. The writers' project.

Mr. MORRIS. In New York City, was that?

Mr. CONAL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And then after you ceased being the war activities director of the CIO in 1945, what employment did you take up?

Mr. CONAL. I set my own organization up, called the Voters Research Institute, sir. And I was with that, as I indicated before, through 1947.

Mr. MORRIS. And you were then working with the CIO Political Action Committee?

Mr. CONAL. Not—

Mr. MORRIS. Not after 1945?

Mr. CONAL. Not after 1945.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you do work for them?

Mr. CONAL. No, sir; I didn't. I made analyses for various candidates.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you do several surveys on a contract basis for the PAC?

Mr. CONAL. How would you define "contract basis," sir?

Mr. MORRIS. I thought that would be a term that you would use in connection with your employment.

Mr. CONAL. Not with PAC, sir. My work with PAC was wholly at that time through the CIO.

That is, I was with the New York CIO, which had a New York PAC. I was not in the national PAC. I was with New York.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, in 1952, did you prepare a survey, a political survey?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir. I made a number of analyses in 1952. One of them I mentioned to you, the one of the Connecticut State—of the various communities in Connecticut. I also made one in Ohio, in the 11th and 22d Congressional Districts in Ohio.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. And what other surveys did you make at that time?

Mr. CONAL. I am trying to think, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. You did not do any on a national level, did you, in 1952?

Mr. CONAL. Of a nationwide level? No. I made certain predictions, I guess, on the basis of the sort of sampling that our studies permitted us to make, but I did not do any national-level study.

Mr. MORRIS. You did not do any work for the Republican National Committee at that time?

Mr. CONAL. No, sir, not for the Republican National Committee.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, have you done any work for the Democratic National Committee?

Mr. CONAL. Well, I was asked by Mr. O'Neill, who was the publicity director then, to do a number of—that was in 1945-46—to do a number of congressional district studies in various narrow-margin districts, and I made a number of these in various parts of the country.

Mr. MORRIS. And then later, in the 1951, 1952, and 1953 period, you did work generally for the Republican groups; is that right, sir?

Mr. CONAL. Well, in most instances, yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. And that would be in Connecticut and Ohio?

Mr. CONAL. It would depend on the client. For instance, in 1950 I was asked, just before the termination of the campaign in Connecticut, whether I could come in and indicate what the outcome might be as between Mr. Bowles, and I forget who was running against him then, and I was in there briefly for an analysis of that.



As I say, I went in there briefly and made an analysis of that, but there wasn't much that I could do. It was possible to make a rather accurate prediction of the outcome, but I would say that it was luck.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you last see Palmer Weber, Mr. Conal?

Mr. CONAL. I pointed out to you, my recollection, the last time I saw him, it was as I was walking out of a restaurant in New York about 6 or 7 months ago, I think.

Mr. MORRIS. And you have not seen him since—

Mr. CONAL. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Since you and he dissolved the last corporation—what was it—in 1953?

Mr. CONAL. The Community Inventories.

Mr. MORRIS. The Community Inventories.

Now, have you been a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Conal?

Mr. CONAL. Have I been?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONAL. My answer to that, sir, is that in the last 10 years I have had no party affiliation or membership in any political party whatsoever.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you a member of the Communist Party when you were on the WPA prior to 1941?

Mr. CONAL. In view of the long period there, I would decline to answer that under my privilege under the first and under the fifth amendments to the Constitution.

Senator JENNER. The committee will recognize your refusal to answer under the fifth amendment, but not under the first amendment.

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, during this period were you the executive secretary of the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights, specifically in the year 1941?

Mr. CONAL. For the same reason, sir, I decline to answer under the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator JENNER. Under the fifth amendment?

Mr. CONAL. The fifth.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist while you acted as executive director for the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights for the year 1941?

Mr. CONAL. The same answer, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you a Communist while you were head of the war activities committee for the CIO during the war?

Mr. CONAL. The same answer, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you a member of the Communist Party when you commenced your first survey work after the war in 1946 or 1947?

Mr. BOUDIN. Excuse me a second.

(The witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. CONAL. My answer to that is the one I gave you before, that [in the last 10 years] I have not been a member of any political party.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Did you give up your membership in the Communist Party when you began the survey work?

Mr. CONAL. That is a serious question, sir. I would like to assert my privilege under the fifth amendment on that.

I think my other answer covered that. I think that I had answered that, that during this 10-year period I have not been a member of any political party.

Mr. MORRIS. Specifically, I wonder if you would answer the question: Did you give up your Communist Party membership when you took up your work with the survey groups?

Mr. CONAL. The way you put the question, sir, I would have to decline to answer that under my privilege under the fifth.

