Y 4
.J 89/2
C 73/52

GOVERNMENT
Storage

DOC EXP

COMMITTEE PRINT

COMMUNIST YOUTH PROGRAM

REPORT

OF THE

S TTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION
THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND
OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

TO THE

IMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE

A11600 669401

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
DUE 5
1966
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

57-243 O WASHINGTON: 1966

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 20 cents

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
BIRCH BAYH, Indiana
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Maryland
GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida

EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii
HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York

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

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut, *Vice Chairman*

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina
BIRCH BAYH, Indiana
GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida

ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania

J. G. SOURWINE, *Counsel*
ALAN D. MCARTHUR, *Associate Counsel*
WARREN LITTMAN, *Associate Counsel*
BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Individuals	7
DuBois Clubs	11
Appendix A (list of persons named in executive testimony and invited to respond or comment, if they so wished)	15
Appendix B (responses by individuals invited to comment or appear)	17

COMMUNIST YOUTH PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

This report is the product of hearings held by the subcommittee on May 17 and 18, 1965, and of investigation and research attendant thereto. Initially intending to study the general youth program of the Communist Party of the United States (CPUSA), the subcommittee sharpened the focus of its inquiry as demonstrations, rallies, and riots broke out on numerous campuses across the country.

These demonstrations seemed spontaneous at first. But a pattern emerged, on campus after campus, which made it unmistakably clear that the CPUSA and its front organizations were playing a key role in organizing them. It became increasingly evident that the Communist Party in both fomenting and exploiting campus unrest was laying the groundwork for a concerted drive to recruit youth to its cause.

As the Vice Chairman, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, declared in presiding over the first of the open sessions:

> * * * the subcommittee has been reminded time and again of the Communist accent upon youth.
>
> The international Communist movement has in every country capitalized upon the energies, the resourcefulness, and the inexperience of those eager to follow leaders who profess they hold the key to utopia.
>
> It has also shown itself exceedingly skillful in the craft of infiltrating and frequently taking over youth organizations, forums, and rallies, and student organizations set up for legitimate purposes and under non-Communist auspices.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> For those who are prepared to more or less swallow the complete Communist ideology, or who have come very close to the Communist Party in their thinking, they have organizations like the DuBois Clubs of America, named after a Communist and described by J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, as "a new Communist-oriented youth organization dominated and controlled by the Communists."
>
> But to strike up contact with the great masses of youth who are not yet prepared to embrace the Communist doctrine, the Communists employ the technique of infiltration.

The Vice Chairman then gravely cautioned that—

> It can be stated as a certainty that wherever youth meets, the followers of the Communist Party will be present, seeking to direct the meeting along channels that serve the ends of the party, seeking office where officers are elected, seeking to make themselves the spokesmen for the movement. * * * It is the Communists who constitute the chief danger to the idealism of American youth because of the utterly amoral manner in which they seek to pervert and exploit it.[1]

As this report will show, the Communists did not miss an opportunity to exploit and pervert. The CPUSA brand may be found upon every phase of the rallies, from planning to the final effort to proselytize young people.

Similarly branded have been attacks upon this subcommittee by some of the leaders and participants in some of the campus demon-

---

[1] Communist Youth Program, pt. 1, SISS hearings, May 17, 1965, pp. 1, 2.

strations. These individuals had been named in testimony before the subcommittee. Thereupon, the subcommittee, in the American spirit of judicial fairness, brought this testimony to their attention and offered them an opportunity to respond.

Note the cleverness of these individuals:

1. The invitations were made public in consistent form by a number of the addressees. (The subcommittee had carefully preserved the privacy of those named.)

2. Selective sentences were culled from the invitations, for propaganda purposes.

3. Regardless of the explicit wording of the invitations, which did not brand or characterize the testimony taken, the party "line" adopted was to fasten upon the subcommittee the onus of having itself employed the language.[2]

4. The demonstrators, leaders, and participants adopted the stereotyped and obviously agreed-upon tactic of refusing to respond in terms of relevance or to admit or deny the truthfulness of the allegations received under oath; argumentativeness, challenges to the subcommittee's jurisdiction (to even entertain testimony on the subject of internal security), a cross-examining attempt to learn sources, demands for legal papers and for public hearing (regardless of absence of issue), requests for legal citations, and a demand for the framing of the legislative purpose * * * despite its obviousness. The notion that these young people, in responding to the subcommittee's offer of an opportunity to rebut the testimony about them, were innocently and unwittingly following the Communist line is unacceptable.

5. Release by these individuals of the invitations in slanted manner for propaganda purposes and to arouse disrespect for the work of a legitimately constituted subcommittee of the Congress of the United States.

---

[2] The individual whose name was mentioned was informed "* * * opportunity is extended * * * to determine for himself if the testimony is adverse and to make response if he so desires before the committee considers whether that testimony should be made public." See Appendix B re (Aptheker). Although the subcommittee did not characterize the witnesses' testimony, examples of reactions from some of the recipients follow:

Donald Bluestone made no formal response, but wrote in his column in the University of Wisconsin newspaper, the Daily Cardinal, that the invitation led him "to believe that the subcommittee considers the charges against me to be rather serious." Bluestone continued: "But am I to assume, Mr. Senator, that criticism of the United States Government and its policies is now subversive? Surely this cannot be the meaning of your letter, can it?"

Fred Blair, a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party (*vide:* p. 16), was described in a news story in the Milwaukee Sentinel of July 22, 1965, as having been "summoned but not subpenaed by the committee to answer charges that he solicited subscriptions for a Communist newspaper * * *. The charge was contained in a letter from J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel for the Internal Security Subcommittee, who offered to pay Blair's expenses for the trip to Washington. Blair, who operates Mary's Bookshop, 318 West Juneau Avenue, said the charge resulted from ads he inserted in Madison newspapers last March 15. The advertisements announced a 'special student offer' for the Worker, a Communist publication."

The subcommittee's letter to John Coatsworth was printed in facsimile in the Daily Cardinal of July 27, 1965, with a boldface caption that he had been invited to Washington "to clear his name of adverse testimony concerning his political activities on campus." An accompanying story said: "Coatsworth interprets the invitations as an attack on students and faculty members that stated their opposition to the war in Vietnam."

An article in the September–October 1965 edition of Insurgent, published every month by the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, asserts that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is "trying to develop a new demonology to show that the DuBois Clubs are manipulating all the puppet strings of protest—guilt-by-association once removed." Again the word "attack" was used: "* * * many of the persons mentioned in the secret hearings were attacked strictly for what they said." The article also said: "Several of the people who received letters are in vulnerable jobs; if the report is released, they will likely lose them."

None of the persons involved was "attacked" or "charged." The subcommittee's invitations left the issue clearly to the individual as to whether the testimony was to be regarded as inaccurate or derogatory, and gave him full opportunity to give any appropriate comment or clarification.

6. An attempt was made by the means recited to prolong the issue *in extenso* for whatever values of propaganda and anti-American irritation it might produce.

7. Not one instance of an expression suggestive of cooperation with a duly constituted U.S. Senate committee appeared in any of the replies with the possible exception of Professor Rice.

A direct product of the Communist planning is *organization:* By learning the names of exhibitionists, "heroes," leaders (though misled) and frenetic exponents of all and anything stimulating or exciting, the CPUSA is able to bring into its fold a valuable nucleus for present and future operations. That which started as a product of ostensible spontaneity becomes a solid organization for Leninist purposes and programing.

The subcommittee believes, in accord with long-established policy, that any Member of the Senate should be in position to check the subcommittee's conclusions for himself. Therefore, the testimony on which this report is based and which has not already been made public is being released along with this report. Further, in accordance with its custom, the subcommittee is releasing in its entirety the testimony taken in executive session. In that aspect correspondence, including invitations and responses within the area defined, also is being released.

AMERICAN SENTIMENT STEADFAST

It is heartening to note that the American people are alert to the Communist strategy of deception. The demonstrations have not persuaded or convinced Americans that our basic position in Vietnam is wrong. Over one-half (58 percent) of those questioned last October in a published Gallup poll approved it; 20 percent had no opinion and only 22 percent disapproved. The highest approval was given by the age group most subject to the draft.

Perhaps even more significant is the "Backgrounder on Communism" issued in January 1966 by the U.S. Information Agency: "Vietnamese Students Find Majority of U.S. Collegians Support American Policy."

The Vietnamese students' survey found that a large majority of American college students firmly supports the U.S. policy of full aid to South Vietnam, while only a small minority questions the action. This was the conclusion reached by 5 South Vietnamese students after they toured 25 American university campuses.

It was significant that attempts by the Vietnamese to talk with the Communist and radical opponents of our policy were rebuffed with "too busy" and "not interested."

WHAT THE EVIDENCE SHOWED

The inquiries as outlined by the Vice Chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, at the outset of hearings May 17, 1965,[3] resulted in testimony establishing the following points:

(1) The Communist Party capitalizes upon youth and its enthusiasm and inexperience.

(2) A characteristic of the CPUSA activity in this area is its diversification, "frequently so subtle and difficult to pin down."

---

[3] SISS Communist Youth Program hearings, pt. 1, May 17, 1965, p. 1.

(3) A traditional tool of the Communists is infiltration, and it was used to the hilt on campus after campus.

(4) Student-body grievances were either fraudulent, created, stimulated, or exaggerated as a catalytic means of setting off mob explosions.

(5) Once aroused, students' energies were channeled and directed by professionals and their disciples into forums, rallies, protests, resolutions, defiance of law, and out-and-out law violations.

(6) Communists (as always) have no compunction in employing amoral means to pervert and exploit the idealism of youth.

(7) The unwavering purposes of the Communist Party was accomplished in several respects, particularly in the gaining of forums and audiences for proselytizing young people as a prelude to widening audience-attention and, ultimately, enlarging its membership.[4]

CP CAPITALIZES UPON YOUTH

Three years ago the Communist Party launched a program to implement its never-varying objective to capture youth. First, the party wrote to all editors of college papers and student councils inviting them to (in turn) invite the "Lecture and Information Bureau of the Communist Party, U.S.A., Arnold Johnson, director." [5]

On the side of the Communists was the obvious excitement of young people at the prospect of seeing and hearing "real live Communists." The party boasted that it had reached 75,000 students in more than 30 colleges and universities in 1961. The Communists concluded that because they had invaded campuses by their aggressiveness and exploitation of free speech, "It is clear from this that the students wish to hear the Communist viewpoint from bona fide spokesmen." They also claimed that students everywhere "reject the widespread practice of denouncing communism without affording the Communists an opportunity to be heard."

That the Congress had taken reams of testimony, conducted months and months of investigation leading to the Internal Security Act of 1950 and its independent amendment of 1954, the Communist Control Act, was of no consequence in such verbal bait. The Congress has solemnly concluded in that act, based upon findings of fact: "Therefore, the Communist Party should be outlawed." [6]

The Communist Party had characteristically bellowed its demands for "invitations" to speak on campuses. The penalty (if such were ignored) would be advertisement that the individual campus had failed to accord the party "free speech," or "right of assembly." The party never fails to exploit the very freedoms Leninism denies. As to failure to register under our laws, the party dismissed what the Congress had denounced as a crime because the requirement to register (sec. 7, Internal Security Act of 1950) is simply "a pretext used

---

[4] NOTE.—As Newsweek, November 1, 1965, put it: "The most articulate and energetic recruits in the antiwar and antidraft campaign are members of the 'new left,' a loose network of undergraduates, graduate students, dropouts, and young marrieds who, united by suspicion of the adult 'establishment' think of themselves as 'the movement.' These are the young radicals who have made civil rights, university reform, and a decentralized ideal called 'participatory democracy' their catchwords. In truth, 'the movement' seems marked by an unwillingness—especially where collaboration with the Communists is concerned—to absorb the doleful lessons of history, and a penchant for thinking the worst of their country and its leaders."

