Q. —attended there. Did Terry Pettus, editor of the "New World" ever attend any meetings in your home?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Terry Pettus address others as comrade?

A. Yes.

Q. And was he in turn addressed as comrade?

A. Yes.

Q. Did George Hurley ever attend any meetings in your home?

A. I don't recall whether he was—I think he's been out to the house, but I don't know whether he was in one of these meetings or not. I couldn't say for sure.

Q. Have you ever attended any Communist Party meeting with George Hurley, that you recall?

A. No, I don't think I have.

Q. Then you do not know whether or not—

A. I don't know—

Q. —George Hurley is a member of the Communist Party. It's slipped my mind now. Did I ask you about John Caughlan?

A. Yes.

MR. HOUSTON: I believe that's all. Thank you very much.

(Witness Excused)

MR. HOUSTON: Mr. Chairman, I—I would like the wishes of the Chairman at this time. The next witness will take around an hour or an hour and a half to examine. Do you wish me to start, Mr. Chairman, or wish it to run through?

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Well, I think we just had an opinion on the night session. I would rather start new in the morning.

MR. HOUSTON: I will ask the witnesses who were subpoenaed, who testified here today—who have not testified today, to be present tomorrow. You who have testified today, Mr. Chairman I recommend that they be released from the subpoena.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Well, if it meets with your approval, we will adjourn until 9:30 o'clock again tomorrow morning.

(WHEREUPON adjournment was taken until 9:30 o'clock a. m., January 30, 1948.)

(9:30 o'Clock, a. m., January 30, 1948)

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: The hearing will be in session.

MR. HOUSTON: Will you take the witness stand, Mr. Honig?

NAT HONIG, having been first duly sworn, testified on direct examination as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOUSTON:

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Pardon me a moment, Mr. Houston. I would like to make an announcement. We have a request, the first request, incidentally, to appear before this Committee. I intended to reply to it with a letter, but there seemed to be no adequate address. Louise Alice Gervais has requested an opportunity to appear before this Committee, and she will be given such opportunity, and if she will leave her address we will notify

her formally the time when she will be permitted to appear, but that is just in case this lady did not understand why we had not replied. We received the request last night, but I was unable to reply this morning, not having a complete address, but we will find it and send a formal notice of the time she may appear.

MR. HOUSTON: Mr. Chairman, how was that name spelled?

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Louise, L-o-u-i-s-e Alice, A-l-i-c-e G-e-r-v-a-i-s. You may proceed.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (resumed)

BY MR. HOUSTON:

Q. Mr. Honig, will you please state your name, and spell the last name for the sake of the record?

A. Nat Honig, H-o-n-i-g.

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Honig?

A. Los Angeles.

Q. Where were you born, Mr. Honig?

A. New York.

Q. Mr. Honig, are you or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

A. I am not now, but I had been for twelve years a member of the Communist Party.

Q. When did you first join the Communist Party?

A. In 1927.

Q. 1927. Now, where did you join the Communist Party?

A. In Jersey City, New Jersey.

Q. What were you doing at the time you joined the Communist Party—what was your occupation?

A. Well, I was a newspaper man.

Q. What employment did you have after you joined the Party?

A. Well, very shortly after I joined the Communist Party, I would say about three months after I had joined, this was in about December, 1927, I joined the staff of the Daily Worker, which was the main newspaper of the Communist Party.

Q. Is the Communist Party—I'll withdraw that—is the Daily Worker an organ of the Communist Party?

A. It is.

Q. And it was at the time you worked on it?

A. Yes.

Q. And you were a full time employee for the Daily Worker in New York?

A. Yes.

Q. Where was the Daily Worker office?

A. In New York City—I can give the exact address if you want it.

Q. Was it in the proximity—close to the headquarters of the Communist Party?

A. When I first worked there it was not. It was on Union Square and the headquarters of the Party was up in—near the Harlem area—just south of 25th Street, but later on they consolidated their offices and they all located, the Party itself and the Daily Worker at 50 East 13th Street.

Q. How long did you work as an employee of the Daily Worker?

A. Pretty close to three years, until March, 1930.

Q. And what did you do in March, 1930?

A. I was assigned by the central committee of the Communist Party to become editor of a weekly newspaper called Labor Unity. It was the official organ of the Trade Union Unity League.

Q. What was the Trade Union Unity League?

A. The Trade Union Unity League was the trade union front for the party. It was the organization through which the party conducted its operations in the unions.

Q. Was this publication that you became editor of, also a Communist Party publication?

A. It was not openly or admittedly so, but it was run lock, stock and barrel by the Communist Party.

Q. Were its policies controlled by the Communist Party?

A. Completely.

Q. Did you receive copies from the Daily Worker to rewrite for your paper?

A. Very often, and I received copy very often from the central committee of the Party or members of it.

Q. While you were editor of this paper did you see any evidence of foreign copy being sent for dissemination?

A. Oh, yes, very—almost every day the mail brought us more or less open stuff that came from Moscow from the Headquarters of the Red International labor unions, then occasionally we got articles written by Soviet trade union officials. We got that indirectly, as it would be brought to this country probably by some couriers as they call their messengers.

Q. As editor of that paper, are you in a position to state whether or not any control over the paper was exercised by Moscow?

A. Well, I know definitely it was, because very often the policy of control was exercised through me, myself.

Q. As an avowed Party member?

A. And as the editor of the paper, yes.

Q. How long were you editor of this paper?

A. Until May—until April, 1934.

Q. Incidentally, do you know Mr. Manning Johnson who testified here yesterday?

A. Yes, I have met him, in New York.

Q. Was he a member of the Party?

A. Yes.

Q. Was he an official of the Party?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. Now, what happened in 1934? You say that was when your employment there terminated.

A. Well, in April—well, early in 1934, about January, I was approached by a representative, by a German who was a representative of the Comintern in this country.

Q. What was his name?

A. He went under the name of Wagner, and his name was—

Q. Do you remember his first name?

A. I don't. We never referred—I don't think he even used his first name, just a handy nom de guerre, so to speak, you know, only our official names to be used in public, and his real name was Merker.

Q. How do you spell that?

A. M-e-r-k-e-r.

Q. M-e-r-k-e-r.

A. Fritz. I believe it was Fritz Merker, but it was Merker, I know that.

Q. You say he was a representative of the Comintern?

A. Yes, he was a secret representative of the Comintern.

Q. Now, suppose you detail for us how you met Mr. Merker and the length of your acquaintanceship?

A. I don't know exactly when it was that I first met Mr. Merker, or any of his colleagues who were similar representatives of the Comintern, but it must have been sometime during the preceding year of 1933 and I met him pretty nearly at all conventions of our Trade Union Unity League, of which our paper was the official organ. I met him at Party conventions and closed Party meetings, smaller Party meetings of higher officials, and I was introduced to him once and I spoke to him very briefly after that at succeeding meetings. He approached me in January of 1934 and he said that he had been watching the work I had been doing and said that they were very pleased with the paper I was editing, and I heard he meant the Red International Labor Union of Moscow. The Red International Labor Union is the trade union branch of the Communists, and he asked me how I would like to go to Moscow, and of course I was very pleased. This is the mecca, naturally, of all Communists, and I said "I would."

Q. All right, was Mr. Merker a citizen of this country?

A. Oh, no. He is a German.

Q. Did he exercise any influence over the Communist Party of this country?

A. That is what he was in the country for, to see to it that instructions from the Comintern were carried out.

Q. Do you have any knowledge whether or not the American members of the Communist Party followed his instructions?

A. Well, they had to, or else.

Q. There just wasn't any question about it?

A. There wasn't any question.

Q. You know, Mr. Honig, we are taking this record by electronic record and it,—unfortunately it doesn't record motions. Just what did you mean when you—

A. Well, they are out, and for a higher official of a party to be out is a pretty tough break. I mean, he would be hounded for a long time to come. Most of these higher officials, too, have never done anything else in their life for livelihood and to be ousted from the party would almost mean starvation for them.