Mr. MORRIS. And when did you first meet Palmer Weber?

Mr. CONAL. The first time I ever met him was when he was research director for the National PAC, and some time in 1944 he came to New York and I was first introduced to him.

Mr. MORRIS. In 1944?

Mr. CONAL. I think so, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. And then you and he worked together—

Mr. CONAL. No, sir. We did not work together there. I didn't see him again until—oh, I might have seen him off and on at certain meetings, but we did not work together. I did not work together with him at all, sir, until the time that he applied for a job with Community Inventories.

Mr. MORRIS. Until the time of what? I missed that.

Mr. CONAL. Until he applied for a job at Community Inventories.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. And you gave him the job?

Mr. CONAL. Yes, sir. I thought he was qualified to do research work.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Now, to your knowledge, did you know that he was or ever had been a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. CONAL. I decline to answer that on the basis of my privilege.

Senator JENNER. Your privilege under the fifth amendment?

Mr. CONAL. Under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. And you are sure you will not answer that question?

It is important, Mr. Conal, because at the time when you were beginning this survey, it is of some interest to the committee whether or not you know that Palmer Weber was a Communist at that time when you hired him.

Mr. CONAL. I would stand on my previous answer, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, are you a Communist now?

Mr. CONAL. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you bear with me 1 minute, Senator, please?

Were you a member of the executive committee of the New York County Communist Political Association during the war?

Mr. CONAL. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you the editor of the Bill of Rights News?

Mr. CONAL. Published when?

Mr. MORRIS. It was published by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.

Mr. CONAL. What period?

Mr. MORRIS. That was 1944.

Mr. CONAL. 1944? No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. You know nothing of a publication called the Bill of Rights News?

Mr. CONAL. No, sir, not in 1944.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, at any time?

Mr. CONAL. I don't recall, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you been connected with the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights?

Mr. CONAL. What period was that, sir?

Senator JENNER. Any period.

Mr. MORRIS. Any period.

Mr. BOUDIN. Excuse me.

(The witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. CONAL. I would assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, have you been closely associated with William Schneiderman, who was a leading Communist Party member on the west coast?

Mr. CONAL. I decline to answer under the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. I did not hear you.

Mr. CONAL. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you marry Greta Spiro? Is that the name of your wife?

Mr. CONAL. Greta Spiro.

Mr. MORRIS. Spiro.

(The witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. CONAL. I would decline to answer, sir, on my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you know Nathan Gregory Silvermaster?

Mr. CONAL. I decline to answer that, sir, on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, have you written for a publication called "Fight," F-i-g-h-t, which was an official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. BOUDIN. What was the spelling of that?

Mr. MORRIS. Fight, F-i-g-h-t; the American League Against War and Fascism.

Mr. CONAL. I have no recollection, sir, of anything like that.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no more questions of this witness at this time.

Senator JENNER. You will be excused.

Mr. BOUDIN. Thank you.

Senator JENNER. Call the next witness.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Behrstock.

Mr. Behrstock, will you stand and be sworn, please?

Senator JENNER. Do you swear the testimony you give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I do, sir.

Senator JENNER. All right.

**TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR BEHRSTOCK,<sup>1</sup> ACCOMPANIED BY LEONARD BOUDIN, HIS ATTORNEY**

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, since our last session with Mr. Behrstock, we have received from the department of public safety, city hall, Jersey City, N. J., under date of April 26, 1956, from Lawrence A.

<sup>1</sup> Previous testimony begins on p. 745 (pt. 13).

Whipple, director, a paper which purports to be the Communist Party card of Arthur Behrstock, dated 1940, which gives the section and the branch of the Communist Party that he was at that time alleged associated with.

I have shown you this card in executive session, have I, Mr. Behrstock?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Is that the same card?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, the same card I showed you in executive session.

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. What was your question?

Mr. MORRIS. Have you seen this card?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Yes; if that is the same card.

Mr. MORRIS. It is the same card.

Mr. BOUDIN. That is a photostat?

Mr. MORRIS. A photostat of a card.

Mr. BOUDIN. Yes, a photostat.

Mr. MORRIS. Is that your Communist Party card?

(A document was handed to the witness.)

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I would give the same answer now that I gave in executive session, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. And what is that answer?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. That I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the first and the fifth amendments.

Senator JENNER. Your refusal to answer the question on the fifth amendment will be recognized by this committee, but not your refusal under the first amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, after you testified here, did you go to your employer—who employed you the last time you were here, Mr. Behrstock?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Now, after you testified here, did you then go to your employer and deny to him your membership in the Communist Party, which fact you did not deny before the Internal Security Subcommittee?