[5] SISS hearings, pt. 2, May 18, 1965, Communist Youth Program, p. 122.

[6] Public Law 637—83d Cong., ch. 886, sec. 2.

to discriminate against Communists." This fallacy in reasoning is grounded upon the impudent assumption that the Communist Party is a political party, rather than a worldwide conspiracy to overthrow this Government by force and violence. Corollary to that assumption is the sophism that all American courts may be ignored by the party until the U.S. Supreme Court has spoken. The disciples of Marx and Lenin thus persist in evading and dodging our laws until the very last step in the hare-and-hounds chase.

The great majority of American citizens and youth as reflected by the press have not been fooled by the ploys and gimmicks of the CPUSA and its inspired zealots.[7]

---

[7] As Time, Oct. 29, 1965, put it: "The fact is that the Vietnicks, by encouraging the Communist hope and expectation that the United States does not have the stomach to fight it out in Vietnam, are probably achieving what they would least like: prolonging the war and adding to the casualty lists on both sides."

57-243 O—66——2

INDIVIDUALS

In any campaign sponsored or abetted by the Communist Party there is bound to be a magnetism for all and sundry individuals who seek to express themselves, either as a caper or a manifestation of exhibitionism or extroversion or, manifestly, because of sincerity of conviction * * * or because of the dictates of Marxism-Leninism.

The subcommittee was primarily interested in the proportional number of those who were responsive to subversive leadership. In its executive sessions the witnesses had mentioned the names of some 30 individuals which were kept within the bounds of secrecy until the subcommittee had the opportunity to extend to them the rights—

(1) To be heard;

(2) To determine if the testimony concerning them was true or false in their own opinions;

(3) To make such response as the individual felt was appropriate, whether in person or in writing.

Communism thrives on social unrest. Gus Hall, the CPUSA's general secretary, in outlining his "concept of the new epoch" referred to the need for "striking the main blow against monopoly capitalism and of developing an antimonopoly coalition." He would "create the vital conditions for socialism."* Surely one of the "vital conditions" is unrest on our college campuses.

As shown in Appendix B, virtually none of those named in the testimony of May 17 and 18 took advantage of the opportunity to cooperate with the subcommittee. That they have a right to thwart legislative processes, within the domain of democracy, was not the issue. But if they lent themselves to Communist strategy, the subcommittee was interested.

Study of the invitations to the 28 names and the responses is revealing. (The number "28" appears because in one instance a husband-wife team, Garcia, is listed.) Demonstrably and dramatically illustrative is case No. 1: Bettina Aptheker, Berkeley, Calif.

Miss Aptheker was invited by the subcommittee, by letter dated July 16, 1965, to respond as she wished to the opportunity to comment.[1] She answered July 21, 1965.

This young woman, who later admitted she was a Communist all during the time she "inspired" and "led" hundreds of campus-excited students into expressions against authority, followed tactics which are easily recognized by those who scrutinize the zigs and zags of communism:

(1) Concealment of her identity as a Communist while pretending to share with her fellow-students a "distress" over American policies;

---

* Political Affairs, February 1961, SISS print, pt. 1, May 17, 1965, p. 75, et. seq., p. 77.

[1] The form of invitation was standard and is to be found on the first page of app. B–1 (re Bettina Aptheker). The schedules do not repeat the identic invitation but do include specific and local sentences apposite to the individual.

(2) Refusal to cooperate with the American Government or its branches;

(3) Refusal to accept the opportunity to comment, particularly when her statement would be sworn;

(4) A "baiting" of American officials by following the best-defense-is-offense tactic;

(5) The framing of irrelevant questions as a distraction;

(6) The assumption that the U.S. Government is an enemy to those within the category of the individual Communist (as college youth);

(7) The effort to set up obstacles with demands for the "authorizing document," "the rules," "names and addresses" of others who may be involved (while at all times refusing to reveal identities of those in concert with her); "legislative purpose," and a demand for the entire legislative transcript.

The testimony had been direct and to the point: That Miss Aptheker had concealed her connection with the Communist Party when she appeared on campus. Imbuing her followers with the enthusiasm and hysteria of crusaders, the young woman had beguiled hundreds of students into believing that her interests were solely those of a sort of present-day Saint Joan, concealing her allegiance to a hostile ideology committed to the overthrow of this Government by force and violence. At a time when this young exponent of Marxism-Leninism was seeking to arouse young Americans against U.S. foreign policy, she was mendacious in claiming to the press, and public, that statements of the FBI Director and the subcommittee's witness, Moore, associating her with communism were "patently absurd." [2]

Miss Aptheker has thus supplied a classic example of Communist infiltration of a "mass organization."

The subcommittee in the instances of campus demonstrations might well draw upon its own language of October 1965, in conclusions reached with regard to the anti-Vietnam agitation and the teach-in movement:

> 1. The great majority of those who have participated in anti-Vietnam demonstrations and in teach-ins are loyal Americans who differ with administration policy in Vietnam for a variety of reasons, ranging from purely strategic considerations to pacifism.
>
> 2. The Communists have traditionally sought to infiltrate and exploit all organizations dedicated to peace * * *.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> 6. The great majority of the teach-ins have had absolutely nothing in common with procedures of fair debate or the process of education. In practice, they were a combination of an indoctrination session, a political protest demonstration, an endurance contest, and a variety show. The proceedings were characterized by extremist statements and the open distribution of Communist literature.[3]

Examination of most of the other responses suggest a definite pattern of obstruction. Citizens have a right to know what those who are hostile to our political system are up to. For this reason, the invitations and responses are carried verbatim in appendix B of this report.

Fred Blair, a Communist, was among those invited by the subcommittee to comment on testimony that he was and is a member

---

[2] See San Francisco Chronicle headline, May 19, 1965, in appendix B wherein the young woman was quoted as scoffing at the "red label" attached to her identity.

[3] SISS print, 89th Cong., 1st sess., "Introduction," pp. xiv and xv.

of the national committee of the party and that he had given "special student offers" to entice demonstrators and students on the campus of the University of Wisconsin to subscribe to the Worker. Blair refused to respond to the invitation but Milwaukee, Wis., papers carried the story of his "rejection" of the invitation while casting the bait that the students "see for themselves," an obvious Communist use of curiosity and democratic openness.

John Coatsworth, graduate student in history, University of Wisconsin, declared in a letter to the subcommittee July 12, 1965, that until he had received "a transcript of all statements such witnesses have made in regard to me," he could not inform the committee of a decision whether to respond.

But the Daily Cardinal, the University of Wisconsin campus newspaper, quoted Coatsworth as saying, he "does not believe the investigation is being conducted for a legislative purpose" as "an excuse for not responding to the subcommittee's invitation." The Cardinal further quoted Coatsworth as having declared that "once he had responded to one question, he would be compelled by law to answer questions about anything else the Senators cared to question him about."

Philip C. Davis, national president of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, wrote the subcommittee last July that as a prerequisite to commenting upon testimony that he had openly stated he would not fight in Vietnam even if drafted, he would require (in effect) reams of material such as subcommittee rules, transcripts of testimony, disclosure of person or persons (and their addresses) who testified about him, etc.

This response also followed the pattern of obstruction rather than cooperation.

Eugene Dennis, Jr., son of the former general secretary of the Communist Party, followed the same pattern, as did Michael Eisenscher, within the same category. Another campus leader, James Hawley, was quoted by the UW campus newspaper, July 27, 1965, as declaring he would turn down the subcommittee's invitation because in his opinion "this type of testimony serves no legislative purpose at all." [4]

It is significant that in all these instances the individuals follow a pattern [5] that serves Communist purposes.

---

[4] See appendix B.
[5] The pattern is spelled out in the seven tactics or criteria found on pp. 2, 3.

DuBOIS CLUBS

Information developed at the hearings established an official link of the Communist Party, through DuBois Clubs, with campus activities directed against policies of this country with respect to Vietnam.

The witness Charles E. Moore, representing the International Association of Chiefs of Police (formerly a special agent of the FBI), testified May 17, 1965, that the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs established through their heirarchy a number of chapters in California and in other universities throughout the country.[1]

Additional supporting evidence will be found in the testimony of Dr. Harry Gideonse, respecting his experience as president of Brooklyn College (New York). Challenged by the "Active Members of the Brooklyn College Student Protest Movement" to support his own statement previously made, that Communists or their disciples were at the core of "petitions, forums, demonstrations, and rallies," Dr. Gideonse stated that the Du Bois Clubs of America were at the center of a meeting widely publicized and that they were, as described by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, "a new Communist-oriented youth organization dominated and controlled by the Communists."[2]

As an open and significant link between the Communist Party and its official organ, the Worker, with the DuBois Clubs, the semiweekly newspaper reflected its policy interest by arrogantly condemning an FBI inquiry as to the fact. The headline: "DuBois Clubs Condemn FBI Investigation of Student Activities." (The Worker, May 11, 1965.)

The tactic employed by the Communists was to allege that the Government through its Bureau of Investigation intended to "investigate student peace activities." Their arm to reach youth in this instance is an organization founded in the name of a Communist. In this particular, the apparatus is boldly different from most techniques of the party: Concealment is the usual tactic.

Another witness, Bob Siegrist, prominent newscaster, testified May 18, 1965, as to conditions on the campus of the University of Wisconsin regarding refusal by some students to serve in the military even if drafted:

> It has been said on the campus and about the campus, even on radio and in a press conference by the national chairman of the DuBois Club of America, Mr. Philip Davis, who was brought to the campus by Gene Dennis at the height of the controversy for the purpose of trying to overcome what Gene Dennis, Jr., said was the attacks upon his DuBois Clubs by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and the "junior grade Hoover" as he put it, Bob Siegrist. And at that time Philip Davis, the national chairman of the DuBois Clubs, was brought there to Wisconsin for that purpose, and he did say on the air, "I will not fight," and, as he put it, "Even if drafted, I will not fight in Vietnam." * * *[3]

---

[1] "Communist Youth Program," SISS publication, pt. 1, p. 4.
[2] Communist Youth Program, pt. 2, May 18, 1965, p. 123, et seq.
[3] SISS print, May 18, 1965, p. 144.

Thus the subcommittee learned that in the wave of campus demonstrations, Communists and zealots openly sought to block this country's policies. Sentiment sounded out by professional polltakers later demonstrated that this country's citizens, including its students at college level, were strongly in support of the United States in its determination to stop Communist aggression in Vietnam and elsewhere.

The significance lies, of course, not in popular support alone but in the fact that foreign interests would block the overwhelming majority of this country's citizens and their Government, its structure, its processes. Actions which in some instances are virtually overt acts of treason stem from hostile anti-American forces and ideologies. This subcommittee continued with its policy to support—

> **The power of Congress to legislate (which rests upon the right of self-preservation), *the ultimate value of any society*.[4]**

and thus to throw light upon exploitation by our sworn enemies of our freedoms of speech, press, and assembly.

Dr. Stefan Possony, director of International Political Studies and Programs, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, incorporated in his testimony May 17, 1965, a paper by Prof. William Petersen, University of California, Berkeley, called "Faculty Rebellion at Berkeley." [5] In that paper Professor Petersen declared that the openly radical student groups active on campus included the DuBois Club, "the half-disguised youth group of the Communist Party. He also described it as "both a Communist front and close to the right wing of the ultras." [6]

Dr. Possony also incorporated in his testimony an article in which the clubs were described as follows:

> **The W. E. B. DuBois Clubs named for a founder of the NAACP who became a Communist at the age of 93 and died soon after in Ghana, was organized last summer and has since spread to 35 chapters, mostly on college campuses, with a membership of about 1,000.[7]**

The witness described the role of both Communist Party organizers and W. E. B. DuBois Clubs "or cells" as "enormous" in the present pattern of party policies and procedures. Thus the unhindered exploitation of this country's freedoms so tempted our enemies that they dared to openly advertise their allegiance to a Communist personality, one who had joined the party and had been a member midst much eclat and publicity stimulated by the Worker. They were anxious to entice and proselytize young people to a cause which virtually canonized one who had received the Soviet Union's Lenin peace prize in 1959.