Q. So they implicitly obeyed the orders of this foreign alien who was here representing the Communist Comintern?

A. Implicitly is the only word.

Q. Now, you stated that you were very pleased with this offer to go to Moscow. Did you go to Moscow?

A. Yes.

Q. Who made all the arrangements for you to go to Moscow?
A. The central committee of the Communist Party.

Q. Who arranged your transportation?
A. Well, I don't know which—well, I do know which, ah—which particular official of the party I had to approach, a man named Mr. Weiner.

Q. I mean, did the Communist Party arrange this?
A. Yes, the Party itself.

Q. Who paid your expenses?
A. The Communist Party had me to go to an organization called World Tourists and they gave me my ticket.

Q. Without payment of any money on your own part?
A. No money on my part at all.

Q. Did you go to Moscow alone, or were you accompanied by someone?
A. I went with a man named William Schneidermann. At that time he had been the district secretary—

Q. Just a moment. How do you spell Schneidermann?
A. S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r-m-a- double n.

Q. Now, can you identify Mr. Schneidermann a little better for us?
A. I believe he still is the district secretary of the Communist Party in California. He was, when I last heard.

Q. This is the William Schneidermann that we from time to time hear from in California?
A. Yes sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Schneidermann accompanied you on this trip?
A. Yeah, from start to finish.

Q. Do you know the reason for Mr. Schneidermann going to Moscow?
A. Yes. He was going to be the American representative at the Comintern just as I was going to be the equivalent at the Red International Labor Union.

Q. Was Mr. Schneidermann a member of the Communist Party?
A. Yes.

Q. Now, will you detail for us your trip to Moscow—how did you—what route did you take—how did you go?
A. Well, we went on a French Line ship. It was the Champlaigne, and we went from New York to London and—to Plymouth, and then by rail to London. We stayed about a week in London when a Soviet ship was to sail to Leningrad. We took that Soviet ship from London to Leningrad.

Q. Prior to departing you had secured a passport, had you not?
A. Yes, I had.

Q. Was this the regular passport issued by the State Department?
A. Yes.

Q. And this passport had your picture in it?
A. Yes.

Q. Now what happened when you arrived in Moscow?
A. Well, I immediately reported to the International Head, or the Red International Labor Union, Lozofsky—Solomon Lozofsky, and he was rather an important gentleman in Soviet affairs. He later on became—during the war his name appeared pretty nearly daily in the papers. He was a spokesman for the foreign office to the American corres—for all foreign correspondents, you might have seen his name.

Q. Well, did you assume any duties in Moscow?
A. Yes. For a short time I assumed the duties—I was sort of breaking in at what they call referant—a peculiar title.

Q. Will you spell that?
A. R-e-f-e-r-a-n-t, and a referant from the American Party to the Red International Trade Unions. That is sort of a junior representative, Communist Party jibberish, or something like that. Then within a few months I was named the regular American representative from the American Party to the Red International Labor Unions.

Q. You were the highest authority from America representing the Communists and the Trade Union movement in America, is that correct?
A. Representing the Communist work in the trade unions.

Q. In America?
A. In Moscow.

Q. Where were your offices in Moscow?
A. In the Palace of Labor, that's what the building was called along the Moscow River.

Q. Were representatives from other countries officed there, also?
A. Yes, I believe they said that there were representatives from something like sixty-six different countries.

Q. Were these other members also members of the Communist Party?
A. Yes, they had to be.

Q. In other words, here is sixty-six countries with representatives here, all of them pertaining to labor movements, is that correct?
A. Yes, yes.

Q. Would you say that the Communist movement within the labor movement of the world was directed from this institution you have described.
A. It was.

Q. Would it be possible under this organization you have detailed to issue the same instructions to Communists in trade union movements throughout the entire world?
A. It was done very often.

Q. It was done very often. We often hear, Mr. Honig, that the Communist Party of the United States of America has no connection with any other Communist Party. Is that true, or not?
A. No. It has.

Q. Is it your testimony that there is one Communist Party in the world?
A. Yes, that is what my testimony is, and that could easily be corroborated by reference to open Communist literature. I don't know if it circulates still, but it did very freely in Communist bookstores in the past, in which the—oh, different Communist leaders throughout the world would say, "We are members of one world Communist Party, and are one monolithic unit," and so forth—that kind of language.

Q. But you can personally testify as representative of the American Trade Union Communists, and collaborating and working with delegates from other countries representing the Communists in their Trade Union movement—
A. Right.

Q. It is just a myth then that they are trying to sell to the American people that the Communist Party has no connection with Russia?
A. Yes, they are mistaken.

Q. Now, will you detail for us a little, your duties? What did you do?

A. Well, my main duty was to meet with all or as many as possible of these delegates from other countries and formulate—help formulate—take part in discussions which would lead to the formulation of policies for Communist work in the trade unions in various countries. Of course, my main work would center on helping to formulate policies to be carried in the trade unions of the United States, both the A. F. of L. and later on—not later on, but at the same time the independent—the Red trade unions. At that time there was a separate split-off trade union movement, a Communist outright Red Trade Union movement. They didn't admit it was Communist. That was the Trade Union Unity League.

Q. Did you meet in council with these other delegates?

A. Yes, at least once a week.

Q. Did you take action, such as adopting resolutions, programs, things like that?

A. Yes.

Q. Would it be possible under this, that a Ukrainian or a Turkish or a French delegate could make a motion and a policy be adopted that would directly affect the American Trade Union movement here and the individuals in it?

A. Well, I might answer that this way: Some Bulgarian, let's say, named Polarov—there was actually such a Bulgarian over there.

Q. Will you spell that name?

A. P-o-l-a-r-o-v. He is probably a big shot there now they've taken the country over. In fact, I've read, for instance, a Bulgarian named Polarov would have a sudden idea, a sudden thought, or a wind, you might call it. There aren't enough unemployment demonstrations in the United States, so he would make a motion to that effect, that there should be more—they should pep that up, and Polarov wins, the Bulgarians win. Six months later it would probably result in the cracking of the head of somebody named Joe Jones in Butte, Montana, or Seattle, Washington.

Q. Did you have veto power over the policies that were to be applied to America?

A. Do you mean I, individually?

Q. You, individually, you thought that wasn't good for America, could you have stopped that program, or were you powerless if the body acted?

A. Well, it all depends on who had a notion—who introduced the idea. For instance, if Stalin—we never saw him—he never came around to our meetings, but if Stalin had an idea that something ought to be done in America in Trade Unions, he'd pass the word along. It would go to—he would send for Lozofsky, probably, and he would tell him his idea and there wouldn't be—wouldn't even be any discussion of that. Lozofsky would say it came from—he wouldn't say it came from Stalin, we would know by the way he put it, providing on how agitated and aggravated he seemed—how scared he seemed, and there wouldn't be any discussion. That would be that, and that's that. If Lozofsky himself, who was the head of the Red International Labor Union, had an idea, there wouldn't be too much discussion, but there would be some.

He would, maybe, to make it look good, ask me, as the American representative, what I thought of it, if it applied to America.

And I generally agreed with him.

Q. It seems to me that it—

A. If I—if I had an idea, well of course they would all pounce on it. There is a great deal of rivalry among the representatives from the different countries. They all want to make a bigger showing than the other to the Comintern, a bigger impression, and if I, for instance, had an idea that something ought to be done in regard to something in America in the Trade Unions, there would be a lot of discussion, and maybe fifty per cent of the time my idea might go over finally, and very often it wouldn't. Sometimes it would be laughed down, and sometimes it would be thought a good idea.

Q. Your testimony is, then, that if some of these foreign delegates got this deal over, they had the power right there to crack heads here in the United States?