Mr. BOUDIN. You mean as to which fact the privilege was pleaded before the committee?

Mr. MORRIS. He did not deny it. He said he invoked his privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. BOUDIN. He did not admit it; he did not deny it.

Mr. MORRIS. That is right.

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I decline to answer that question under the same grounds that I previously stated this morning.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you not go to your employer and specifically deny that you had ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I assert the same privilege, Mr. Morris.

Senator JENNER. The photostatic copy of the Communist Party card of Arthur Behrstock will go into the record and become a part of the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Together with the letter of transmittal, Senator, showing where we got this card?

Senator JENNER. Yes.

(The letter and card referred to were marked "Exhibit No. 281 and No. 281-A" and are as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 281

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,  
CITY HALL,  
Jersey City, N. J., April 26, 1956.

HON. ROBERT MORRIS,  
Chief Counsel, Un-American Activities Committee,  
Care of Senator Eastland,  
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: I am enclosing herewith what apparently appears to be a photo-  
static copy of Arthur Behrstock's membership in the Communist Party, U. S. A.  
With kind regards,  
Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE A. WHIPPLE, Director.

EXHIBIT No. 281-A

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

# 27089-4-40

1940  
Membership  
Book

No. 1929

Name ARTHUR BEHRSTOCK  
(PRINT)

State N. J.

County Passaic City Passaic

Section (A.D. or Ward) 24

Admitted on 7-14-40

Signature of State or District  
Chairman or Secretary, and Party  
Head.

The Party Membership Book is valid until it has  
been cancelled by the Party.



Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you, on May 15, 1953, give a fund-raising party—did you participate in a fund-raising party for Steve Nelson at 60 Hicks Street, in Brooklyn?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I decline to answer on the same grounds that I previously stated this morning; namely, the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. You have worked for the Daily Worker in the past; have you not?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your assignment with SCAP? You know what SCAP is; do you not, Mr. Behrstock?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you identify it for the record, please?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I will have to recall the initials now.

Mr. BOUDIN. Excuse me a second. I know Judge Morris will forgive me and the witness will, of course, answer. But these questions were taken up 3 times, in 2 executive sessions and 1 public session.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Boudin, you understand—

Mr. BOUDIN. I am not objecting. I was just reminding you.

Mr. MORRIS. You understand there was a difference of wording on some of these questions, which was very important. I think you will recall the last time I asked him if Steve Nelson had been at his house or his apartment at 60 Hicks Street.

Mr. BOUDIN. I am referring to the SCAP situation, which I thought you had covered fully. I just want to call that to your attention, but we have no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. We appreciate that, Mr. Boudin. But there are a few things I want to add about the SCAP thing, and I would not want to put them in out of context.

Mr. BOUDIN. Fair enough.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us what your role was in SCAP, Mr. Behrstock?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. As I said before, it was a kind of omnibus job. Its functions were not very clearly defined at the beginning of an occupation, and the job evolved in a certain sense as the occupation bedded down, so to speak.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us what SCAP stands for?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

And then you had this omnibus job that you were telling us about?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Well, omnibus in the sense that it wasn't quite well defined, but in general—

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you at that time—what were the terminal dates of your employment with SCAP?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. The terminal dates?

Mr. MORRIS. The terminal dates. When did you begin and when did you end?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I think I came into SCAP probably about July 1944, and I think I ended about June 1946, roughly, give or take a month or so.

Mr. MORRIS. And what did you do after you left SCAP in 1946?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. What was my job?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I was a free-lance writer.

Mr. MORRIS. A free-lance writer?

Now, did you write an article called Snafu in Tokyo, in the Nisei Weekender for January 1, 1947?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. May I see the article, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

(A document was handed to the witness.)

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I assert the same privilege, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. All right.

The last time you testified that you were Chief of the Planning and Operational Division, did you not?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And for what particular subdivision of SCAP?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Civil Information and Education.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, on the basis of information that you received at that time, did you write this article which has just been shown to you?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I assert the same privilege, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that article, which is an article that is highly critical of General MacArthur and General MacArthur's administration in Tokyo, which was purportedly written by Arthur Behrstock, a fact which the witness does not deny, but instead invokes the privilege under the fifth amendment, go into the record?

Senator JENNER. It may go into the record and become part of the official record of his committee.

(The article above referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 282" and was placed in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you know a Japanese Communist named Shiga while you were in Japan?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Offhand, the name isn't familiar, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist while you were with SCAP?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I assert the same privilege I did before.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you a Communist now?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. The same answer, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to put into the record several articles that had more to do, Senator, with the last session that we had, when we put into the record the testimony of Mr. Rastvorov about the head of the trade mission in Japan. I would like to go into the record at this time.