---

[4] Mr. Justice Harlan, U.S. Supreme Court, June 8, 1959, *Barenblatt* v. *U.S.*, 79 S. Ct. 1081 et seq.

[5] SISS print, May 17, 1965, p. 17.

[6] Id., p. 20.

[7] SISS print, "Communist Youth Program," pt. 1, May 17, 1965, p. 31. DuBois was not a member of NAACP at time of his death. He had "repudiated" it.

The New York Times reported Nov. 23, 1961, p. 5, that the "noted Negro sociologist and historian" cited his "long and slow decision" before joining the Communist Party on the basis of allegation that "capitalism cannot reform." He was a cofounder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He resigned in 1934 in a policy dispute. contending that there should be voluntary Negro segregation in certain fields as a means of "self-dependence" to counter white discrimination. Although he returned in 1944 as director of special research and remained until 1948, he left because of his endorsement of Henry A. Wallace's Progressive Party candidacy for President, despite NAACP's policy of nonpartisanship.

Dr. DuBois left Brooklyn in October of 1961 for Ghana where he was head of a Ghana secretariat planning a new Negro encyclopedia. The Washington Evening Star Aug. 28, 1963, reported that he "became a Ghanian citizen this year."

The FBI Director has charged that the DuBois Clubs were formed by mandate of Gus Hall, the head of the CPUSA.[8]

From St. Louis, Mo., came the boastful declaration of an organizer of a chapter of DuBois:

> We are an action group, supporting and originating militant action on problems facing American youth, and we are also a group studying and searching for answers. We believe socialism may be the answer, and so socialism is a part of our study.

"Socialism" is a term freely employed by Communists as an interim step to communism.

The organizer, James M. Peake, Jr., according to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch February 22, 1965, declared:

> There is interest in the DuBois Clubs on almost every campus in the United States. Interest is growing among students at Washington University.

In a radio broadcast, Peake gave off with a half-truth by declaring:

> For our club we chose the name of William Edward Burghardt DuBois, one of the leaders of the Negro freedom movement, one of the founders of the NAACP and we think one of the greatest Americans of all time. * * * We hope that we can live up to the name that we have chosen, etc.[9]

In typical deceptive Communist fashion, there is concealed from students and young people in general the salient fact that *the name chosen is that of a Communist* whose "ideals" were by no means those of American youth. In addition to the tactic of concealment, there is not revealed to the possible recruits just how the "spokesman" became such * * * just who chose him and for what purposes, nor is there a scintilla of evidence that he had been selected democratically. Although the NAACP is referred to most respectfully, the possible recruit is not informed that DuBois wanted no part of it, that in fact he had repudiated the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The organizer (Peake) did admit that his membership rolls were "secret," thus enabling the organizer and his superiors in the apparatus to make claims as to numbers which could not and cannot be verified.

There are, of course, several organizations within the compass. As a newspaper columnist put it—

> So there is a coalition of what might be called antipatriotic societies * * * DuBois Clubs, Students for a Democratic Society, the Progressive Labor Party, the May 2d Movement and the various "coordinating committees," marching together much as the Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries and anarchists closed ranks when it was a matter of getting rid of the Russian czar. Tomorrow they will be at each other's throats but that is another story.[10]

The subcommittee has in the face of this and other thrusts against our way of life kept in mind its duty to disclose, to alert the Congress to the need for either more rigid enforcement of present legislation or

---

[8] The Director, Oct. 19, 1965, characterized the DuBois Clubs as an "illegitimate spawn conceived by the Communist Party." In the opinion of the subcommittee, it is probably the most direct link between the new left and the established Communist apparatus. The DuBois Clubs' international secretary, Michael Myerson, journeyed to North Vietnam during the summer of 1965 and was made an "honorary nephew" of Ho Chi Minh; he returned flashing a ring made from the wreckage of an American plane shot down near Hanoi. The clubs have 35 chapters, mostly on campuses. Typical of aggressive Communist influences, the membership, around 1,000, can't be employed as a caliper for admeasuring the full range of subversive power and direction.

[9] James M. Peake, Jr., radio broadcast, station KFRH, Washington University, Feb. 24, 1965.

[10] John Chamberlain, Washington Post, Nov. 30, 1965.

57-243 O—66——3

to the need for implementing objective * * * that "it is vital to the internal security of the United States that the Congress maintain a continuous surveillance over the problems presented by such activity and threatened activity * * *."[11]

A California legislative report found that the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs were a youth front for the Communist Party, that the "WEB's" were and are "Communist from top to bottom." Headquartered in San Francisco, WEB organizers and their recruits were pupils in secret training schools conducted in the summer of 1965 by the Communist Party, as exposed by the FBI. Subjects for study included "How To Pick an Issue" and "How To Organize a Campaign." Study papers outlined techniques for selecting hate targets around which large masses of non-Communists might be mobilized in united-front maneuvers.[12]

Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI in his latest pronouncement on the subject, FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, February 1, 1966, declared, "* * * The unvarnished truth is that the Communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate to captivate the thinking of rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the Communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the Communist cause. This is being accomplished primarily by a two-pronged offensive—a much-publicized college speaking program and the campus-oriented Communist W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. Therefore, the Communist influence is cleverly injected into civil disobedience and reprisals against our economic, political, and social system."

---

[11] From S. Res. 366, 81st Cong., 2d sess., creating the subcommittee.

[12] California Senate Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, 13th report, June 18, 1965. The report (p. 36 et seq.) details these conclusions. It reflects the fact that the idea for the National DuBois Clubs was conceived in Berkeley and San Francisco and charges that a handful of leaders managed to capture all important positions in preparatory arrangements. "The same names occur with monotonous regularity, as the same people move from one strategic office to another." The subcommittee concluded that the formation of the DuBois Clubs resulted in what is now "the actual organization of Communist youth;" avers that the driving power for the Berkeley rebellion came from the leaders.

APPENDIX A

List of Persons Named in Executive Testimony and Invited To Respond or Comment, if They So Wished

(1) Aptheker, Bettina
2224 Roosevelt Street
Berkeley, Calif.

(2) Blair, Fred
3236 North 15th Street
Milwaukee, Wis.

(3) Bluestone, Donald
432 West Miffin Street
Madison, Wis.

(4) Ciporen, Fred
432 West Miffin Street
Madison, Wis.

(5) Coatsworth, John H.
1114 St. James Court
Madison, Wis.

(6) Colbert, Gwen
In care of University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wis.

(7) Davis, Philip C.
1853½ McAllister Street
San Francisco, Calif.

(8) Dennis, Eugene, Jr.
1096 Ashbury Street
San Francisco, Calif.

(9) Eisenscher, Michael
2556 North Lake Drive
Milwaukee, Wis.

(10) Friedlander, Dan
516 West Johnson Street
Madison, Wis.

(11) Garcia, Elsa Stubbs
1935 Russell Street
Berkeley, Calif.

(11a) Garcia, Bernardo
1935 Russell Street
Berkeley, Calif.

(12) Goldberg, Arthur
2632 College Avenue
Berkeley, Calif.

(13) Goldberg, Jacqueline
2455 Prospect Street
Berkeley, Calif.

(14) Gruber, John
515 West Johnson Street
Madison, Wis.

(15) Hawley, James P.
206 Bernard Court
Madison, Wis.

(16) Kaplow, Alicia
Care of University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wis.

(17) Kaufman, Robert P.
University of California
Berkeley, Calif.

(18) Lima, Margaret
6115 Dover Street
Oakland, Calif.

(19) Lockshin, Arnold
13 North Mills
Madison, Wis.

(20) Patrick, Philip
Care of Capital Times Station WABI
Madison, Wis.

(21) Plagemann, Stephen
1930 Walnut Street
Berkeley, Calif.

(22) Radke, Lester A.
432 West Miffin Street
Madison, Wis.

(23) Rice, William
2212 Hillington Green
Madison, Wis.

(24) Tabb, William K.
13 North Mills Street
Madison, Wis.

(25) Treuhaft, Robert E.
6411 Regent Street
Oakland, Calif.

(26) Wood, Ann Fagan
1715 Francisco Street
Berkeley, Calif.

(27) Zeitlin, Maurice
Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wis.

APPENDIX B

Responses by Individuals Invited To Comment or Appear

(1) Aptheker, Bettina

Date of letter of invitation: July 16, 1965.

Date of answer: July 21, 1965.

Form of invitation: Standard, as follows:

DEAR (NAME OF ADDRESSEE): It is the practice of the Internal Security Subcommittee to confine to executive session testimony involving likelihood of an adverse comment or report upon a named individual. Thereafter, *opportunity is extended to the individual to determine for himself if the testimony is adverse and to make response if he so desires before the committee considers whether that testimony should be made public.*

(The following two paragraphs refer to the individual addressed:)

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed that you participated in campus demonstrations at both the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Wisconsin, Madison, which demonstrations were Communist-suggested.

That you concealed your connection with the Communist Party last December 1964, when you appeared at the University of Wisconsin.

The form continues:

If you wish to deny or otherwise make response to this testimony, opportunity will be afforded for your appearance, and your actual traveling expenses plus *per diem* in lieu of subsistence will be paid by the subcommittee.

If we do not hear from you within 10 days from the time you receive this letter, we shall assume that you have no desire to make response.

So that we may try to schedule your appearance at a mutually convenient time, if you do wish to respond, please suggest at least two alternate dates which would fit your schedule.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

Individual's response:

JULY 21, 1965.

SIR: I find it impossible to respond to your letter of July 16, 1965, until such time as there is information concerning the following:

You refer to testimony given about me on May 18, 1965, presumably at a hearing of the committee. What was the subject matter under inquiry at that hearing? What was the authorizing document for such an inquiry? What are the rules of the Senate Judiciary Committee and what are the rules of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as to hearings, testimony, and reports? What are the names and addresses of the witnesses who testified against me? What is the legislative purpose of making such testimony public?

Before making any response concerning my appearance before the committee I request: A reply to the above questions; a copy of the transcript of testimony on May 18, 1965; and knowledge of whether or not I would appear before the Committee in open or in executive session.

(Signed) BETTINA APTHEKER.

Reply of subcommittee's chief counsel, dated July 28, 1965.

(Standard Form of Reply)

DEAR MISS APTHEKER: This is to acknowledge your letter of July 21, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to you to determine whether you consider the substance of testimony as mentioned to be adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

If you should choose to respond, testimony would be taken in executive session.

You have not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue with respect to the authority of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

Subcommittee Comment

The witness, Charles E. Moore, former FBI special agent, now with International Association of Police Chiefs, testified at executive session May 18, 1965, that Bettina Aptheker was (and is) the daughter of Herbert Aptheker, leading Communist Party theoretician, that she was a constant associate on the University of California campus at Berkeley of another daughter of a Communist functionary.

The implication of the witness was that the policies and objectives of the Communist Party, not those of the University, were the impelling motives for the self-appointed "leader" in directing and instigating demonstrations, that Communist politics, not educational policies, were her interests and that Miss Aptheker concealed her membership and true motives.

Miss Aptheker, as noted, chose to disclose no information and refused to make response under oath in person. The young woman thus refused to disclose or discuss her role in the Free Speech Movement, of which she was and is a member of the steering committee and, as the witness described her, "one of the principal spokesmen * * * later traveled across the country to other campuses attempting to stir up support for FSM. She is also active in the DuBois Club."

The subcommittee believes that the thousands of college students who listened to the disciple of Marxism and Sovietism had a "right to know," to be fully informed, that the individual owed the duty to her fellow students to disclose her affiliations.