A. Once a decision was reached by the Red International Labor Union, it would be sent over—there would be a joint meeting with the Comintern delegates, and once it was okehed by both groups, that was law as far as the American party was concerned. They could—sometimes it was too ridiculous, and once in a while it would be, because they had some funny notions about the United States—some of these foreigners had never been here. Well, a top party leader such as Browder or Foster could point out some inaccuracy. He wouldn't question the wisdom of the policy proposed, but some of the ways of carrying it out. For instance, I will give you an idea of what they thought happened in America. Some of these top leaders of the Comintern, the Red International Labor Union. I was editor of Labor Unity. Just before I went over there I got a communication from one of the officials of the Comintern, wanting to know why I wasn't sending them any publications in the cowboy and Indian languages. "Those oppressed minorities," he called them. They didn't know what—and yet these were people who would discuss and help to form policies for the United States.

Q. These same people were making policies that affect the laboring people here in the United States?

A. Yeah.

Q. Well, was Mr. Browder able to stop their demands for publications in the cowboy language?

A. Well, I never took them in to Browder. I thought it was a good joke and I told a few of my closest cronies in the Party whom I knew wouldn't let it go any further, about it. We laughed, and that was that. I wrote back and told them there wasn't any such thing.

Q. But you dare not question the policy?

A. No, we generally didn't, once it was okehed back there.

Q. If you could have found the cowboy language, you would have probably issued a publication?

A. Well, I must admit I was tempted to invent one, and maybe that would have enhanced my prestige.

(Laughter)

Q. Now, you mentioned something that interests me. You said the head of this whole movement, what was the name, Lakofsky or—

A. No, Lozofsky, L-o-z-o-f-s-k-y.

Q. Well, this fellow now,—you mentioned that by the manner in which he presented things he would often indicate fear if something came from Stalin. Are these high officials surrounded by fear?

A. Oh, well, Lozofsky was really—it is really an amazing thing. He was a big man in the Soviet Union. He was a man who ostensibly had charge of every little thing that any Communist would do in any union in the United States, a man many times so agitated, so ashen and pale at meetings we had, that we knew immediately, of course, that he had gotten hell bawled out of him at the Kremlin, or else he had proposed something which had been laughed down or had been called ridiculous or something like that, or been rebuked in some way or another. He was a big—a man who was not just an ordinary rank and file Soviet citizen.

Q. Does this atmosphere of fear pervade all through the Communist Party?

A. Terribly so in Russia, and here, too. But toward the end of my stay there—just to give you an illustration—the purges began—the first of the original purges. There was an assassination in Leningrade of a man named Kero who was a leader of a whole Communist Party movement in the Leningrad area. He was supposed to have been next in line to Stalin at that time —very highly regarded by Stalin. He was assassinated and immediately—I don't know how many million people were arrested. I would say at least thirty-three and a third per cent of all the foreign Communists, strictly from the Balkan countries, disappeared, and I couldn't begin to say how many Soviet Communist members disappeared, many whom I knew, had talked with them, gone to their houses, had dinner with and so forth, I never saw again, suddenly.

Q. What do you mean by disappeared? Did they walk out?

A. Never saw them. Now I mention these meetings every week that we delegates to the RYLU—the Recognized Youth for Labor Unions, would hold. We had the first meeting after the assassination of Kero, and I don't believe more than five of us were present of the old bunch who used to attend the meetings each week.

Q. Of the whole sixty-six?

A. Well, there weren't—sixty-six weren't always there. Some didn't come when their particular problems weren't concerned. Usually we had an attendance of maybe thirty or thirty-five, and I don't think this time—maybe five of us were there, the others—and most of the rest I never did see again.

Q. Were you surrounded by an atmosphere of fear while you were there?

A. For the most part I personally wasn't, except on one occasion. I did have one little twinge in my mind. They had my passport. When I arrived there one of the first things I was told to do was give my passport to Lozofsky. I gave him my good American passport and they used that, as couriers for the Comintern and the Red International Labor Union, these unions used that in traveling about Europe and Asia. They took my picture out and pasted whatever picture—the picture of the individual being used as courier, in its place. I always felt that if somehow or other somebody developed a grudge against me, they—they didn't ever have to give me that passport back. They could say it got lost, and I would be in a pickle there because I had never reported to the American Embassy, of course—never been to the American Consulate. I didn't know whether I could dare go to the American Embassy or Consulate and tell them my passport was gone and so forth and so forth, you know.

Q. You weren't there as an American citizen in Russia, then, is that right?

A. I wasn't even there, as far as the American Consulate or Embassy were concerned.

Q. Had you told the State Department when you left here that you were going to Russia?

A. No. They ask you to declare where you are going, and I—what you are going to do and for what, and why you are going abroad, and I said I was a tourist, and going to visit England, France and maybe Switzerland, and so forth, but never mentioned Russia.

Q. Is that a common practice, to deceive, to lie, in the Communist Party?

A. Oh, yes, it is almost a virtue.

Q. How did you know that they had used your passport and removed the picture?

A. Well, one thing—occasionally I would meet some of these other couriers who traveled about, and none of them told me they had used my passport, personally—they wouldn't do that. They wouldn't even know that they were using my passport, probably. I mean that they didn't know I was Honig. I didn't tell you that when I arrived there, also one of the first things that was done, Lozofsky said to me "You are not Comrade Honig any more. You are Comrade Davis." Now, that was that. You see I never had used a phony name in the Party before. I never did—never had a chance to in Russia, for that matter. I like my own name, and didn't see any reason to change it. But he said that's that, and it was that.

Q. If one of these couriers had gotten in trouble you were not Honig, but Davis, in Moscow you would have been in—

A. Honig would be in a jam, even though he wasn't there.

Q. Well, now, Honig, will you detail to me if you can—no, I withdraw that. Did you subsequently get your passport back?

A. I got it back once when I acted as a courier myself, and then of course I got it back finally when I left the Soviet Union.

Q. Now, did you observe any change in the passport when you got it back?

A. Yes. I noticed a sort of a little hairline dried paste mark there, you know, which showed clearly that my picture had been removed and been put back, but it did not exactly jibe with where it had been before.

Q. So this showed on the face of the passport?

A. Yeah.

Q. That didn't add to quieting your nerves any, did it?

A. No, it didn't particularly scare me at the time. I had a clear conscience about my party membership. I knew that I was perfectly loyal, I wasn't scared. I knew there was always that possibility that somebody might frame me for some reason,—that was done in the Party here, and must be done all over the world.

Q. Is that a practice to frame people in the Party?

A. Well yes to a—there is quite a lot of rivalry. There was when I was in. I assume it hasn't changed for the better, and very often—a man who may have a certain title in the party—certain position, the man just below him thinks he ought to have it. Of course he'll do just as would be done in any office anywhere. They'll try to get him—to get his job. They'll spread rumors, or slanders about him, or say he—maybe listen closely to every word he says and try and catch him in that horrible act of deviation from the Party line, and very often they would report things that just hadn't happened about this particular person.

Q. Well, was the man given a fair trial whereby he could face his accusers and hear the testimony against him and defend himself?

A. It would all depend on who he was and what you call fair trial.

Q. Well, let's put it this way, is a Russian trial a fair trial?

A. I don't believe a Russian trial is a trial.

Q. In other words, they just disappear then?

A. It is just a formality, even where they allow them to have a trial.

Q. You mentioned that you acted once as a courier. Will you explain what you meant by that and what you did?

A. Well, a courier of course is more high-faluting Communist language for simply messenger boy, and I understand now, I felt that they probably thought well, they—I would like to see a little more of Europe and that I had been a pretty good boy there, and so they'd give me a break and sent for me and they said I was to take 84,000 French francs to a certain person in Paris and this was put in sort of a stocking which was a money belt and I was to tie that around my middle and keep it there until I reached my destination and delivered the money—no questions asked, and I could spend a day or two in Paris seeing the town, and then go right back.

Q. What was this money for?

A. For French Party work—well, I couldn't say exactly. That I wasn't told. I assumed it was either for that, or maybe even—and I did find out later that that happened—it might have been for further transmission to another country.