As I say, they bear more on the other hearing, Senator, than this present hearing.

Senator JENNER. They may go into the record at the proper place.

(The newspaper articles referred to were marked "Exhibits No. 283 and 283-A" and appear at p. 815, pt. 14.)

Mr. MORRIS. What was your relation to the C. I. and E. Library in Tokyo?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. My relation to the C. I. —

Mr. MORRIS. Civil —

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Civil Information and Education.

Mr. MORRIS. That is right.

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Library?

Mr. MORRIS. Library, yes.

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. At best, most perfunctory. I had no special connection with the library there.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you acquainted with the radio program known as the Hour of Heroes?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. It is not familiar to me. Radio was not a speciality of my daily work.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, do you specifically deny that in the spring of 1946 you met regularly at night with a Japanese Communist named Shiga on the fourth floor of the Radio Tokyo Building in Tokyo?

(The witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I assert the same privilege, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. When I asked you about Shiga before, you said you did not recall, as I recall it, Mr. Behrstock.

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I don't recall the name. But on the advice of my counsel, I am taking the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you meet with any Japanese Communists on the fourth floor of the Radio Toyko Building in Japan?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I assert the same privilege.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you prepare a movie code for Japan?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. A movie code?

Mr. MORRIS. A movie code.

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. No, sir; I didn't.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you work on it at all?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know a Japanese named Tamin Suzuki?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. That name is not familiar.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know a publication in Japan called the Akahata?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. No. I don't read Japanese, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you acquainted with that publication?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. No, I am not.

Mr. MORRIS. You have done no work for that publication?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. You do not know that the word "Akahata" means red flag in Japanese?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Your knowledge of Japanese exceeds mine.

Mr. MORRIS. You were there several years, Mr. Behrstock.

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. I should say, Mr. Morris, as I said before, that I am not an expert on the Far East and never have been. I went to the Far East as an infantry officer. I came into MacArthur's headquarters, and my interest in the Far East was as a part of a job at that period, and my interest dwindled very fast, because I am not a far-eastern expert or anything of that kind, and I never knew Japanese other than how to say "Good morning," or something of that kind.

Mr. BOUDIN. The witness does not, however, contest your translation, Judge Morris. We accept it.

Senator JENNER. How did you happen to be assigned to SCAP?

Mr. BEHRSTOCK. Well, if I might make a small personal aside, I was in a replacement depot in Buna, New Guinea, waiting to be assigned to a replacement division as an infantry platoon leader, when MacArthur formed the Psychological Warfare Headquarters, and a stop order, I guess, was put on all people who could write or had any journalistic background, and I think I mentioned that at the last session.

When I was interviewed for this position, I was very much torn, because I wanted to go in infantry. Put it that way.

Senator JENNER. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no more questions, Senator.

Senator JENNER. I have no further questions.

You will be excused.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, before the hearing is over, I would like to put the Certificate of Incorporation of Community Inventories and an amendment, apparently, of the Certificate of Incorporation of Community Inventories, into the record.

Senator JENNER. It may go into the record and become a part of the official record.

(The documents referred to, entitled "Certificate of Incorporation of Community Inventories, Inc.," and "Certificate of Amendment of Certificate of Incorporation of Community Inventories, Inc.," were marked "exhibit 284 and 284-A" and read as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 284

## CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF COMMUNITY INVENTORIES, INC., PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 2 OF THE STOCK CORPORATION LAW

We, the undersigned, for the purpose of forming a corporation pursuant to article 2 of the stock corporation law of the State of New York, do hereby certify:

First: The name of the proposed corporation shall be Community Inventories, Inc.

Second: The purposes for which it is to be formed are:

To market a service analyzing socioeconomic data and information.

To purchase, acquire, sell, lease, mortgage, pledge, transfer, or otherwise deal in real property.

To acquire, and pay for in cash, stock, or bonds of this corporation or otherwise, the goodwill, rights, assets, and property, and to undertake or assume the whole or any part of the obligations or liabilities of any person, firm, association, or corporation engaged in the same or similar business.

To purchase, hold, sell, assign, transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise dispose of shares of the capital stock of, or any bonds, securities or evidences of indebtedness created by any other corporation or corporations organized under the laws of this State or any other State, country, nation, or government, and while the owner thereof to exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges of ownership.

To issue bonds, debentures, or obligations of this corporation from time to time for any of the objects or purposes of the corporation, and to secure the same by mortgage, pledge, deed or trust, or otherwise.

To purchase, hold, sell, and transfer the shares of its own capital stock; provided it shall not use its funds or property for the purchase of its own shares of capital stock when such use would cause any impairment of its capital except as otherwise permitted by law; and provided further that shares of its own capital stock belonging to it shall not be voted upon directly or indirectly.