Long after Bettina Aptheker had concealed her true role and in the middle of November 1965, the People's World carried a screaming five-column headline, "Splash on Cal. Campus—Miss Aptheker: 'I am a Communist'" (Nov. 13, 1965, p. 12).

Thus Communists on the west coast in their official newspaper, People's World, heard about their heroine in terms of éclat. On the east coast, the official Communist Party organ, the Worker, November 16, 1965, page 2, proclaimed "'Proud To Be Communist Party Member,' says Cal. Student Leader."

U.S. News & World Report (Nov. 22, 1965, p. 17), carried as its lead paragraph from Berkeley, Calif.:

Bettina Aptheker, a leader in the Free Speech Movement that caused turmoil on the campus of the University of California here last year has acknowledged that she is a Communist.

The 21-year-old history major wrote an open letter to the Daily Californian, a student newspaper, in which she declared, "*I have been for a number of years,* I am now, and I propose to remain a member of the Communist Party of the United States."

The Free Speech Movement led a big sitdown demonstration on the Berkeley campus last December, *demanding more political freedom* at the university. About 700 persons were arrested during the demonstration.

Miss Aptheker is the daughter of Herbert Aptheker, director of the American Institute of Marxist Studies in New York. She recently was married to Jack Kurzweil, a fellow student.

In her letter to the newspaper, the Free Speech leader said she *had kept her Communist affiliation a secret* up to now, because earlier acknowledgement would have meant "cooperation with the red-baiting attack on the FSM." [Emphasis added.]

The New York Times (Nov. 11, 1965, p. 28) carried a report on the subject under the headline, "Berkeley Faculty Warned on Politics"; featured a picture of Bettina Aptheker, and stated that she was a leader of the Free Speech Movement "that kept the Berkeley campus in an uproar last year."

The San Francisco Chronicle, May 19, 1965, carried a headline: "FSM Leader Scoffs at 'Red Label' " under which it was recited that speaking for Mario Savio and herself, Miss Aptheker "took time out from Berkeley's sit-in trial yesterday to level their sights on FBI Director and Charles E. Moore, an official of the International Association of Police Chiefs.

"*Statements* by Hoover and Moore *attempting to relate Communists to last December's Free Speech Movement demonstrations* on the University of California campus were '*patently absurd*,' they said." [Emphasis added.]

The revelation originally appeared in the Daily Californian, November 9, 1965, first page, with the headlines, "Exclusive: Bettina Aptheker Reveals Communist Membership." Her 3-year membership was made known formally in a letter to "my fellow students." Confronted with the obvious, that she had previously concealed the fact, she gave several reasons such as that she wanted to "open up dialog" now rather than at the height of campus violence. "Finally," she wrote, "because of my role on campus I think people have a right to know I'm a Communist." As to the Communist-encouraged Free Speech Movement, she apparently adhered to Communist preferences and strategies because otherwise, "That would have hurt the movement. It was also irrelevant because I always stated my views. I have never hesitated to state I am a Marxist and a Socialist."

But Miss Aptheker had been informed in a letter of this subcommittee July 16, 1965, of the testimony that she had "concealed your connection with the Communist Party last December 1964, when you appeared at the University of Wisconsin."

As reported, *supra*, the young disciple of sovietism had obviously "hesitated [even concealed] to state I am a Marxist and a Socialist" at a time when such fact would have tempered the thinking of those listening to her soapbox utterances on campus in favor of Communist policies against American policies in Vietnam.

(2) Blair, Fred

Date of letter of invitation (standard form): July 9, 1965.

Response: None.

Local substance of letter of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you are or were chairman of the Communist Party in Wisconsin and a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party and that on March 15, 1965, you advertised in at least two Wisconsin newspapers a "special student offer" by which the *Worker* was offered in particular to demonstrators and students on the campus of University of Wisconsin as a part (inferentially) of the Communist policy, drive and incitement of demonstrations to promulgate the Communist policy in connection with Vietnam * * * as opposed to American policy.

That the said advertisement was carried over the proprietary name of "Mary's Book Shop, 317 West Juneau Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis., Fred Blair, Manager."

Newspaper stories July 22 and 23, 1965, carried the headlines from Milwaukee, Wis.: "Fred Blair Rejects Bid by Senate," and "Ex-Red Party Leader Refuses 'Invitation.'"

The stories contained the sentence, "Blair described the ads as 'free enterprise.' He said the paper had been labeled communistic and he suggested that students 'see for themselves.'"

---

(3) Bluestone, Donald

Date of letter of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Response: None.

Local substance of letter of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that your columns in the Cardinal, University of Wisconsin campus newspaper, were "left-oriented with respect to such things as Vietnam and the usual things."

That you "played at least a major role" in writing a certain bluebound mimeographed document on the Vietnam situation, distributed by the Committee To End the War in Vietnam.

The Daily Cardinal, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., Tuesday, July 27, 1965, carried a first page article, "Internal Security Committee Invites U Students to D.C." In that article it was stated:

"Donald Bluestone, a Daily Cardinal columnist, has already stated in an open letter to Senator Eastland printed in the July 16 (1965) edition of this newspaper that he declined the invitation. Since the letters issued are not subpenas, acceptance or rejection is the prerogative of the recipient."

---

(4) Ciporen, Fred:

Date of letter of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Response: None.

Local substance of letter of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that—

(a) In your activity on the University of Wisconsin campus in behalf of the Committee To End the War in Vietnam you argued "accusatively" against Mr. Conlon as representative of the State Department;

(b) That, as reported in a national magazine, you declared, "Come on, why not be honest with us? Like Johnson, you think we are a bunch of babbling idiots";

(c) That you failed to cooperate in bringing order to a teach-in session on the University of Wisconsin campus; to the contrary, you encouraged a group not to be seated by saying: "If you ask them to sit down, you are missing the point."

---

(5) Coatsworth, John H.:

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of answer: July 12, 1965.

Local substance of letter of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you had participated in a so-called students' trip to Castro Cuba in the summer of 1963 in violation of the U.S. State Department travel ban.

Individual's response:

MADISON, WIS., *July 12, 1965.*

Mr. J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel, Internal Security Subcommittee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: Thank you for your letter of July 9, 1965. I take note of your committee's decision to extend an opportunity to individuals named in executive session testimony "to determine for himself if the testimony is adverse * * *."

Without prejudicing my right under committee rules to respond to the testimony you refer to, I should like to request that you make available to me the name or names of individuals whose testimony you have received in executive session, together with a transcript of all statements such witnesses have made in regard to me. Upon receipt of this material, I shall be happy to notify you of my decision whether to respond to it or not.

Sincerely,

(Signed) JOHN H. COATSWORTH.

Subcommittee's reply of July 21, 1965, to Mr. Coatsworth's July 12, 1965, letter:

DEAR MR. COATSWORTH: Reference is made to yours of July 12, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to you to determine whether you consider the substance of the testimony, as mentioned, adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy. You have not been summoned and there is no issue pending between you and the subcommittee, nor is the authority of the subcommittee in question.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

The Daily Cardinal, University of Wisconsin, Tuesday, July 27, 1965, in a page 1 article states:

"John Coatsworth, a graduate student in history, who has been active in the Committee To End the War in Vietnam, commented that the letter which he received made reference to his recent trip to Cuba. However, Coatsworth believes that the Senators are more interested in his campus political activities. * * * Coatsworth interprets the invitations as "an attack on students and faculty members that stated their opposition to the war in Vietnam." If the rules are as Coatsworth speculated, then he believes that he would not go to Washington for two basic reasons:

"(1) Once he had responded to one question, he would be compelled by law to answer questions about anything else the Senators cared to question him about; and

"(2) He does not believe that the investigation is being conducted for a legislative purpose."

(6) Colbert, Gwen

Date of investigation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: None.

Local substance of letter of standard form of invitation:

That you were the "front" or "spokesman" for the Ad Hoc Committee against Extremism and that two campus-demonstration leaders had "used" you for the purpose. That you identified one Alicia Kaplow as cochairman of Friends of SNCC on the Wisconsin campus.

---

(7) Davis, Philip Cheatham

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: July 18, 1965.

Local substance of standard form of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that as national chairman of the DuBois Clubs, you appeared on a television program March 9, 1965, at a time when campus demonstrations had taken place at the University of Wisconsin, and asserted that if drafted, you would not fight in Vietnam.

Individual's response:

Letterhead of W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, 1853½ McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., July 18, 1965.

Mr. J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel, Internal Security Subcommittee,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: This is to acknowledge reciept [sic] of your letter of July 9, 1965.

Your letter states that "opportunity is extended to the individual to determine for himself if the testimony is adverse and to make response if he so desires, before the committee considers whether that testimony should be made public." Before I am able to properly respond to your letter, I will need to know the following things:

- What was the subject matter for the hearing under inquiry?
- What was the authorizing document for such inquiry?
- What are the rules of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as to hearings, testimony, and reports?
- What are the name(s) and address(es) of the witnesses who testified against me?

In addition, before I am able to make a response or deny alleged testimony about me, my actions, or any statements that I might have made, placed before your committee on May 18, 1965 or on any other date, I must be able to see what said testimony was. Please send such a transcript, containing all references to me, or to the W. E. B. DuBois Club of America, to the above address.

There are two further questions. Would an appearance in response to your letter be an open, public hearing before the subcommittee, or a hearing before a closed executive session? What is the legislative purpose of making this testimony public?

Please comply with my request at your earliest convenience.

Yours for peace and freedom,

(Signed) PHILIP C. DAVIS.
National President, W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America.

Reply dated July 28, 1965, to national president of W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America:

DEAR MR. DAVIS: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 18, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to you to determine whether you consider the substance of testimony as mentioned to be adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspond-

ence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

You have not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue with respect to the authority of the subcommittee.

Should you wish to respond, testimony would be taken in executive session.

For your information, there is enclosed herewith a handbook of the Internal Security Subcommittee setting forth rules of procedure and information for witnesses.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

The name used by Mr. Davis' organization is that of W. E. B. DuBois, one of the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1909. He later repudiated the NAACP and in 1961, at the age of 93, joined the Communist Party. DuBois received the Soviet Union's Lenin Peace Prize in 1959.

Studies at staff level reflect that while the organization does not actually conceal the fact that it is named after a Communist of international reputation, there would appear to be no doubt but that many recruits and members are attracted or taken into the DuBois Clubs without being informed of its Communist inspiration.*

* Mr. Hoover, in his on-the-record testimony before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations Mar. 4, 1965, in regard to FBI's appropriation request for the fiscal year 1966, declared that ever since the demise in 1957 of the Labor Youth League, dominated and controlled by the CPUSA, the establishment of another nationwide youth organization has been a goal of the party. "A positive step was taken in this direction in late 1963 when Gus Hall ordered the formation of a Marxist-oriented youth organization to attract non-Communists as the first step toward their eventual recruitment into the party."

The Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, has reported that the DuBois Clubs were formed by mandate of Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States.

DuBois died at the age of 93 in Ghana where he had gone to serve in the government of Kwame Nkrumah, Communist ruler and secretary general of the People's Party of Ghana. DuBois renounced his American citizenship to serve Nkrumah.

A St. Louis, Mo., organizer of the clubs, James M. Peake, Jr. (*vide:* p. 11), declared in a newspaper interview February 22, 1965:

We are an action group, supporting and originating militant action on problems facing American youth, and we are also a group studying and searching for answers. We believe socialism may be an answer, and so socialism is a part of our study.

He said there is interest in the DuBois Clubs "on almost every campus in the United States" and indicated that the St. Louis chapter will keep its membership rolls secret.

As Dr. Possony put it:[1]

In the Marxist-Leninist interpretation, the establishment of socialism after the proletarian revolution would constitute the first stage on the road to communism.

---

[1] (From "Wordsmanship, Semantics as a Communist Weapon," a study prepared for the Internal Security Subcommittee in 1961 by Dr. Stefan T. Possony, director of international studies, Hoover Institution, Stanford, Calif.)