Q. Does the Communist Party send money over the world to finance their movements in different parts of the world?

A. The Communist International did.

Q. The Communist International?

A. Yes.

Q. From your experiences and your position in the Party and your ability to get on the inside of things, do you know whether or not it was their policy to send any money to the United States?

A. I know that it was.

Q. You know that it was. Do you know the names of any of the men by whom they transmitted it?

A. Well, this man Wagner that I mentioned was one, and there was a Finn, a man from Finland—a leading Finnish Communist—I never knew his Finnish name. He called himself Alf. He was around for a while. These people came and went. Sometimes they too disappeared. Sometimes they were sent—suddenly sent for and sheepishly went back to Moscow, and later on I found out when I went there, some of these people that I knew as Comintern representatives here had also been arrested later on in some of these purges.

Q. Now, before you went to Russia did you know that the Communist Party from time—the Communist International—from time to time sent money into this country to finance activities in this country?

A. I knew that because when I was editor of Labor Unity I met regularly with the National Executive Committee of the Trade Union Unity League and I know also that very often what little pay I got as editor depended on whether that money had arrived, but I was pretty close to Jack Stachel, Bill Foster, William Z. Foster, who is head of the Trade Union Unity League, and

they were members of the political bureau of the Party, and they kept me in their confidence and they would tell me they were expecting some money through Allen, or through Wagner, or so forth. I didn't have to have a diagram drawn for me.

Q. And then after you became—went to Russia, you actually were sent on this mission to France with this 86,000 francs that you testified—

A. 84,000.

Q. 84,000?

A. Eighty-four thousand or eighty-six, I don't remember.

Q. Did you deliver this money to this address and person in France?

A. No, I never got into France. The French officials wouldn't let me in. They stopped me at the Swiss border because somebody had tipped them off in some way. I have no way of knowing who or how, whether that was done by somebody at Moscow or somebody had talked. I know I didn't talk about it, but some other Communist who somehow knew I was going had talked too freely and it had gotten to the ears of the French Embassy there, and they had sent the word to France—I don't know exactly how, but I was stopped by the French customs guards and told that they would like to check further into my visa—my passport and so forth, and they took me off the train before it got into France and they detained me. They questioned me a little—didn't ask me whether I was a Communist, or what I was doing in Moscow, but it was obvious that I had gotten my visa in Moscow—I had to do that. And of course I was in high dudgeon, pretended to be a very typical American tourist seeing the continent, and I would speak to my consul about it and see that the French were—I practically tried to make an International incident of it, you know.

Q. Did you go to see the American Consul?

A. Yes, I did. I did, and I told him that I was a tourist.

Q. Did he believe you?

A. I guess he had his doubts. He knew—he probably figured—he didn't tell me that in so many words, but he just about told me that. The French wouldn't have stopped me for no reason at all. He said they very rarely stop an American and if they do, why they must feel they have good reason. He was a good skate about it, but he—

Q. He didn't do much, eh?

A. He didn't lend any effort, particularly, to help me out.

Q. Do you figure that he had been tipped off, also, about your mission?

A. Well, what I assumed then is that he didn't. When I first met him he didn't seem to have been, but I believe the French consul or some French official immediately got in touch with him in the town—it was the town of Bazel, Switzerland, and told him what they thought. In fact, he got a call from somebody while I was there that seemed to be referring to me—I couldn't exactly tell. He was very cagey.

Q. How is the American passport regarded by these European countries?

A. Well, it just is a golden key. It was at that time in Europe. What I mean is that the best thing you could have in traveling about Europe at that time. Things were so uncertain in most of Europe that—so much jealousy between various countries that a Polish passport would be questioned in Germany, and an Austrian passport in Italy, or maybe not that, but an

Austrian passport in Hungary, a Hungarian passport in Roumania and so forth, but American or British passports were pretty handy things to have.

Q. Now were you—was there anything unusual in the manner in which they detained you? Did they take you off the train?

A. Yes. They told me to get off the train at once. They weren't brutal about it or anything—just said "Please come off the train, Comrade," and I did. There were two guards.

Q. Well, what was the outcome of this thing?

A. Well, I stayed around a week there and I raised what Cain I could—I knew my position was pretty insecure and that there were a lot of things I couldn't say to them. I stayed around a week, kind of on my own. I couldn't appeal to anybody except the ones I did, The American Consulate. I finally knew that he wasn't going to do anything—that he was just stalling, so I just went right back with the money because I figured perhaps the French might change their mind and let me go into France and then confiscate the money, and I felt that would have been a disgrace to me.

Q. It would have been a little hard to explain when you got back?

A. Yes, a little hard to explain.

Q. Now, did you take any trips around Russia while you were there?

A. Yes, I took a number of trips in Russia.

Q. Mr. Honig, what—how does the standard of living in Russia, or how did it at that time, compare with the standard of living here in the United States?

A. Oh, it is just unimaginably lower and—you can hardly mention the two in the same breath.

Q. Well, let's go into that just a little. Are people as well clothed in Russia as they are here?

A. No. Nowheres near. Not nearly as well clothed.

Q. Did you stand out as being a better clothed man?

A. Oh, yes. You could spot a foreigner—the Russian knew a foreigner immediately by the way he was dressed.

Q. Because of the superior quality of his clothing?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that true also of Russian officials?

A. Russian officials of course were dressed a little better, because they had a system there of distributing both food and clothing and housing, for that matter, according to rank. Of course they had avowedly abolished the class—system of classes, as they called it—there were systems of class distinctions and a high ranking official of a party or in some industry or business, then the better was the restaurant you ate in, the better the clothing store you could buy in, the better your salary and life, of course, and the better home you were given to live in. I will tell you the best home you could live in among those that didn't actually live in the Kremlin itself, couldn't compare with some of the poorest homes that we have.

Q. Did any of these Russian officials ever try to confiscate or steal, or buy or beg any of your clothing from you?

A. No, they never tried to steal or confiscate. I never knew very many of them who were personally dishonest in that respect, as far as stealing anything, and they never tried to confiscate anything. They made it as easy as they could for we who were representatives of the foreign Communist

Parties. But ordinary Russian citizens and Russian Party members themselves and Russians who worked in the Red International Labor Unions or the Cominterm would often ask us Americans—the British particularly, for any clothing that we felt we weren't going to need any more.

Q. Did this Lozofsky that you mentioned, ever ask you for any of your castoff—

A. No. He was one of the lucky handful that either lived in the Kremlin or lived in something just about as—

Q. Did any of them ask you for your suits?

A. Yes. There was a man named Kutnik, K-u-t-n-i-k, who was the head—head of the department where I worked, what they called the Anglo-American Secretariat, in a sense he was my superior, but in another sense he wasn't. He was my superior in the technical sense. He would coordinate all the technical work in the office and he often asked me for a suit, a pair of shoes—I mean, he was very open and shameless about it.

Q. In other words, the—theoretically your boss, was trying to get your worn-out clothing from you?

A. Oh, yeah. He was not the only one.

Q. And your worn-out clothing—that of the American employee was better than the clothing of a Russian boss?

A. Yeah—of that particular Russian boss or anybody in his rank.

Q. Well, now, how were the common people dressed?

A. Well, I would say—I won't say that they went around in rags and tatters. They didn't do that any more than they just starved to death on the streets. They didn't do that, and that wouldn't be realistic to say that. They had clothes that if they had a new suit, it was just a very sleazy looking suit, and it wouldn't last very long. I suppose the material was so shoddy that it would fall apart very rapidly. If it was a suit they had any more than a few months of course it would have holes in it. They would try to patch it and darn it, and material would be the poorest—and I am not an expert on material of any kind—but it would be the poorest type. You could feel it to be very thin and the women's clothing, of course, I particularly noticed, because women's clothing in other countries is more colorful and meets your eye sooner, and there women's clothing was terribly drab. It seemed there was very little color. It was either black, or brown, or a dull gray, very cheap. The women, of course, most pathetic, would beg even more for women's clothing, from foreigners.