In general, to carry on any other similar business in connection with the foregoing, and to have and exercise all the powers conferred by the laws of New York upon corporations formed under the act hereinbefore referred to, and to do any or all of the things hereinbefore set forth to the same extent as natural persons might or could do.

The foregoing clauses shall be construed both as objects and powers, and it is hereby expressly provided that the foregoing enumeration of specific powers shall not be held to limit or restrict in any manner the powers of this corporation.

Third: The total number of shares that may be issued by the corporation is 100. All shares shall be common stock without par value.

The capital of the corporation shall be at least equal to the sum of the aggregate par value of all issued shares having par value, plus the aggregate amount of consideration received by the corporation for the issuance of shares without par value, plus such amounts as, from time to time, by resolution of the board of directors, may be transferred thereto.

Fourth: The office of the corporation is to be located in the city of New York, county of New York, and State of New York.

The address to which the secretary of state shall mail a copy of process in any action or proceeding against the corporation which may be served upon him is room 1201, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Fifth: The duration of the corporation shall be perpetual.

Sixth: The number of its directors shall be three; directors need not be stockholders.

Seventh: The names and post-office addresses of the directors until the first annual meeting of the stockholders are:

Names	Post-office addresses
Osborne A. McKegney	2728 Henry Hudson Parkway, Bronx, N. Y.
David T. Walsh	285 East 181st St., Bronx, N. Y.
Catherine McKee	398 Hickory Ave., Paramus, N. J.

Eighth: The name and post-office address of each subscriber of this certificate of incorporation and a statement of the number of shares of stock which each agrees to take in the corporation are:

Names	Post-office addresses	Number of shares
Osborne A. McKegney	2728 Henry Hudson Parkway, Bronx, N. Y.	1
David T. Walsh	285 East 181st St., Bronx, N. Y.	1
Catherine McKee	398 Hickory Ave., Paramus, N. J.	1

Ninth: All of the subscribers of the certificate are of full age, at least two-thirds of them are citizens of the United States, at least one of them is a resident of the State of New York and at least one of the persons named as a director is a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of New York.

Tenth: The Secretary of State is designated as the agent of the corporation upon whom process in any action or proceeding against the corporation may be served.

In witness whereof, we have made, signed, and acknowledged this certificate, this 18th day of July 1952.

OSBORNE A. MCKEGNEY.  
DAVID T. WALSH.  
CATHERINE MCKEE.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

County of New York, ss:

On this 18th day of July 1952, before me personally came Osborne A. McKegney, to be known, and known to me to be one of the persons described in and who executed the foregoing certificate, and he duly acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

ARTHUR ENGELMANN,  
Notary Public, State of New York.

Term expires March 30, 1954.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

County of New York, ss:

On this 18th day of July 1952, before me personally came David T. Walsh, to be known, and known to me to be one of the persons described in and who executed the foregoing certificate, and he duly acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

ARTHUR ENGELMANN,  
Notary Public, State of New York.

Term expires March 30, 1954.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

County of New York, ss:

On this 18th day of July 1952, before me personally came Catherine McKee, to be known, and known to me to be one of the persons described in and who executed the foregoing certificate, and she duly acknowledged to me that she executed the same.

ARTHUR ENGELMANN,  
Notary Public, State of New York.

Term expires March 30, 1954.

EXHIBIT No. 284-A

## CERTIFICATE OF AMENDMENT OF CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF COMMUNITY INVENTORIES, INC.

PURSUANT TO SECTION THIRTY-SIX OF THE STOCK CORPORATION LAW

We, the undersigned, being the holders of record of all the outstanding shares entitled to vote upon an amendment to the Certificate of Incorporation of Community Inventories, Inc., hereby certify as follows:

First: That the name of the Corporation is Community Inventories, Inc.

Second: That the Certificate of Incorporation of the corporation was filed in the office of the Secretary of State, Albany, New York, on the 21st day of July, 1952.

Third: That the Certificate of Incorporation is hereby amended to effect one or more of the changes authorized in Subdivision 2 of Section 35 of the Stock Corporation Law as follows:

- A. Authorization of new shares of Preferred stock with par value
- B. Authorization of new shares of Preferred stock without par value
- C. Reclassification of shares

Fourth: That the Certificate of Incorporation is hereby amended by amending Article Third of the Certificate of Incorporation so that said Article Third shall read as follows:

Third: The total number of shares which may be issued by the corporation is One Thousand One Hundred (1,100). Of the said shares Seven Hundred (700) shall be classified as Preferred Class A and the par value of each such share shall be One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00); Three Hundred (300) shares shall be classified as Preferred Class B, all of which are without par value and One Hundred (100) shares shall be classified as Common Stock, all of which are without par value.