(8) Dennis, Eugene, Jr.

Date of letter of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of answer: July 21, 1965.

Local substance of letter of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you personally ran a rooming house at 515 West Johnson Street, Madison, Wis., as "something of a nerve center and propaganda and agitational center for the DuBois Clubs. Beyond that, that the roominghouse served as a nerve center for (your) activities as Midwest regional coordinator" for DuBois Clubs.

The foregoing activities relate to University of Wisconsin campus demonstrations during the past term.

Answer of Eugene Dennis, Jr., July 21, 1965:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: This letter is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 9, 1965, as of July 19, 1965. Before I am able to respond to your letter, and to its invitation to appear before the subcommittee, I must have answers to the following:

(1) What was the subject of the hearing where testimony was given alleging certain activities by me?

(2) What was the authorizing document for such hearing and inquiry?

(3) What are the rules of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and of the subcommittee in question, regarding hearings, testimony, and reports?

(4) What are the name(s) and address(es) of the witness(es) who testified against or about me?

(5) Would an appearance before the subcommittee be before an executive or a public session?

(6) What is the legislative purpose of making this testimony public?

(7) What is the considered opinion of the members of the subcommittee on a recent decision by House Labor Subcommittee Chairman James Roosevelt to strike from the record testimony relating to person or persons not present, *when the testimony was given*, to refute such testimony?

(8) Will the subcommittee supply a complete transcript of all hearings wherein testimony against or about me was given? If not, please explain. Please send such testimony to the above address.

I hope to have a complete response to this letter before July 29, 1965, so that the 10-day waiting period specified in your letter can be satisfied or extended.

Yours for peace and freedom,

(Signed) EUGENE DENNIS, Jr.

Reply to Eugene Dennis, Jr., dated July 28, 1965:

DEAR MR. DENNIS: This is to acknowledge your letter of July 21, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to you to determine whether you consider the substance of testimony as mentioned to be adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

You have not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue with respect to the authority of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

Testimony taken at executive session of Mr. Bob Siegrist May 18, 1965, reflected that the fathers of Eugene Dennis, Jr., and Michael Eisenscher, *infra*, were established former Communist Party leaders, both of them in the State of Wisconsin, and one of them, Eugene Dennis, Sr., the late head of the Communist Party, U.S.A. (See p. 164, pt. 3, Communist Youth Program.)

(9) Eisenscher, Michael
Date of letter of invitation: July 9, 1965.
Date of response: July 19, 1965.
Local substance of letter of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you were one of two operators of a rooming house at 515 West Johnson Street, Madison, Wis., during the past term at University of Wisconsin; that it was "something of a nerve center and propaganda and agitational center for the DuBois Clubs," of which you were area coordinator.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *July 19, 1965.*

J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: I wish to inform you that I received your letter dated July 9, 1965, addressed to me in Madison, Wis., on July 14, 1965. In that letter you stated that in testimony adduced on May 18, 1965, the subcommittee was informed in substance that I was "one of two operators of a roominghouse at 515 West Johnson Street, Madison, Wis., during the past term at the University of Wisconsin; that it was 'something of a nerve-center and propaganda and agitational center for the DuBois Clubs,' of which (I was) area coordinator."

You also stated that if I wish to deny or otherwise make response to this testimony, I will be afforded opportunity to appear before the subcommittee.

As you should realize, this is a decision one does not make lightly, or without much forethought and consideration. In order for me to make such a decision I hope that you will provide some additional information upon which I can make an intelligent and informed judgment and response.

Based upon that part of the testimony which you summarized, I feel inadequately prepared to comment, and thus request that you send me a complete transcript of the full testimony adduced by the subcommittee from which I may better prepare a response. From that which you summarize I cannot fully determine for myself if the testimony is adverse.

With the same regard I request the name (or names), and address (or addresses) of the witnesses whose testimony concerned information about me.

I am unclear as to the nature of the May hearings, and thus request that you inform me what specific legislative purpose they had, and what subject matter was under consideration. This will greatly aid me in understanding the context in which my name was raised with regard to the purpose of the subcommittee. I wish also to know and receive a copy of the authorizing document, or mandate, which authorized the May hearings, and from which body this authorization eminated.

So that I may better understand the makeup and operational methods of the subcommittee and its parent committee, please send me copies of the rules of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the subcommittee governing hearings, testimony, and report of proceedings, and any other additional information you may feel is pertinent to the rights of witnesses before these committees.

In the initial paragraph of your letter you refer to the "opportunity * * * extended to the individual to determine for himself if the testimony is adverse and to make response if he so desires, before the committee considers whether that testimony should be made public." Please inform me what the legislative purpose is in making testimony public, and under what conditions or with what consideration testimony is made public.

Finally, before I make a decision in response to your invitation, please inform me whether my response would be taken in executive or public session.

Your cooperation will greatly speed and facilitate a meaningful and considered decision on my part, I trust that you will respect the above requests and understand my relative ignorance in this matter.

Sincerely,

(Signed) MICHAEL EISENSCHER.

The subcommittee, by its chief counsel, replied to Mr. Eisenscher July 27, 1965, as follows:

DEAR MR. EISENSCHER: This is to acknowledge your letter of July 19, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to you to determine whether you consider the substance of testimony as mentioned to be adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

You have not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue with respect to the authority of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

---

(10) Friedlander, Dan
Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.
Date of response: None.
Local substance of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that as cochairman of the Committee to End the War in Vietnam you "rushed to the platform" of a teach-in television presentation at the University of Wisconsin campus calling attention to a button which proclaimed you were "not a member of HUAC," and calling attention further to the fact that your father had been subpenaed by the House Un-American Activities Committee in Chicago, May 25, 1965.

The subcommittee was informed that as of the time the letter of invitation was en route to Mr. Friedlander's home in Madison, Wis., or shortly thereafter the addressee was in Europe attending "End Vietnam" sessions. The subcommittee's information reflects that Friedlander is a student copresident of the Committee To Put an End to the War in Vietnam, that he was a delegate in the summer of 1965 to Europe where he attended a meeting of World Council of Peace Congress held in Helsinki, Finland, July 10–15, 1965. This meeting is described in the Worker, July 18, 1965, pages 2 and 11; July 20, 1965, page 2; July 25, 1965, pages 1 and 11. The World Peace Congress has been cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

---

(11) Garcia, Elsa Stubbs
(11a) Garcia, Bernardo
Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.
Date of response: July 20, 1965.
Local substance of invitation:

(11—Mrs. Garcia) That you attended a Moscow World Youth Festival and were an organizer of the University of California students who visited Cuba.

(11a—Mr. Garcia) That you are a "former resident of Cuba, once active in the now-defunct Fair Play for Cuba Committee and the Committee Against U.S. Intervention in Cuba," husband of Elsa Stubbs Garcia who attended a Moscow World Youth Festival and an organizer of the University of California students who visited Cuba.

The July 20, 1965, response came from San Francisco attorneys for Mr. and Mrs. Garcia, as follows:

DEAR MR. SOURWINE (CHIEF COUNSEL, INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE): Under date of July 9, 1965, you addressed a letter to Mr. Bernardo Garcia and his wife, Elsa Garcia, concerning certain evidence received by the Internal Security Subcommittee in executive session and offered to them an opportunity to come to Washington to explain or deny such evidence.

The summary of the evidence in your letter was quite brief and it is impossible for us to advise Mr. and Mrs. Garcia whether or not it is in their best interests to accept your invitation without knowing the precise testimony and evidence adduced. We would appreciate, therefore, your sending us a transcript of the testimony and copies of the exhibits, if any, to which you referred in your letter.

In addition, we feel that in order to fully advise our clients, it would be necessary also to have a copy of the resolution authorizing the particular investigation in which the subcommittee is now engaged so that we might be able to advise them as to the pertinency of the information elicited in your executive session.

We would also like you to furnish us with a copy of the subcommittee's rules.

When we receive the foregoing information, we will be in a position to advise our clients whether or not they should appear before your committee.

Sincerely,

(Signed).

The subcommittee chief counsel replied July 28, 1965:

Reference is made to your letter of July 20, 1965, wherein you acknowledge receipt of similar letters addressed to Mr. Bernardo Garcia and to his wife, Mrs. Elsa Stubbs Garcia, by this office.

The subcommittee has merely extended opportunity to your clients to determine whether they consider the substance of the testimony as mentioned to be adverse, and whether they wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

Neither Mr. Garcia nor his wife has been summoned and there is, of course, no issue pending involving the authority of the subcommittee. For your information, there is enclosed a copy of the subcommittee's "Handbook for Witnesses."

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

---

(12) Goldberg, Arthur

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.
Date of response: July 14, 1965 (by counsel).

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you were a suspended student at the University of California, one of the ringleaders of the FSM movement.

Answer on behalf Arthur Goldberg by a Berkeley attorney, July 14, 1965; to the chief counsel:

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: Mr. Arthur Goldberg has consulted me with regard to your letter of July 9, 1965.

I must state that I am somewhat puzzled by your letter, and feel that I do not have enough information to adequately advise Mr. Goldberg. I would therefore appreciate it if you would inform me as to the subject of the investigation being conducted by the committee. Please include a copy of the resolution of authorization to the committee with regard to that subject. It would also be helpful if you would forward a copy of Senate Resolution 366 (81st Cong.).

Regarding the testimony of May 18, 1965, which apparently made reference to my client, would you please inform me as to the name of the witness and forward to me a transcript of his testimony.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed).

The subcommittee by its chief counsel replied July 21, 1965, by sending to Mr. Goldberg's attorney the following letter, copy to the individual:

DEAR SIR: This acknowledges your letter of July 14, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended to your client, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, opportunity to determine whether he considers the substance of the testimony, as mentioned, adverse and whether he wishes to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence.

The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

Your client has not been summoned and there is no issue pending between him and the subcommittee, nor is the authority of the subcommittee in question.

Your attention is directed to the enclosed copy of letter sent to Mr. Arthur Goldberg this date.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

A massive 1964 confrontation at Berkeley might well be described within the terminology of Leninist technicians in mass psychology as a "beacon demonstration." As reported by Eugene H. Methvin, Reader's Digest, January 1966, a pamphlet was prepared for the purpose by SLATE, a campus political party headed by Art Goldberg, a self-styled Maoist who had been arrested twice in Red-led demonstrations. The pamphlet exhorted students to "Start a program of agitations, petitioning, rallies, etc., in which the final resort will be *civil disobedience. Organize and split this campus wide open.* If such a revolt is conducted with unrelenting toughness and courage, it could spread to other campuses across this country."

When university authorities tried to enforce a long-standing rule against setting up tables on campus sidewalks to recruit and raise money for off-campus political causes, Art Goldberg formed a "United Front" to protest.

Goldberg, with Mario Savio and Bettina Aptheker, organized at the University of California what they choose to call the "Free Speech Movement," a misnomer indeed for any young American who dared to support his Government's international policies. Prof. William Petersen, of the Berkeley Sociology Department, stated, "the real issue was the seizure of power: who would run the university."

---

(13) Goldberg, Jacqueline

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: None.

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you were associated with the Communist-infiltrated Women for Peace, who attended the Women's International Democratic Federation Conference in Moscow, cited as a Communist-front organization.

SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—The subcommittee has been informed that the addressee Jacqueline Goldberg is now Mrs. Mario Savio.

---

(14) Gruber, John

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: None.

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that in January 1964 you were managing editor of the Cardinal, University of Wisconsin, and that during your regime, the publication, as a matter of nonobjective policy, failed to report nonleft activities.

That when a newscaster called attention to the fact, your publication visited upon him a reprisal in the form of a page 1 editorial attacking him.

(15) Hawley, James P.
Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.
Date of response: July 19, 1965.

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you were cochairman with one Dan Friedlander of the Committee To End the War in Vietnam, that you were "quite a stage manager" in connection with the University of Wisconsin demonstrations and in particular against President Johnson's Vietnamese policy and against U.S. Government officials.