Q. Did this go all the way down the line, even to the employees that you came in contact with in your living quarters, and like that?

A. Occasionally. They would be much more timid about it. It was a little more difficult for them to even talk—even to a foreign Communist, too much. They knew that everybody in that particular place I lived in would be a Communist, but they—they were even scared to talk too much to us, so that very rarely did they do it.

Q. Did the people of Russia have work clothing and dress clothing like they have in this country?

A. Yes. Yes, they did. The average Russian tried to keep up a pride in his appearance. What clothing he had he tried to keep scrupulously clean.

Q. Is there much difference between their work clothes and the dress clothes? Let's take for example, a hotel maid?

A. In the case of a hotel maid there wouldn't be very much difference, because—well, they would look pretty much alike. I suppose a hotel maid would put on what she considered while she was at work her oldest clothing, and then put on later, after she quit work, what she thought was her best clothing. I couldn't tell much difference. In the men, of course the working men would wear overalls at work and then they would try to put on regular suits after work—washed up—regular suits.

Q. Now how about food. Do they eat as well in Russia as we eat here?

A. No, they don't. Of course they are victims of the same system in food as they are in clothing. They have to eat according to their rank, according to their job. They are assigned—everybody is assigned to a particular restaurant that he eats in. He—

Q. He has no choice in those restaurants?

A. No, if he can manage to save a few rubles—and I—I—there's very few ordinary working people who could—he was at liberty to go into some of these restaurants that catered to foreign tourists, but it would take a month or two to save to buy a meal in that.

Q. You mentioned that there were different stores they traded in. Isn't that true also that they could only buy in certain stores?

A. The stores were generally attached to the place of work, if it was a big enough place of work, and each place of work would have—oh, maybe half a dozen different stores, according to the category of the employee. If he was a very high up employee, naturally the store he was assigned to—he had a ticket, what we called a ticket or coupon for, was a better—close to the top in Soviet stores. If he were simply a plumber in the building, something of that sort, then he could only buy in the cheaper stores.

Q. In other words—

A. Of course I don't mean cheapest in price. I mean cheapest in quality.

Q. The Communists tell us there is no class distinction in Russia. It looks like this is a lot worse distinction than we have got in this country.

A. It was very bad distinction. It was the worst type of class distinction I have ever seen.

Q. Well, now, how did you as an American who had been raised in America, fit the conditions of Russia into your scheme of thinking?

A. Well, naturally I couldn't say to myself that things were wonderful there. I didn't come there with the preconceived notion that it was going to be a paradise for the working class. I did think it was going to be that—harsh in many ways, and I thought that naturally would be so, because I believed, oh, moderately in the propaganda that I, myself, helped put out, in my work that—well, Russia is hemmed in by capitalist countries. They just won't allow Russia to obtain the needed machinery, the needed raw material to properly clothe and house their people, and that some day, of course, comes the revolution. Those things would change. There would be revolutions in different countries. There would be a revolution in England, and the goods that England makes would be available to the Russian people just as it was to the British people, and so forth.

Q. Was that the general explanation that is put out to the Russian people, also?

A. Oh, yes, Russian people were told that. Why you still read from those who write about Russia, are still reading from what it says by apologists for Russia, for Soviet Russia, the same thing. The Russians are told that these things are only temporary. These things, of course—now, of course, they have the added reason that war came along and that set us back ten years more. Hitler set us back ten years more, so now it will be just a little longer we will have to wait, so we must be patient.

Q. How is their sanitation, city buildings, city water department, sewage disposal, things that are just ordinarily accepted in American cities, are they on par with ours in Russia?

A. They generally weren't. There were a few isolated cases where new cities had been built up around new industries where American engineers had been employed and an American engineer who would go abroad couldn't build a second rate job—he couldn't supervise a second rate job, and if he got any kind of weak cooperation at all from Soviet bureaucracy, he would install pretty good sanitation or sewage systems, or any type of system that he did or had to do with. Of course later on I saw cases where that happened and then it was torn down. After he went home, the thing would be allowed to go to ruin. I of course lived in Moscow. I spent practically the most of my time there anyway. Moscow is a very old city—very old city. The plumbing of course dated from the 15th and 16th Centuries. Many of the houses did—some of the places I lived in did, and there were practically no changes. Such sanitation as we know in this country, such as toilets in the actual home were unknown in most of Moscow.

Q. Did you have occasion to travel within Russia?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you make any trips?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you have an opportunity to observe Russian industry?

A. Yes, I did, quite often.

Q. How does Russian industry compare with American industry from a point of efficiency?

A. It doesn't. The Russians themselves know that, and freely admit it. They certainly do in their own publications, their own industrial publications. They have to admit it because sometimes things go so badly wrong that scapegoats have to be chosen, publicly. For instance, there were terrific railroad wrecks constantly. You took your life in your hands any time you went on a Soviet railroad trip, and they would have railroad wrecks that were not reported in the paper, but you would come across them in travel, and it wouldn't be a question of maybe a handful of people being killed, but you know the figures were pretty—almost fabulous,—two hundred, four hundred, five hundred would be killed in a railroad wreck you would come across—see that. Well, thěn, you would only find out indirectly just how many would be killed, or how bad it was, unless you happened to see it. I saw a few in Moscow, myself. The trains that were pulling in the yard, there. The only way you would learn that a terrible railroad wreck had occurred, you would see in the Moscow papers that Ivan so and so, railroad engineer, was tried yesterday in the People's Court for sabotage. He was sentenced to death, and the execution would be immediately carried out. That would be word for word, just exactly that. Then you'd know a terrible railroad wreck had occurred and you knew the reason why that was—you knew the state of the railroads. I could quote a Communist leader, a present Communist leader

on that, William Z. Foster, who is chairman of the Party—National chairman. He had once been a railroad man before he had been a Communist. He had been a railroad inspector. I knew him pretty intimately and he'd told me that it made him sick to his stomach to see the conditions of the railroad box cars—railroad flat cars. He as a former railroad inspector knew about that because that was his particular trade. It offended his craft pride, but even he told me that.

Q. And in the event of a wreck like that, they attributed human responsibility, and that somebody had deliberately tried to wreck this train. Is that why they would take the engineer out and shoot him?

A. When an engineer had a railroad wreck of any importance, and for all I know even minor ones, he was gone—he was a goner, regardless. They wouldn't—

Q. Now, what do you mean by "a goner"?

A. Well, he automatically would be tried for sabotage and shot. I mean, the thing appeared in the paper so often that it was obvious that every railroad wreck, every engineer involved was shot, because—well, even if you took the Moscow Daily News, which is the English language paper in Moscow, a Communist paper, even there every day there would be two or three little items saying exactly that.

Q. How much time would elapse between the time of the wreck and his trial, and the time of his trial and his execution?

A. I couldn't say that. I never witnessed such a trial. I had no way of knowing when a wreck had occurred.

Q. Do they have a system of jurisprudence in that country, as compared with our court procedure?

A. It is totally different, and very difficult to compare. It could be extremely fair in one sense on minor types of cases that didn't involve anything political. Naturally, cases involving divorce or petty things of daily life, or somebody caught robbing a cash register in a store or something of that sort, well, there would be a pretty fair system of justice. Nothing political would be concerned there, but it was on political trials where there was no such thing as justice. And, in fact, there was no such thing as a real trial.

Q. Decision was all made before the trial?

A. Yes. In our sense, there was no trial. The accused pretty often came in there with the confession cut and dried.

Q. Well, why did he confess?

A. Well that's always been a mystery to me.

Q. Could you travel freely around the country at will?

A. I would say that in a qualified sense. If I was sent to a particular place and performed my duties, on my arrival at that particular town I could poke around all I wanted to, investigating anything on my own hook here and there, talk to anybody I wanted to, and I don't believe I was shadowed or anything. Of course I was pretty well trusted.