The designations and the powers, preferences and relative, participating, optional or other special rights, and qualifications, limitations or restrictions thereof, of the various classes of stock of the corporation are as follows:

The holders of the Preferred Class A shares shall be entitled to receive out of the net profits or net assets applicable to dividends a cumulative dividend at the rate of seven percent (7%) payable annually beginning twelve (12) months after issue before any dividend shall be paid or set apart for payment to the holders of the Preferred Class B or Common shares, provided however, that whenever a dividend is paid on the Preferred Class A shares and full cumulative dividends thereon for all previous dividend periods have been paid or provided for, the directors shall have the power in their discretion to declare and pay a dividend for a like period on the Preferred Class B shares at the rate of Seven Dollars (\$7.00) per annum. Any further funds applicable to dividends may, in the discretion of the Board of Directors, be distributed to the holders of the Common shares.

The holders of the Preferred Class A and Preferred Class B stock shall be entitled, in case of liquidation, dissolution, or winding up of the corporation, whether voluntary or involuntary, before any amount shall be paid to the holders of the Common Stock to be paid One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00) per share and the dividends accumulated or declared and unpaid thereon, but shall not participate in any further distribution of the assets of the corporation.

At the discretion of the corporation the shares of Preferred Class A and Preferred Class B shall be subject to redemption in whole or in part, by lot or pro rata at One Hundred and Ten Dollars (\$110.00) per share if redeemed not later than seven (7) months after issue; at One Hundred and Twenty Dollars (\$120.00) per share if redeemed not later than twelve (12) months after issue; and at One Hundred and Thirty Dollars (\$130.00) per share if redeemed thirty-six (36) months or later after issue.

Except as otherwise provided by Statute, the holders of the Preferred Class A and Preferred Class B shares shall not be entitled to vote, the sole voting power being vested in the holders of the Common Stock.

The capital of the corporation shall be at least equal to the sum of the aggregate par value of all issued shares having par value, plus the aggregate amount of consideration received by the corporation for the issuance of shares without par value, plus such amounts as, from time to time, by resolution of the Board of Directors, may be transferred thereto.

In witness whereof we have signed this certificate this 8th day of November 1952.

CLAYTON E. WHEAT, JR.,  
BERNARD CONAL.

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
County of New York, ss:

On this 8th day of November 1952, before me personally came Clayton E. Wheat, Jr., and Bernard Conal, to me known and known to me to be the individuals described in and who executed the foregoing certificate, and they severally duly acknowledged to me that they executed the same.

[SEAL]

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
County of New York, ss:

Mary C. Wheat, being first duly sworn on oath, says that she is the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of Community Inventories, Inc., and, as such, is the custodian of the stock book of said corporation; that the persons who have executed the foregoing certificate in person or by proxy constitute the holders of record, as disclosed by said stock book, of all the outstanding shares of said corporation entitled to vote on the amendment of the Certificate of Incorporation of said corporation intended to be effected by the foregoing certificate.

MARY C. WHEAT.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of November 1952.

[SEAL]

SAM NEUSTADT,  
Notary Public, State of New York.

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
County of New York, ss:

Clayton E. Wheat, Jr., and Mary C. Wheat, being duly and severally sworn, each for himself, deposes and says that he, said Clayton E. Wheat, Jr., is President, and she, said Mary C. Wheat, is Treasurer of Community Inventories, Inc., and that:

(a) the number of additional shares not resulting from a change of shares which the corporation is hereby authorized to issue by the foregoing certificate is one thousand (1,000) shares, and the number of such additional shares with par value is seven hundred (700) shares, and the par value thereof is one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per share and three hundred (300) shares are without par value;

(b) the number of shares changed as provided in subparagraph five of paragraph (C) of subdivision 2 of Section 35 is no shares of the par value of \$no per share and the number of shares resulting from such change is no shares, and the par value thereof is \$no per share;

(c) the number of shares not resulting from a change of shares of which the par value has been increased is no shares, and the amount of the increase in par value is \$no per share.

CLAYTON E. WHEAT, JR.,  
President.  
MARY C. WHEAT,  
Treasurer.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of November 1952.

[SEAL]

SAM NEUSTADT,  
Notary Public, State of New York.

Commission expires March 30, 1956.

Senator JENNER. If there is nothing further, the committee will stand in recess.

Mr. BOUDIN. Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS. Thank you, Mr. Boudin. Thank you, Mr. Behrstock.  
(Whereupon, at 11:25 a. m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

## INDEX

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the names of an individual or an organization in this index.