MADISON, WIS., *July 19, 1965.*

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,
U.S. Senate
(Attention J. G. Sourwine).

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: I have recieved [sic] your letter of July 9, 1965, by registered mail. Before I am able to make a decision in response to your invitation to testify and make response in my own behalf I will need the following information:

(1) What is the legislative purpose or purposes of this hearing which was held on May 18, 1965, and what is the title of this hearing?

(2) What is the authorizing document or documents for the above-mentioned hearing and what are the terms of that authorization?

(3) What are the rules, bylaws, etc., of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee on Internal Security as-to hearings, testimony and report?

(4) What is (are) the name(s) and address(es) of the witness(es) who testified adversely about me?

(5) What is the legislative purpose of the proposal to make the testimony public?

(6) If I respond to your invitation and decide to come in my own behalf will this hearing be held in executive or open session?

In addition to the above information I will need to see a transcript of the testimony made against me prior to my acceptance of your invitation.

Upon receipt of this information I will consider your invitation and inform you of my decision.

Sincerely,

(Signed) JAMES P. HAWLEY.

The subcommittee, by its chief counsel, replied (July 27, 1965):

DEAR MR. HAWLEY: This acknowledges your letter of July 19, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to determine whether you consider the substance of the testimony as mentioned adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

You have not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue with respect to the authority of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

The Daily Cardinal of Tuesday, July 27, 1965, carried a first-page article in which Mr. James Hawley was mentioned:

Another student who was sent a letter, Jim Hawley, cochairman of the Committee To End the War in Vietnam, asked Washington for information concerning the legislative purpose of the inquiry, the identity of the person who offered the initial testimony, and other procedural questions. Hawley said that he would consider a final response after his letter was answered. Other persons reportedly dispatched similar letters.

The persons who were issued letters have not formed a group and are acting and speaking for themselves. Hawley noted, however, that they have conversed informally among themselves as to the steps to be taken.

In speculating on the probable answer to his queries, Hawley said if they were as he expects then he will turn down the invitation on the basis that "this type of testimony serves no legislative purpose at all." The specific references made to the cochairman of the campus group are that he led demonstrations against Government policy. Hawley's letter makes no mention of Communist affiliation which is a modification of previous practice of the legislative committee.

---

(16) Kaplow, Alicia

Date of letter of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: None.

Local substance of letter of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you were "identified as a cochairman of the Friends of SNCC on (UW) Madison campus, a girl from New York," and "that the other cochairman was an active DuBois Clubber."

---

(17) Kaufman, Robert P.

Date of letter of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: None.

Local substance of letter of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you were quoted as "notable among the Zeitlin defenders, Robert P. Kaufman, now an important Marxist youth leader at UC," that you were further quoted as the coauthor of a pamphlet with Bettina Aptheker defending the "free speech" rebels, published by the WEB DuBois Clubs.

That you were described as a teaching assistant, close associate of the chairman of the Communist Party for northern California and of the second-ranking Communist Party functionary in the East Bay area—identified as being present at the founding convention of the DuBois Clubs held in San Francisco last June.

---

(18) Lima, Margaret

Date of letter of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: July 20, 1965.

Local substance of letter of invitation:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you were "a constant associate" on the UC campus, Berkeley, of a member of the steering committee of FSM, attempting to stir up support for FSM, and that your interest, inferentially, stems from your relationship with "a top (Communist) party functionary."

Response July 20, 1965:

OAKLAND, CALIF., *July 20, 1965.*

Mr. J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel, Committee on the Judiciary,
Internal Security Subcommittee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 12.

Before I can decide whether or not to make any response to the testimony to which you refer in your letter I must have in hand the following information:

(1) The subject of the hearing to which you refer.
(2) A copy of the transcript of the testimony pertinent to me.
(3) The name and address of the witness who refered [sic] to me.
(4) A copy of the authorizing document for the inquiry.
(5) A copy of the rules of the Internal Security Subcommittee and the Judiciary Committee concerning hearings, testimony, and reports.
(6) Should I accept your invitation to respond in person, whether or not my testimony would be heard in public or executive session.

Thank you very much for attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours:

(Signed) MARGARET LIMA.

Reply from the chief counsel, July 28, 1965:

DEAR MISS LIMA: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 20, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to you to determine whether you consider the substance of testimony as mentioned to be adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

You have not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue with respect to the authority of the subcommittee.

Were you to respond, testimony would be taken in executive session.

For your information, there is enclosed a handbook for witnesses of the Internal Security Subcommittee containing rules of procedure.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

---

(19) Lockshin, Arnold

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: July 19, 1965.

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you addressed a State Department representative, Mr. Conlon, on the subject of Vietnamese policy "at a near-riotous event" on the University of Wisconsin campus by saying, "Get this straight, sweetie: We are not going to fight your filthy Fascist war. Go fight it yourself."

Answer from Arnold Lockshin, July 19, 1965, 13 North Mills, Madison, Wis., follows:

MADISON, WIS., *July 19, 1965.*

Mr. J. G. SOURWINE,
Senate Internal Security Subcommittee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 9. The letter reached my hands on July 17, since the address was to an old residence of my parents. In order to facilitate communication, please send all future correspondence to the Madison, Wis., address given above.

Before I am able to ascertain whether or not to appear before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in response to your letter, I will need the following information which I request from you:

(1) The names and addresses of all persons who made the statements concerning me to which your letter refers;

(2) The transcript of the pertinent remarks;

(3) A statement regarding the legislative purpose of this investigation;

(4) A copy of the enabling legislation or resolution for this investigation;

(5) A statement as to the legislative purpose of making this testimony public;

(6) A copy of the rules of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and of the Internal Security Subcommittee;

(7) A statement as to whether or not the testimony I am asked to give will be held in open or executive hearings.

Sincerely,

(Signed) ARNOLD LOCKSHIN.

Reply from the chief counsel July 21, 1965:

DEAR MR. LOCKSHIN: Reference is made to yours of July 19, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to you to determine whether you consider the substance of the testimony, as mentioned, adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

You have not been summoned and there is no issue pending between you and the subcommittee, nor is the authority of the subcommittee in question.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

(20) Patrick, Philip
Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.
Response: None.
Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that an attack was made upon a newscaster named Bob Siegrist during one of your programs given over to an interview for 55 minutes with Eugene Dennis and the DuBois Club National Chairman Philip Davis, that during the interview the two parties named recited their propaganda which included the usual criticism of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and of Bob Siegrist.

That "early criticism of Bob Siegrist and one of his sponsors * * * was uttered by Papa Hambone without benefit of script or of tape recording of that utterance."

---

(21) Plagemann, Stephen
Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.
Date of response: July 20, 1965.
Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that while an employee of the U.S. Geodetic Survey, Menlo Park, you participated in picketing a Government agency in 1960, the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

That a veteran reporter on a San Francisco newspaper charged under the heading of "Communist connections" that you had an "activist role" in the disturbances last October 1964, at the University of California at Berkeley.

The subcommittee received by its chief counsel letter dated July 20, 1965, the following response from Mr. Lawrence Speiser, director, Washington office, American Civil Liberties Union:

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: I am representing Mr. Stephen Plagemann, who recently received your letter dated July 9, 1965, concerning testimony about him which was heard by the subcommittee. In order for us to make an intelligent decision as to whether the testimony was adverse and whether he should accept your offer to appear, we would like to request a copy of the transcript of the testimony which the subcommittee has already heard concerning Mr. Plagemann.

In addition, we request a copy of the official action of the subcommittee authorizing this particular investigation and setting forth its legislative purpose. We would also appreciate receiving a copy of the rules of procedure for the subcommittee setting forth the rights of witnesses.

Any future correspondence concerning Mr. Plagemann should be sent directly to me as his attorney.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) LAWRENCE SPEISER,
Director, Washington Office.

The subcommittee by its chief counsel replied, July 22, 1965, to the attorney for Mr. Stephen Plagemann as follows:

DEAR MR. SPEISER: This acknowledges your letter of July 20, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended to Mr. Plagemann opportunity to determine whether he considers the substance of the testimony as mentioned adverse, and whether he wishes to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence.

The subcommittee declines to be drawn into a controversy because of its extension of a courtesy. Your client has not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue involving the authority of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

(22) Radke, Lester A.

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: None.

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that the Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Inc., Madison, Wis., in February of this year had filed an unfair labor charge alleging that the Teamsters had unlawfully accepted assistance from you during the time you were a student at the University of Wisconsin; that you had been employed as a night supervisor; that the Milwaukee office of NLRB dismissed the charge for the reason that you were already fired, as of February 3, 1965.

That you admitted you had falsified your employment application for the position; specifically, that you did not include your education, 6 years of college. That (nevertheless) you were hired March 4, 1965, as a physicist in high-energy physics at Sterling Hall on the UW campus, regarded as "quite a contrast to Radkes seeking, and obtaining, his employment with the Coca-Cola Bottling Co."

That your job with that company carried the right to hire and fire a group of manual workers and "He is believed to have promptly fired two of the plant's best men."

That you made the statement to employees that your parents were very active in the Kohler strike "which was a classic strike" in Sheboygan, Wis., when in fact "there was no record or recollection that either of Radke's parents had ever worked there" and that your only activity in that connection was as a strike-breaker within the definition of striking UAW–CIO people.

That in your application for employment with the Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Inc., you not only omitted the full extent of your education, but "also stated that he (Radke) was employed by the Amperex Co. in 1964 when, actually, Radke's employment had been terminated in 1963."

---

(23) Rice, William G.

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Dates of responses: July 15, 1965, July 19, 1965, August 7, 1965, August 25, 1965.

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965. testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that "Professor Rice was identified first in the Cardinal and later in the Communist publication, the Worker, as one of the 100 so-called constitutional law authorities who had signed a petition for abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities the last time around, last winter; (he) was 1 of the 10 who drafted the petition."

(Referring to a copy of the student newspaper, the Cardinal, reporting the February 9, 1965 rally) * * * (it) "carried a picture of Professor Rice and quoted some of the things he said. The essence * * * was simply that the United States was absolutely wrong with its policy in South Vietnam and, indeed, with its policy of retaliatory bombing against communism in North Vietnam. . His arguments were basically the arguments employed in the late 1940's in favor of the Chinese Communists, that this was merely a civil war which the United States had no reason to enter and no constitutional authority nor right to enter. It was a war without constitutional declaration on the part of the United States and we should get out and there should be a unified North and South Vietnam, obviously on Communist terms. * * * That seemed to be his main thesis."

First response of Mr. William G. Rice:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN LAW SCHOOL,
Madison, Wis., July 15, 1965.

Mr. J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel,
Subcommittee to Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: Your letter of July 9 reached me July 13. The fact that I have—as chairman of the Wisconsin Civil Liberties Union and as an individual—asked for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is a matter of notoriety which I would not and could not deny. The fact that I publicly oppose our waging war in Vietnam is also a matter correctly reported in several daily papers. Specifically, I have cooperated in the "teach-in" at the University of Wisconsin and have helped organize a group called Citizens for Peace in Vietnam.

Within a week, as you request, I will give you answer to the invitation you have considerately offered me to testify before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws under Senate Resolution 366 (81st Cong.). If I decide to come, it would be not to dispute my public activity, but to dispel the hostile innuendo of your witness, whom I assume to be Mr. Siegrist.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) WILLIAM G. RICE,
Emeritus Jackson Professor of Law.

Mr. Rice's second letter July 19, 1965, also addressed to the subcommittee's chief counsel:

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: In further answer to your letter of July 9, 1965, which I acknowledged last week, I accept the invitation of the committee to testify.

I submit this statement to save time at the hearing by focusing evidence on the specific false implications concerning me contained in the testimony of your witness.