Q. You were highly trusted?

A. I was pretty highly trusted. I couldn't, however, decide when I was in Moscow, working there, well, tomorrow I feel like taking a trip to Leningrad. I couldn't just go and buy a ticket and go to Leningrad. I had to get all sorts of permission.

Q. Is that true also of the ordinary Russian citizen?

A. Oh, no. The ordinary Russian citizen, he can't even move from one job to another without permission. He can't move from one apartment to another if he ever were lucky enough to find a vacancy, or if he has a cousin—if he was a single man and he has a cousin who had two rooms, and the cousin had only twelve people in his family, still he can squeeze a thirteenth in and he wants to live with his cousin, he can't just go and live there.

Q. By these illustrations you use, do you mean you know of conditions where as many as twelve persons live in two rooms?

A. Oh, yes, that's ordinary. It's unbelievable, that is true.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Mr. Houston, I wonder if I could speak with you for just a moment.

Q. Did you have any trouble while you were in Moscow?

A. I didn't have any real trouble. Once I got into a—once I got in a position where some doubt was cast on my association with foreigners there. I might explain that there was a foreign correspondent there named Rodman—and he was very pro-Soviet of necessity. As a matter of fact, he wrote for —he was a correspondent for liberal papers and one of them I remember was the London News Chronicle. It was quite a liberal paper, and even papers further to the left than that. That was not a radical paper, but a liberal paper. But he was correspondent for quite liberal papers. He was a close friend of this Louis Fisher that you have heard of, and I have met him somewhat in New York occasionally. At that time he was not a Communist Party member. I never knew that he ever had joined the party, actually. But anyway, he was very pro-Soviet in his leanings there, and not only myself, but Schneidermann, the representative to the Comintern from the United States spent a lot of time with him and his wife. He had a sister there—his wife's sister came there to visit and we were social friends and came to their house often. Well, when the World Congress of the Comintern began in 1935, I believe June or July of '35, I was to be a delegate to it and we were to get our passes to the Congress at the building at which it was held. When I came to call for my pass it wasn't there. They told me to see Lozofsky, the man I mentioned as head of the Red International Labor Union. He told me that a serious charge had been made against me; that I was asosciating with bourgeoise correspondents. Of course I have associated with bourgeoise correspondents since, very much—but anyway, he told me that, and that wasn't quite as radical a thing as he accused me of then, but I must say it struck fear in me, and I said, "I don't understand the charge. Who said I was doing that? Who was I supposed to be associating with?" He wouldn't say—wouldn't tell me at first who made the charge. Finally he told me that this Kutnik, who was the head of our department, had made the charge. I might have offended him, maybe by not giving him some clothing at one time, because there were other people whom I thought deserved it better. He was a little higher in the scale economically than some of these people. I might have got him sore because he was quite a tyrant in the office over the office help, the typists and so forth, and I used to stick up for them, and I figured someday he would put in a bad word for me. It turned out it was this man, and he had told Lozofsky that in front of the place where I lived —he lived in the same building. Very frequently there would be a car with an American flag—the cars of American foreign correspondents and foreign consulate employees, generally fly the flag of their nation, a little flag, on the

radiator cap. He said this car would be parked in front of our hotel. Our house was called a hotel, actually, and that he did a little detective work and found out that this man came to see me—correspondents. So I explained to Lozofsky that this man who came to see me was Rodman. At that time I had found out that Rodman was not only very pro-Soviet, but I had a suspicion that Rodman was reporting on other foreign correspondents to the Soviet government and I don't want to say that I knew that, because I could not prove that—but I had a suspicion of that, and I told him of my suspicion of that. I asked him to investigate this man Rodman, which would clear it up like magic if they did that, and of course the thing blew over and I was immediately admitted as a delegate. That was the worst scare I had there because I realized that with a charge like that, if too much credence were—if Kutnik were standing very high at that particular moment in Communist councils, which he sometimes was, it would be tough on me.

Q. Did you have any fears of not being able to eventually get home?

A. Oh, yes, I told you I had that lurking doubt or shadow of fear, because they always had my passport and they could conveniently lose it.

Q. You didn't want to stay there the rest of your life?

A. No, hardly.

Q. How did you get back?

A. Well, after that Comintern Congress incident I really began to be scared quite a lot. I felt that if on a flimsy thing like that I could even be accused of something that somebody a little more important could make—for some reason got a grudge against me, and I knew as I said before, how many times grudges have been gotten in the Communist Party—if somebody more important than he was did that, and accused me of something, I might not even get any kind of a hearing or any kind of attention and I would lose that passport, so I figured I would begin finagalling around, hinting that I might like to go back, and I told them that I missed the actual day to day work of the Party at that time, and the very—jobs I used to do anyway in and out of the Party, I missed the country and people in America and so forth—I felt my duty was there for the sake of the revolution and so forth. Of course I guess they heard that song and dance many times. They just smiled at that. I know there were others who were perfectly good Communists, but began to long for home. And that didn't work. Fortunately—not fortunately for Foster, but fortunately for me, he had a very—William Z. Foster, who is now chairman of the Party, had a very serious heart attack at that time, and was sent to Russia to recuperate in a sanitarium, and he had been—he had been a pretty close friend of mine—I went to see him often. After a while he was considered able to go home again and resume his duties, or at least partially resume his duties in the American party at home, and he demanded that I go with him as his traveling companion. He said that he, having a bad heart, might go off at any minute, you know, and he wanted to have somebody with him if he had an attack, and he had a lot of ways, and he swung it for me, and by that fortunate circumstance I got my passport back and was able to go out.

Q. And you did return to the United States?

A. With Foster, yes.

Q. When did you return to the United States?

A. Well, I arrived home in November, 1935.

Q. What did you do after you returned to the United States?

A. Well, very shortly afterward I was assigned to do some work for the District Headquarters of the Communist Party in New York—the New York State District, and I was there for a very short while—just a matter of maybe four or five—six weeks.

Q. What was the nature of these duties?

A. Well, I would travel around in the Upstate sections of the party as a sort of a trouble shooter.

Q. You were still an official of the Communist Party?

A. Yeah.

Q. Well, what did you do after this four or five weeks?

A. Then I was sent out to—by the central committee of the party, I was sent out to San Francisco to be managing editor of the Western Worker, which was the Pacific Coast organ of the Commuist Party.

Q. Did you—

A. It took in Seattle as well as Frisco.

Q. What's that?

A. It took in Seattle. It covered the whole coast.

Q. Covered the whole coast. Where were the headquarters of this paper?

A. In San Francisco.

Q. Did you assume the position as managing editor?

A. Yes. I was labor editor and managing editor.

Q. Labor editor and managing editor.

MR. HOUSTON: Mr. Chairman, I suggest we have a recess now. We are at a good breaking point.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: We will recess for about ten minutes.

(Recess)

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Shall we proceed?

NAT HONIG, previously sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (resumed)

BY MR. HOUSTON:

Q. Mr. Honig, while you were in Russia, and sitting as a member of this Congress, was there any discussion of old age pensions?

A. By Congress you mean—while I was in Russia—were there any discussions in the Red International Labor Union?

Q. Yes.

A. Yeah. Not at a Congress. Yes, there was. Very frequently there was discussion of the whole subject of the aged people and Communist work among them.

Q. Was any policy adopted?

A. Yes, a policy—very soon after I came there, there was a policy adopted that Communist parties all over the world must begin doing some serious work among the older people. It was said that that had been neglected, and Communists had very largely overlooked that one at that time, and a—the discussion was becoming more concrete all the time. Finally, I believe it was early in 1935, it was decided at one meeting of the Red International Labor Union delegates that particularly in the United States, the work had to be

University of Washington Library

really begun in the organization of old age groups. The Townsend movement had gotten very strong and Old Doc Townsend disturbed the Party very much. He—ah—they regarded him as a Fascist, they called him, and he was seen several times with Gerald L. K. Smith here, you know. He had appeared I think once on the platform with him, or something. Whether he had any sympathy with him I don't know, but anyway, this was discussed, that very fact, and it was decided that he was getting so much power among the old people that the Party had better do something quick about it, and start to organize rival old age groups to work within the Townsend movement in the first place, to see if they could grab control of that. They found out quickly that they couldn't, as Townsend and his lieutenants were so powerful in their hold on people, they had captured the imagination of the old folks, that they couldn't get his group away from him to convert them into Party controlled organizations. So they began to form their own old age groups.