	Page
<b>A</b>	
Akahata, publication in Japan.....	1457
Allied Force headquarters.....	1427
American Management Council.....	1446, 1447
Antonov ("Ignat").....	1440, 1442
Article entitled "Snafu," Nisei Weekender, Tokyo, dated January 1, 1947.....	1456
Australian Committee for the Cultural Freedom.....	1439
<b>B</b>	
Behrstock, Arthur (testimony of).....	1452-1461
Leonard Boudin, attorney.....	1452
5th on identity of CP membership card issued in his name.....	1453
5th if participated in fund-raising party for Steve Nelson.....	1455
5th if worked for Daily Worker.....	1455
Was free-lance writer.....	1455
5th if wrote article for Nisei Weekender, Tokyo.....	1456
5th if Communist.....	1456
5th if had meetings with Shiga, Japanese Communist.....	1457
Bill of Rights News.....	1451
Bonte, Florimond.....	1438
Boudin, Leonard, attorney for Arthur Behrstock.....	1452
Bridges-McCarthy bill.....	1435
Browder.....	1427
Brown, Edmund G., attorney general of Calif.....	1443, 1444
Brown, Fred (alias Alpi and Farucci Marini).....	1424, 1425
Bukharinites.....	1426
Bulgaria.....	1426
Burdett, Winston.....	1438
<b>C</b>	
Canada.....	1425
CIO.....	1450
CIO Political Action Committee.....	1449, 1450
Civil Information and Education Library, Tokyo.....	1456
Civil Rights Congress.....	1433, 1434
Cohen, Herbert B., attorney general of Pennsylvania.....	1435, 1443, 1444
Cominform.....	1436
Communist/s.....	1427, 1432, 1456
Communist Information Bureau.....	1436
Communist International.....	1424
Communist Party.....	1423-1434, 1436, 1437, 1439, 1441, 1446, 1450-1453
Community Inventories, Inc.....	1446, 1450, 1451, 1458, 1460, 1461
Conal, Bernard (testimony of).....	1445-1452
203 West 90th Street, New York.....	1445
Leonard Boudin, attorney.....	1445
Community analyst.....	1445
Owned Voters Research Institute, 1945-47.....	1446
Born Belfast, Ireland.....	1448
Came to United States 1924.....	1448
War activities director for CIO.....	1448
5th if executive secretary of New York Conference for Inalienable Rights.....	1450

	Page
Conal, Bernard (testimony of)—Continued	
5th if member of CP when with WPA	1450
5th if head of war activities committee for CIO	1450
5th if member of executive committee of New York County Communist Political Association	1451
5th if connected with National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights	1452
5th if married Greta Spiro	1452
Constitution	1444
Craven, Joseph D., attorney general of Delaware	1443, 1444
Czechoslovakia	1426, 1431

## D

Daily Worker	1428, 1455
Davis, Ben	1433
Democratic National Committee	1449
Dennis	1431, 1433
Dickerson, Harvey, attorney general of Nevada	1443, 1444

## E

Eastland, Senator	1435
Eisler, Gerhardt (alias Edwards)	1424, 1425
Exhibit No. 278—Reference to Tass from report of the Royal Commission on Espionage, August 22, 1955	1440-1442
Exhibit No. 281—Letter to Robert Morris from L. A. Whipple enclosing CP membership card of Arthur Behrstock, dated April 26, 1956	1454
Exhibit No. 281-A—Copy of Arthur Behrstock's membership in the CP, dated 1940	1454
Exhibit No. 282—Article entitled "Snafu" in Nisei Weekender, Tokyo, dated January 1, 1947, by Arthur Behrstock (in subcommittee files)	1456
Exhibit No. 284—Certificate of incorporation of Community Inventories, Inc	1458, 1459
Exhibit No. 284-A—Certificate of amendment of certificate of incorporation of Community Inventories, Inc	1460, 1461

## F

FBI	1428
Field, Herman	1428
Field, Noel	1428
Fifth amendment	1450-1453, 1455, 1456
Fight, publication of American League Against War and Fascism	1452
First amendment	1450, 1453
Flynn, Gurley	1427
For a Lasting Peace and a People's Democracy, February 17, 1956	1430
Foster	1431, 1432

## G

Gates	1433
Green, Gil	1433

## H

Hillman, Sidney	1448
Hour of Heroes (radio program, Tokyo)	1457
House of Representatives	1443, 1444
Hungary	1426-1428

## I

Internal Security Subcommittee	1435, 1439, 1446, 1453
International Workers Order	1425