His basic statements are true, that is, (1) that I have sought and still desire the termination of the mandate of House Committee on Un-American Activities; (2) that I have opposed and continue to disagree with the expenditure of taxes and manpower for offensive military violence in Vietnam. My views on both matters are well known to all who care to hear them—so readily available in the press that no testimony before your committee would add anything.

Your informant is in slight error regarding the HUAC statement. I was not one of its draftsmen; but I was one of its original signers. I do not know who compiled the language. Those who sent it to me asking for my approval and my signature were two friends of long standing, Thomas I. Emerson and the late Alexander Meiklejohn. I was glad to find that I was in substantial accord with their views and honored to be asked to become a cosigner with them of the statement.

I first knew Mr. Meiklejohn 30 years ago when he and I were fellow members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin. Since then I have felt the warmest personal regard for him and admiration for many of his ideas. As you know, he was designated by President Kennedy in 1963 as a recipient of the Medal of Freedom and was formally invested by President Johnson shortly before Mr. Meiklejohn's death.

My friendship and admiration for Mr. Emerson, professor of law at Yale, is of even longer standing. When I was general counsel of the first National Labor Relations Board (of which Lloyd K. Garrison, now chairman of the New York City Board of Education, was Chairman) Tom Emerson was a very able member of my legal staff. A few years later, when I had left Government service and returned to teaching and practice of law in Wisconsin, Mr. Emerson moved my admission to the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court, at which, in the course of his distinguished career as teacher, writer, and advocate, he most recently stood to argue against the invasion of marital privacy by a statute of Connecticut, which he persuaded the Court last month to hold to be unconstitutional (*Griswold* v. *Connecticut*).

Whether our statement appeared in the Worker I do not know since I practically never see that paper. A New York daily of more importance printed it.

My public statements of disapproval of the policy of the United States in Vietnam are statements of my belief that the United States should fulfill its obligations under international law, statements not made because of love of communism. I am not familiar with "the arguments employed in the late 1940's in favor of the Chinese Communists" and I do not recall ever to have made a public statement about the policy of our country in the Chinese civil war. Our present involvement in Vietnam is certainly radically different from the military aid we have given to the Chinese Nationalists or any other governments—including that of South Vietnam prior to the Johnson administration.

Since your witness has smeared me with false colors, I accept the opportunity to present myself before your committee on August 9, if that is an agreeable date; or at some later date in August which you propose. At your early convenience may I hear from you so that I can make vacation plans consistent with my visit to Washington?

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) WILLIAM G. RICE,
Professor of Law, Emeritus.

The subcommittee chief counsel replied July 29, 1965:

DEAR MR. RICE: Responding to your letter of July 19, 1965, there is a possibility that the Internal Security Subcommittee will be sitting August 9, 1965, the date you requested.

Because of the pressure of legislative matters at this session, no firm date can be given until several days in advance, but if you will contact this office by telephone collect on August 6, we will make every effort to make definite an executive session for the August 9 date.

If you will want air transportation provided in advance, rather than arranging your own and then accepting reimbursement, please notify us.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

On August 6, 1965, at 11:15 a.m., the chief counsel was informed by telephone by Mr. Rice that he would decline to appear at an executive session of the subcommittee and indicated the would write for a public appearance.

A letter of the chief counsel dated August 6, 1965, was addressed to Mr. Rice that date; it read:

DEAR MR. RICE: This confirms that on the basis of your decision not to appear, communicated to us by telephone today, arrangements to hear you in executive session Monday have been canceled.

In view of your questions about rules, a copy of our handbook, Rules of Procedure and Information for Witnesses, is enclosed.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

The subcommittee received (by its chairman) the following letter dated August 7, 1965, from Mr. Rice:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., August 7, 1965.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security,
Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: Pursuant to my telephone conversation with Mr. Sourwine yesterday, I write you concerning my appearance before your subcommittee in reply to the unfavorable comments on a speech I made last February which Mr. Siegrist—I believe—presented to you in executive session last May. I commend your new procedure that gives opportunity for such an appearance though in my case I doubt that the comments are worth being so

dignified. I wish only to dispel his misinterpretation of what I said and have no desire to make derogatory statements about him or anyone else.

When Mr. Sourwine told me that you were offering to hear me in executive session, I asked for a public session, both because I believe testimony should generally be taken in public unless it is expected to be scandalous, incriminating, or revelatory of official secrets, and, in my case, because the statements of Mr. Siegrist refer only to what I have said or written in public, matter that has already been extensively published. To obtain such a hearing, Mr. Sourwine advised me to write to you.

Therefore, I ask your subcommittee to hear me in public session on a date not later than September 2. My address till then will be S. A. Eliot Cottage, Northeast Harbor, Maine. Upon reasonable notice, I can come to Washington at any time between August 12 and September 2, inclusive.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) WILLIAM G. RICE,
Professor of Law, Emeritus.

The following letter dated August 11, 1965, was sent by the chairman of the subcommittee to Mr. Rice and addressed to him, per his request, in Northeast Harbor, Maine:

DEAR MR. RICE: This acknowledges your letter of August 7, 1965.

Unless and until there are issues that suggest to the subcommittee the need for your testimony at a public hearing, there is nothing that calls for digressing in your case from the usual procedure of completing the executive sessions. Public discussion of unreleased executive session testimony would not appear proper.

Opportunity is timely for you to make response in consonance with the subcommittee's invitation, in the manner in which the original testimony was received, executive session. It is noted that you do not deny the substance of allegations made concerning you. It is your privilege, of course, not to regard them as derogatory. If you nevertheless would like to "dispel misinterpretations," I again invite you to enter into arrangements for an executive session.

Sincerely,

(Signed) JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Internal Security Subcommittee.

The Internal Security Subcommittee (by its chairman) received the following letter dated August 25, 1965, from Mr. Rice:

S. A. ELIOT COTTAGE,
NORTHEAST HARBOR, MAINE,
August 25, 1965.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security,
Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: Replying to your letter of August 11, I acknowledge the validity of your position that it would be improper for you to hear in public session my comments on testimony taken by you in executive session. I trust you likewise acknowledge the validity of my position that it is proper for me to expect derogatory insinuations (which you have given me only in paraphrase and without identifying the author) regarding my public statements, which, being public can be verified by you from other sources, will be disregarded by you unless so verified and deemed by you to justify his appraisal.

My speaking out in opposition to the President concerning his Vietnam policy is obviously not reprehensible but the clear right of any citizen. What your witness has said about my speech is derogatory only if you accept his characterization of it as sufficiently significant for you to proceed to give it publicity. Since this characterization seems to me a heap of nonsense, I assume that it so seems to you also.

If you are interested in my views about Vietnam, you will find them recorded in the statement and answers to questions that I gave at a public hearing at Madison, Wis., on July 30, 1965, held by Congressmen Kastenmeier and Rosenthal.

I thank you for renewing your offer to let me testify in executive session. Since, in view of the foregoing, I believe my acceptance would serve no public

advantage, I will not ask for any of your valuable time. But if, contrary to my confidence in your good judgment, your "grand jury" investigation should result in publicity that is accusatory of me, I intend to renew my demand for a public hearing before an appropriate public authority.

The repeated blasts on local radio stations of Mr. Siegrist, whom I assume to be the witness who mentioned me, have been so flimsy that I have taken no notice of them. But the situation would be different if his remarks so impress a subcommittee of the Senate that they are given public dissemination.

In closing allow me to repeat to you what I have said publicly on other occasions—that in the opinion of this practicing attorney and teacher of constitutional law the Senate which has a vital function in the conduct of our foreign relations has been unduly inert regarding events in Vietnam. It has left to the President a singular control of policy where there should have been vigorous inquiry by the Senate for defining the aims of the United States and the means for achieving them—as is customary in the development of changes in internal law. If a policy that was likely to and actually had evolved into the mass killing of Vietnamese and Americans does not have the full-scale attention of the Senate, we have strayed far from the democratic definition and control both of our foreign policy and of the enormously powerful and expensive military arm of our Government.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) WILLIAM G. RICE,
University of Wisconsin Law School.

---

(24) Tabb, William K.

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.
Date of response: July 20, 1965.

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that you were the person who "seized the platform" May 6, 1965, at a UW rally when the then ad hoc committee re Vietnam "upset the campus meeting" addressed by three U.S. Government officials.

That, as to whether you could be called a "professional student," * * * "He certainly wouldn't be an amateur after 8 or 10 years." (At University of Wisconsin.)

That "he reportedly arranged for Tim Wohlforth, identified as editor of the Young Socialist, to speak on Marxism on the campus of Earlham College, October 30, 1958."

By letter dated July 20, 1965, and addressed to the chief counsel, the subcommittee was answered:

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: Received your letter of July 9. Am somewhat mystified. The testimony made about me is ridiculous. Having been here 3 years, not 8 or 10, I hope to get my degree in what is considered very good time, under 4 years. A quick check with the registrar's office would have satisfied you on that. However this is not the point. I do not see what legislative purpose such testimony serves. Perhaps you would enlighten me. Also if I am to deny testimony or in other way respond I would like to have a complete transcript of any hearings in which my name was mentioned and the name or names of persons mentioning me. You say that I may respond before the testimony is made public. What purpose is served by making such testimony public? Also I would like to know if I do come under what rules you hold hearings. Am I on trial? Do I get a lawyer? Are sessions open or closed? Can I refuse to answer questions? Do I face jail for failure to answer questions you put to me if I think they violate my first amendment rights? Finally, so that I might be able to understand the purpose of my coming, what legislation is under consideration and what specifically would be the mandate under which the subcommittee would be questioning me?

Upon receipt of the answers to these questions and other information you think might be helpful to me, I will be better able to judge whether or not I will appear before your committee voluntarily. Finally if I decline your invitation, will I be ordered before your committee at any foreseeable time?

Sorry to trouble you with all these questions but in my studies of government and the democratic process no mention was ever made of your subcommittee.

Most sincerely yours,

(Signed) WILLIAM K. TABB.

The subcommittee, by its chief counsel, by letter dated July 28, 1965, answered Mr. Tabb as follows:

DEAR MR. TABB: This is to acknowledge your letter of July 20, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to you to determine whether you consider the substance of testimony as mentioned to be adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into a controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

You have not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue with respect to the authority of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

---

(25) Treuhaft, Robert E.

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: July 19, 1965.

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that according to a photograph provided by an inspector of the Berkeley, Calif. Police Department, you were identified as conferring with a young student wearing an FSM armband in Sproul Hall, administration building at the University of California at Berkeley, at the time of student demonstrations and riots last December 1964.

That according to police officials, you were "very active in advising and giving guidance to the leaders of the student demonstrations."

That "Mr. Treuhaft was the first person arrested at these demonstrations. He was arrested for trespassing. * * * He was belligerent with the district attorney who ordered his arrest." (The subcommittee was informed the charges were later dropped.)

From Mr. Treuhaft's attorneys the subcommittee received a letter dated July 19, 1965, as follows:

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: I acknowledge on behalf of my client, Robert E. Treuhaft of Oakland, Calif., your letter to him of July 9, 1965.

I represent Mr. Treuhaft in a criminal action, now awaiting trial, arising out of the incidents you mention at Sproul Hall on the University of California campus in December 1964.

Since the case is in that posture, you will understand my surprise and concern that the subcommittee has adduced testimony purporting to relate to my client and his arrest. Clearly, publication of the testimony so adduced would effectively operate to deprive my client of a fair trial before an impartial jury.

It is possible that the subcommittee was not informed that my client is himself an attorney at law. His consultations with leaders of the FSM movement, by whom he had previously been retained, were had entirely in his capacity as their attorney. Mr. Treuhaft is accordingly of course not free to discuss with the subcommittee privileged communications had with his clients, even if the criminal charge against him were not pending. Moreover, I am sure you will understand that the very fact of inquiry by the subcommittee into the subject of Mr. Treuhaft's consultations with his clients tends to interfere with their right to counsel, and with his discharge of his professional obligations.