Q. Now this was a policy adopted in Russia?

A. This was a policy adopted at meetings of the—joint meetings of the Red International Labor Unions and Comintern delegates from various countries.

Q. Now you have testified that you came to San Francisco and assumed the labor editor and managing editor of the Western Worker, which was the Communist publication on the west coast at that time?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that paper still in existence?

A. Not under that name. It is now the People's World.

Q. Is the People's World the same paper that was formerly the Western Worker?

A. Yes, now a daily paper.

Q. What was it when you first took it over?

A. It was the Western Worker and it appeared weekly.

Q. Did you enlarge it?

A. Not while I was there. After I came to Seattle it was made into a daily and its name was changed.

Q. Was it made a semi-weekly while you were there?

A. Not while I worked on it, and I believe I—I think I worked the very last day that I was in San Francisco on it.

Q. Now, as editor of the Western Worker did you receive instructions from the Communist Party as to policies and lines to be followed?

A. Yes.

Q. Did this paper follow the current Communist Party line?

A. It did.

Q. It was an unofficial publication of the Communist Party?

A. No, it was an official publication.

Q. Official?

A. Official.

Q. Is the People's World, its successor, an official publication?

A. I haven't seen a copy of that for a long time. The first copies I saw of the People's World, under that new name was and said so openly, if I remember right.

Q. Official publication of the Communist Party?

A. If my memory serves me right, yes.

Q. Did you—were you assigned to any unit or fraction of the Communist Party after you came to San Francisco?

A. Well, the first unit—those of us who had higher jobs in the Party for the sake of making it look good to the rank and file Party members—we were first of all told to belong to some of these—at least one ordinary Party unit. So I decided to be with the Newspaper Guild Party unit down there. I met with them. But I also met with the waterfront fraction of the Party, regularly.

Q. Waterfront fraction of the Party in San Francisco?

A. Yes.

Q. You state you met regularly with them?

A. Yes.

Q. Over what period of time?

A. Well, I would say roughly speaking from about March,—somewhere in the Spring of 1936 to pretty well in 1937—at least to the Spring of 1937.

Q. How often were the meetings of this fraction held?

A. They were held—when I first met with them they would try to hold them regularly every week, but things were rather quiet on the waterfront at the time and you couldn't get the Party people who worked on the waterfront to come out pretty regularly then, because these meetings would be rather routine. But later on, when the waterfront strike in San Francisco which became the general coastwise maritime strike, began to brew, the discussions were quite exciting. They were after all—they were the Communist Party which have the wooden hand on the waterfront to a large degree, except for one or two unions, was deciding on something which was going to paralyze one complete port and possibly a complete city if they could work it, and maybe the whole coast, and they even talked of later spreading it throughout the country, and naturally you would like to be at that, so Party members did come regularly who were pledged to be there.

Q. Did they come regularly during the waterfront strike?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Do you remember the names of any of the people that attended this fraction of the Communist Party?

A. Well, at meetings that I attended at the waterfront fraction, Schneidermann of course was the district secretary of the Party—

Q. Was this the same William Schneidermann—

A. Yes.

Q. —with whom you went to Russia?

A. There was Shoemaker,—I don't remember his first name now, who was an official of a longshoreman's local. I don't remember his title, but he was an official, and was a Party member, and there was Henry Schmidt who was vice-president—I believe that was the title, in the longshoreman's local there; Harry Bridges who was president of the local.

Q. Is that Harry Renton Bridges, who is International president—president of the International Longshoreman Worker's Union?

A. It is. Oh, there was a fellow named Goldblatt who was—he was secretary or president, I believe, of the International—of the Warehousemen's Local and Longshoreman—

Q. Is that spelled G-o-l-d-b-l-a-t-t?

University of Washington Library

A. That's right. Oh, there are a host of others I don't recall them at the moment. They are local.

Q. Did Harry Jackson attend any of these meetings?

A. I never saw Jackson. I don't believe he even was in San Francisco when I came there. I believe he already had been transferred to Seattle.

Q. Was William Schneidermann a member of the Communist Party?

A. He was a member and he was the head of the Communist Party in California.

Q. He was the open—

A. Yes, open—district secretary.

Q. District organizer—district secretary.

A. Yes.

Q. Was this John Doe Shoemaker a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you further identify him as to—what position did he hold?

A. I don't believe it was a very important position. He might have been a member of their executive board—their local executive board.

Q. When you say "their," who do you mean?

A. The longshoremen.

Q. The longshoremen?

A. Yeah.

Q. He was identified with the longshoremen?

A. Yeah.

Q. Was Henry Smith a member—

A. Henry Schmidt—S-c-h-m-i-d-t.

Q. S-c-h-m-i-d-t. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. Was Mr. Goldblatt a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. Was Harry Renton Bridges a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, he was. Goldblatt's name I believe now was Sol Goldblatt.

Q. Sol?

A. If I remember right.

Q. What if any further evidence do you have to confirm your conviction that this was a Communist Party meeting?

A. Well, in the first place, I was assigned to attend these meetings by the district executive board of the Communist Party.

Q. You were assigned to attend them?

A. Yes, that is—

Q. And told they were fraction meetings of the Communist Party?

A. Yes. Yes.

Q. Was anybody admitted to these meetings who was not a Communist?

A. No, never.

Q. Did they address each other as "Comrade"?

A. Pretty usually—either that or by their first names.

Q. Well, did they often address each other as "Comrade"?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Have you ever heard Harry Renton Bridges addressed as "Comrade"?

A. Oh, yes, I have done it myself for that matter, but I have heard others address him as "Comrade Bridges."

Q. You have done it yourself and heard others?

A. Yes.

Q. Did he remonstrate or object to that?

A. Never that I heard.

Q. Have you ever heard Harry Renton Bridges address anyone else as "Comrade"?

A. Yes.

Q. Has he addressed you as comrade?

A. I couldn't say definitely. I don't believe we addressed each other very much.

Q. In other words, you wasn't too close to Bridges?

A. I wasn't too close to him; I just attended the same meetings that he did.

Q. Now, you have talked about the waterfront strike there. When did this waterfront strike occur?

A. I believe it was September, 1936 when it started, but I couldn't remember exactly.

Q. September—

A. Later in '36.

Q. Late in '36?

A. Yes, at least the second half.

Q. Had Harry Renton Bridges attended any of these Communist Party fraction meetings prior to these waterfront strikes?

A. Oh, yes. The most important meeting, naturally, was when we mapped out the strike strategy. He attended that—virtually all of them. Once in a while he would be out of town and couldn't attend, but otherwise he did regularly.

Q. Was anything pertaining to the Communist Party discussed at these meetings?

A. Well, I don't think anything else really was. I mean that was the purpose of the meeting. Just how the Communist Party would call the strike, run the strike, increase the strike, how it would gain—recruit new members in the strike, how it would combat anti-Communist Party leaders of certain unions, such as Harry Lundberg and further how it would take physical action against Harry Lundberg and other firm opponents of the Party, they use the term "dump them," and they frequently discussed that fact that Harry Lundberg would have to be dumped sooner or later—perhaps they meant beaten up badly.

Q. Did Harry Renton Bridges participate in these discussions?

A. Always.

Q. How many meetings would you estimate that you have attended with Harry Renton Bridges?

A. It would be difficult to give an estimation. I did it pretty regularly from possibly July in '36 to at least the end of the year, allowing for the fact that Bridges would be out of town maybe once in every fourth week.