## J

Javits, Jacob K., attorney general of New York	1444
Jenner, Senator	1445

## K

	Page
Kavanaugh, Thomas M., attorney general of Michigan	1443, 1444
Khrushchev	1429-1431, 1436
Kislytsin	1440, 1441
Kovalenok ("Stoun")	1441

## L

Lautner, John (testimony of)	1423-1444
Lives Washington, D. C.	1423
District organizer for CP in West Virginia for 5 years	1423
Head of New York State Review Commission of CP	1423
Purged from CP	1428
Lenin	1430
Leninism	1435, 1436
Letter to Senator Eastland from H. B. Cohen, July 18, 1956	1443
Loeb, Dorothy	1438
Lord, Miles, attorney general of Minnesota	1443, 1444

## M

MacArthur, General	1456, 1457
McClure, General	1427
McKee, Catherine	1459
McKegney, Osborne A.	1459
McManus, Robt.	1445
McTernan, John	1428
Maclean	1441
Makarov	1440, 1441
Mandel, Benjamin	1423, 1445
Marini, Farucci (alias Alpi and Fred Brown)	1424, 1425
Marxism	1435, 1436
Mikheev, Vladimir	1439
Mikoyan	1431
Miller	1441
Mitchell, Jonathan	1445
Morris, Robert	1423, 1445
Moscow	1426, 1431, 1441
Mosov ("Tekhnik")	1440
MVD	1440-1442

## N

National Association of Attorneys General	1443, 1444
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights	1451, 1452
National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis	1453
National PAC	1451
Nazi organization	1425
Nelson, Steve	1437, 1455
New York	1425, 1431, 1432, 1434, 1435, 1437, 1438, 1448
New York Conference for Inalienable Rights	1450
New York County Communist Political Association	1451
New York State Review Commission of CP	1423, 1424
New York Times	1436
Newsweek, May 21, 1956	1439
Norman, Bill	1434
Nosov	1440-1442

## O

O'Neill, Mr.	1449
O'Sullivan, Fergan	1442
OWI	1438

## P

PAC	1449
Pakhomov ("Valentin")	1440-1442
Peters, J.	1439



	Page
Petrov.....	1441, 1442
Petrov Royal Commission in Australia.....	1439, 1440
Political Action Committee.....	1447
Powers, William E., attorney general of Rhode Island.....	1443, 1444
Pravda.....	1436
Psychological Warfare Branch.....	1438
Psychological Warfare Headquarters.....	1457
Poland.....	1426, 1431

## R

Radek deviationists of CP.....	1426
Radzie, Constantin.....	1437
Rajk.....	1426, 1428
Rakosi.....	1426
Rastvorov.....	1456
Republican National Committee.....	1449
Rhodes, Peter.....	1438
Richman, Grover C., Jr., attorney general of New Jersey.....	1443, 1444
Rote Fahne, German Communist daily.....	1425
Rumania.....	1426
Rusher, William A.....	1423, 1445

## S

Sadovnikov.....	1440, 1441
SCAP (Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers).....	1455-1457
Schneiderman, William.....	1452
Schroeder, F. W.....	1423, 1445
Senate.....	1443, 1444
Shiga.....	1456, 1457
Shiple, Mrs.....	1428
Silvermaster, Nathan Gregory.....	1452
Simon and Shur.....	1447
Smith Act.....	1431, 1435
Some Fundamental Questions of Present Day International Developments.....	1430
Soviet Union in the Struggle for the Consolidation of Peace and Internal Security, The.....	1430
Stahlhelmer Organization (base of Nazi Party).....	1425
Stalin.....	1429, 1436
Stein, Sid.....	1434
Struik, Prof. Dirk J.....	1437
Supreme Court.....	1437, 1444
Suzuki, Tamin.....	1457
Sydney Morning Herald.....	1442

## T

Tass News Agency.....	1439, 1440, 1442
Thompson, Bob.....	1431-1434
Titolsm.....	1426
Trotskyism.....	1425
Troyka system.....	1432
20th Congress of CP.....	1429-1431

## U

United States.....	1424, 1428, 1430, 1431, 1437
U. S. S. R.....	1424, 1440, 1441

## V

Veterans of the International Brigade.....	1438
Yogeler, Robert.....	1428
Voters Research Institute.....	1446, 1449

## W

Wallace, Henry.....	1447
Walsh, David T.....	1459
War Department Military Intelligence Training School.....	1438

	Page
Weber, Palmer.....	1446, 1450, 1451
Welker, Senator.....	1423
West Virginia.....	1438
West Virginia State Youth Committee.....	1439
Wheat, Clayton E., Jr.....	1446, 1461
Wheat, Mary C.....	1461
Whipple, Lawrence A.....	1452
Williamson, John.....	1438
Winston, Henry.....	1433
WPA.....	1448, 1450