Finally, the information received by the subcommittee appears to be less than reliable. If, as the subcommittee was informed, the charges against Mr. Treuhaft have been dropped, neither he nor his lawyer has been informed of the fact. I attended a session of the municipal court in Berkeley, Calif., on July 6, 1965, when the matter was tentatively set for trial September 13, 1965. For the reasons earlier stated in this letter, I am not free to comment on the accuracy or inaccuracy of other testimony concerning my client which you delineate in your July 9 letter.

In order to assist the trial preparations for the defense of my client, will you be kind enough to furnish me with the names and addresses of witnesses who testified concerning Mr. Treuhaft before the subcommittee and with a transcript of the testimony of each of them. I shall be glad to defray the costs of this material.

Very truly yours,

(Signed).

To Mr. Treuhaft's attorneys the subcommittee, by its chief counsel, replied as follows:

JULY 28, 1965.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 19, 1965, on behalf of Mr. Robert E. Treuhaft of Oakland, Calif.

We have made note in our files that the parenthetic note in my letter of July 9, 1965, to your client, that the charges in question were dropped, is apparently an error or misunderstanding of the witness; that in point of fact the municipal court trial is now set for September 13, 1965.

The testimony respecting Mr. Treuhaft has not been made public. As to the substance of the testimony mentioned, the subcommittee has merely extended to Mr. Treuhaft opportunity to determine whether he considers the same adverse, and whether he wishes to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

Mr. Treuhaft has not been summoned, there is no issue pending, and there is, of course, no issue respecting the authority of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

Demonstrating mobs on the campus of the University of California December 2, 1965, had the aggressive legal assistance of Robert Treuhaft who was the first person arrested as State police cleared a building on the campus.[2] As reported by the Reader's Digest, January 1966, the lawyer "identified in congressional testimony as a Communist Party member" was advising students who had participated or who were engaged in sit-down opposition. Treuhaft had opportunity, of course, in the subcommittee's investigation to explain his presence on the campus; who (if anybody) had engaged his talents or to assist his Government by testimony under oath for purpose of establishing the reason for the unrest. As indicated, *supra*, he chose to do nothing of the kind.

---

(26) Wood, Ann Fagan

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: July 18, 1965.

Local context:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that although you were an employee of the University of California, you were seen on the roof of a trapped police car during the October revolt at Berkeley giving legal advice to the demonstrators (on the campus).

That as such you were among "individuals involved in activist roles in the disturbances—who had Communist connections."

The subcommittee received from Mrs. Wood a letter dated July 18, 1965, as follows:

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
July 18, 1965.

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: I would like to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 9, 1965. However, I find it extremely difficult to respond to your letter without knowing: the subject matter of the inquiry of May 18, 1965; the wording

---

[2] It took 350 policemen 12 hours to carry out the 773 arrested demonstrators. Among them were 86 nonstudents, 38 with criminal records, 45 with known subversive and radical backgrounds.

of the document authorizing the hearing on that date; the rules of the committee and subcommittee covering hearings and inquiries; the name(s) and address(es) of the witness or witnesses who testified about me, and without seeing a transcript of their testimony.

If you send me this information, I will be able to respond to your letter.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) ANN FAGAN WOOD.

To Mrs. Wood's answer the subcommittee chief counsel replied July 27, 1965, as follows:

This acknowledges your letter of July 18, 1965.

The subcommittee has extended opportunity to you to determine whether in your opinion the substance of the testimony as mentioned was adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

You have not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue with respect to the authority of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

---

(27) Zeitlin, Maurice

Date of invitation: July 9, 1965.

Date of response: July 19, 1965.

Local substance:

On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that "Professor Zeitlin is currently on official leave from the (UW) campus from everything apparently except demonstrations."

That "he pursued a line" at the February 9, 1965, get-out-of-Vietnam demonstration on the Capitol steps. "Among other things, he had praise for the Moscow attitude and criticism for the U.S. attitude."

That "while on the Berkeley campus as a graduate student in 1961 (you) denounced the U.S. role in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion and (were) active in the Berkeley Fair Play for Cuba Committee and as a leader of the UC Student Forum on Cuba. The forum, according to the Communist People's World of January 14, 1961, had as its aims the restoration of United States-Cuba relations."

That "Zeitlin has been a frequent exponent of the 'we-made-Castro-a-Communist theme.'"

That it was "such persons in America as Bob Siegrist who had exposed Castro's Communist background * * * who had driven a very nice revolutionary into the camp of the Communists."

That you declared, "Don't you know? Haven't you heard (re Castro's admission of communism) that that was a completely fraudulent document. Castro never said it at all."

That the foregoing "is the technique used by these people on young minds who have no recourse at all. This is a typical type of technique by many of these professors. * * *"

The subcommittee by its chairman received under date of July 19, 1965, the following letter:

MY DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: I have received your letter dated July 9, 1965.

I would be happy to appear before your subcommittee if you were to supply me with the following information:

(1) What is the legislative purpose of your committee hearings and the title?

(2) What are the authorizing documents and the terms of the authorization?

(3) What are the rules, bylaws, etc., of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the subcommittee as to hearing, testimony, and reports?

(4) What are the name(s) and address(es) of the witnesses who testified adversely about me?

(5) What is the legislative purpose of making the adverse testimony public?
(6) If I respond, will this hearing be held in open or in executive session?
Finally, I would require a transcript of the testimony given before your committee with reference to myself.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) MAURICE ZEITLIN,
Assistant Professor.

To Mr. Zeitlin's letter, the subcommittee by its chief counsel July 22, 1965, addressed the following reply:

DEAR MR. ZEITLIN: Your letter of July 19, 1965, addressed to Senator Eastland anent my letter of July 9, 1965, has been turned over to this office for reply.

You addressed to the subcommittee six questions and concluded that you "would require a transcript of the testimony * * *."

The subcommittee has merely extended opportunity to you to determine whether you consider the substance of the testimony mentioned to be adverse and whether you wish to respond. If not, there is no need for further discussion or correspondence. The subcommittee declines to be drawn into controversy because of its extension of a courtesy.

You have not been summoned and there is, of course, no issue involving the authority of the subcommittee. If you should decide you wish to testify, the hearing would be in executive session.

For your information, there is enclosed a copy of the subcommittee's "Handbook for Witnesses."

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. G. SOURWINE,
Chief Counsel.

INDEX

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

	Page
A	
Ad Hoc Committee	22
American Civil Liberties Union	32
Wisconsin Branch of	34
American Institute of Marxist Studies	19
Amperex Co	33
Aptheker, Betinna	7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 28, 30
Aptheker, Herbert	19
B	
"Backgrounder on Communism"	3
Barenblatt v. *U.S*	12
Blair, Fred	2, 8, 9, 20
Bluestone, Donald	2, 20
Brooklyn College	11
Brooklyn College Student Protest Movement	11
C	
California, University of (Berkeley)	17, 18, 26–27, 38, 39
Chamberlain, John	13
Ciporen, Fred	20
Citizens for Peace in Vietnam	34
Coatsworth, John H.	2, 9, 21
Coca-Cola Bottling Co	33
Colbert, Gwen	22
Committee Against U.S. Intervention in Cuba	26
Committee To End the War in Vietnam	20, 21, 26, 29
Communist Control Act	4
Communist Party of the U.S.A	1, 3, 4, 7, 13, 24
National Committee of the	20
Communist Party, Wisconsin	20
Conlon, Thomas F	20, 31
D	
Davis, Philip Cheatham	9, 11, 22–23, 32
Daily Californian (publication)	19
Daily Cardinal (newspaper)	2, 9, 20–21, 28–29, 33
Dennis, Eugene, Jr	9, 11, 24, 32
Dodd, Senator Thomas J	1, 3
DuBois Clubs of America	1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 18, 22, 23, 25
DuBois, Dr. W. E. B	12, 13
E	
Earlham College	37
Eastland, Senator James O	20, 35, 36, 41
Eisenscher, Michael	9, 24–26
Emerson, Thomas I	34

F

Page

Fair Play for Cuba Committee 40
Federal Bureau of Investigation 1, 8, 14, 18, 23, 32
Law Enforcement Bulletin 14
Free Speech Movement 18, 19, 27, 28
Friedlander, Dan 26, 29
Friends of SNCC 22, 30

G

Garcia, Bernardo 26, 27
Garcia, Elsa Stubbs 26, 27
Garrison, Lloyd K 34
Gideonse, Dr. Harry 11
Goldberg, Arthur 27, 28
Goldberg, Jacqueline 28
Griswold v. *Connecticut* 34
Gruper, John 28

H

Hall, Gus 7, 13, 23
Hambone, Papa 32
Harlan, Justice John Marshall 12
Hawley, James 9, 29
Ho Chi Minh 13
Hoover Institution 23
Hoover, J. Edgar 1, 11, 14, 19, 23, 32
House Un-American Activities Committee 26, 32, 33, 34

I

Individuals invited to comment or appear, responses by 17–41
Insurgent (publication) 2
Internal Security Act of 1950 4
International Association of Chiefs of Police 11, 18, 19
International Political Studies and Programs 12

J

Johnson, Arnold 4
Johnson, President Lyndon 20, 34

K

Kaplow, Alicia 22, 30
Kastenmeier, Representative Robert W 36
Kaufman, Robert P 30
Kennedy, President John F 34
Kohler Co 33
Kurzweil, Jack 19

L

Labor Youth League 23
Lima, Margaret 30, 31
Lockshin, Arnold 31

M

Mary's Bookshop 2, 20
May 2d Movement 13
Meiklejohn, Alexander 34
Methvin, Eugene H 28
Milwaukee Sentinel (newspaper) 2
Moore, Charles E 8, 11, 18, 19
Moscow World Youth Festival 26
Myerson, Michael 13

N

NAACP 12, 13, 23
National Labor Relations Board 33, 34
Newsweek (magazine) 4
New York Times (newspaper) 12, 19
Nkrumah, Kwame 23

P

Page

Patrick, Philip ---- 32
Peake, James M., Jr ---- 13, 23
Persons named in executive testimony and invited to respond or comment, if they so wished (list of) ---- 15
People's Party of Ghana ---- 23
People's World (publication) ---- 18, 40
Petersen, Prof. William ---- 12
Plagemann, Stephen ---- 32
Political Affairs (publication) ---- 7
Possony, Dr. Stefan ---- 12, 23
Progressive Labor Party ---- 13

R

Radke, Lester A ---- 33
Reader's Digest (publication) ---- 28, 39
Reply, standard form of ---- 18
Rice, William G ---- 33, 34
Rosenthal, Representative Benjamin S ---- 36

S

St. Louis Post-Dispatch ---- 13
San Francisco Chronicle (newspaper) ---- 8, 19
Savio, Mario ---- 19, 28
Siegrist, Bob ---- 11, 24, 32, 34–37, 40
SLATE ---- 28
Speiser, Lawrence ---- 32
Students for a Democratic Society ---- 13
Subcommittee comment ---- 18–20
Supreme Court, U.S ---- 5

T

Tabb, William K ---- 37, 38
Time (magazine) ---- 5
Treuhaft, Robert E ---- 38

U

U.S. Information Agency ---- 3
U.S. News & World Report ---- 18

W

Wallace, Henry A ---- 12
Washington Evening Star (newspaper) ---- 12
Washington University ---- 13
Wisconsin, University of ---- 2, 9, 11, 17, 20, 21, 25, 28–29, 33, 35
Law School ---- 34, 37
Wohlforth, Tim ---- 37
Women for Peace ---- 28
Women's International Democratic Federation Conference ---- 28
Wood, Ann Fagan ---- 39
Worker, The Daily (newspaper) ---- 2, 9, 11, 12, 18, 26, 33
World Peace Congress, The ---- 26

Y

Young Socialist (publication) ---- 37

Z

Zeitlin, Maurice ---- 40, 41

○