University of Washington Library

Q. Well, would you say you attended two meetings with him or twenty be nearer?

A. Twenty would be nearer the truth.

Q. Well, would twenty be a good estimate, or would you say fifty?

A. Well, I'll figure the months out—August, September, October—five months—twenty would be a pretty close estimate.

Q. Was there ever any doubt in your mind as to whether or not Harry Renton Bridges was a member of the Communist Party?

A. No. I knew he was a member of the Communist Party the day I arrived in—as a matter of fact, I knew he was a member of the Communist Party when I was in Moscow.

Q. How did you know that?

A. Well, in the Red International Labor Union meetings in 1934 there was a general strike in 1934 in San Francisco which arose out of a waterfront strike and we discussed that strike, its preparations, and the carrying on of the strike and its outcome, and—ah, we discussed Harry Bridges as Comrade Bridges.

Q. Did you ever hear Earl Browder refer to Bridges as Comrade Bridges?

A. No, I never heard him refer to him as Comrade Bridges, but I saw a letter from Earl Browder to Lozofsky referring to Bridges as Comrade Bridges.

NEWS REPORTER: Letter to whom, please?

THE WITNESS: Oh, to Lozofsky, L-o-z-o-f-s-k-y who was the head of the Red International Labor Union.

Q. How did you happen to see this letter?

A. Well, my—my—my job there was to handle—deal with American trade union questions that was communications with Browder regarding American Trade Union questions and it was shown to me by Lozofsky.

Q. And Lozofsky is a Russian, high in the councils of the Communist International, is that correct?

A. Well, he was high in the councils of the Trade Union of the Red International Labor Union, which was a Trade Union section of the Communist International, which was.

Q. And in this letter Earl Browder—was he then head of the Communist Party in this United States?

A. Secretary of the Party.

Q. And he referred to Harry Bridges as Comrade Bridges?

A. Yes.

Q. After you assumed your position in San Francisco, did you receive other evidence of the membership of Harry Renton Bridges in the Communist Party, other than sitting in meetings with him?

A. Oh, yes. I attended district executive meetings of—in my position on the Western Worker—of the Communist Party there in San Francisco, at Party headquarters and we discussed Bridges as our Comrade Bridges, discussed his work. Sometimes we were very critical. He sometimes would stray off the reservation, not politically, but as far as carrying things out practicably or feasibly. He wouldn't do what he was told. Not that he wasn't subservient completely politically.

Q. Was Harry Renton Bridges regarded highly by the Communist Party?

A. He was regarded highly at all times.

Q. Did you ever hear Harry Jackson discussed in connection with Harry Bridges?

A. Well, I have discussed Harry Bridges with Harry Jackson myself, as a Party member.

Q. And Harry Jackson was an open official of the Communist Party here in Seattle at a later date?

A. Yes. Harry Jackson earlier had been a Communist waterfront organizer. That is, he carried out Communist organization on the waterfront and I had heard it said that he was the actual—the man who actually recruited Bridges to the Party and he was referred to by Communist Party members as "Bridges' brains." He steered Bridges into Party lines.

Q. Did you ever hear Harry Bridges referred to by any name other than Harry Bridges?

A. No, I never did. I have been told by Party leaders in San Francisco that he had actually signed a Party card and they said "The darn fool had done that," and someone said, "You are a darn fool to let him do it, sign a Party card under a different name," and I don't remember the name. I know it, but it is not on my tongue.

Q. As an official of the Communist Party in a responsible position in San Francisco you found, or it came to your attention that Harry Bridges had been issued a Party card at one time?

A. Yes.

Q. Under a name other than Bridges?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, you mentioned there that you discussed dumping anti-Communists. Is that a practice of the Communist Party?

A. That was practiced on the waterfront at the time.

Q. Do you know—were any plans made to dump anybody?

A. I never was present when actual plans were carried out for dumping or physical beating of anybody concerned, I doubt it very much, whether some of those people were capable of doing it. I have thought that maybe it was a lot more talk than actual ability to do so.

Q. Have you ever heard as an official of the Communist Party of anybody being dumped?

A. Well, I have heard, for instance, before my San Francisco experience there were what they called Trotskyites, who had been expelled from the Party for supporting Trotsky and the Communist Party members frequently beat them up when they encountered them, and vice versa, because most of the Trotskyites were kind of little, slim fellows, you know. They weren't husky waterfront people and they weren't like Harry Lundberg, who obviously could take care of himself, so that they would have the guts to maybe dump these people. I know—I knew of a case where that was done.

Q. Did you leave this position as editor of the Worker—Western Worker?

A. I didn't leave it on my own volition. I was transferred to another position by the Party.

Q. What position were you transferred to?

A. Editor of the Timber Worker, which was the official organ of the International Woodworkers of America, located in Seattle.

University of Washington Library

Q. Did you subsequently come to Seattle?

A. I did.

Q. When did you arrive in Seattle?

A. It was—I am pretty sure it was August, 1937, or early September. I think it was in August.

Q. And did you assume your duties as editor of this Timber Workers' publication?

A. Not immediately. There was a peculiar hitch there. There was—the paper had been—what was happening was this: The paper was in the hands of what they call a right wing, up to that time being published in Aberdeen, and the Communists had been getting stronger and stronger control of the IWA, the Woodworkers' Union, felt the time was ripe now to put a stamp on it, and their idea was to transfer it to grab control of the paper, transfer it to Seattle, open up an office here in the Arcade Building where the International Headquarters of the Party—of the Union were, and which was filled with Communists, get it away from the right-wing element in Aberdeen and start publishing it right away there before—practically before the opposition knew a thing about it, and declare it the official organ. It would have the same name, but it was going to have a different look, a different mat and everything, and have the thing accomplished before the others knew it, actually.

Well, I was sent for to be the man to take charge of that paper. When I arrived I thought, well, the only thing I had to do was to step in and start getting the paper out. That's what I had been doing most of my working life, was getting papers out one way or another. But it wasn't that easy. I was told to hang around Rapport's office—Rapport was district secretary of the Communist Party for the Northwest.

Q. You refer to the man who is also known as Rappaport?

A. Yes. I had never known him as Rappaport. I understood that was his actual name, but Rapport—

Q. You refer to Morris?

A. Morris Rappaport. So actually what I did was prepare all my copy and I had to prepare all the copy myself for that paper while I worked on it, all through the time, was prepare all my copy in Rapport's office in the Empire Building here on Madison and Second, the Party Headquarters. For two weeks I had to do that, and surreptitiously get it to the printer because there were one or two people—there was the one man particularly, Emmanuel Webber was his name, who was secretary-treasurer of the IWA. He was the fly in the ointment in that office—International office. He was anti-Party. He came from Portland and they later on came to know—

Q. He belonged to the anti-Communist Party?

A. Anti-Communist Party, and they didn't want him to know that a new editor was in town, that a move was on to transfer the paper. He probably suspected something like that. If I went up to the Timber Workers office, which was part of the International Workers of America office, he would see me there, want to know who the heck I was, all about it, and that would spoil the game, so I had to stay away from my own office for a couple of weeks and get that paper out.

Q. And you got it out in the office of Morris Rapport, the district secretary of the Communist Party for the Northwest?

A. For the most part. I did some of the work at night in my hotel room where I lived. For the most part in that—in that office.

Q. Now were you assigned any other party responsibilities here besides being editor of this paper?

A. Yes. Shortly after that, and I can't remember the exact date again, I was made educational director for the Northwest District of the Communist Party. That took in Oregon, Washington and Idaho.

Q. In reality then, you were working very closely with Mr. Rappaport?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Is the term educational director synonymous with the other term "agit prop"?

A. Agit prop.

Q. Agit prop, and you were the agit prop or educational director for the Northwest district?

A. Yes.

Q. And your territory corresponded with the territory of Morris Rappaport?

A. That's right.

Q. Were you assigned to fractions and units of the Communist Party here in Seattle and requested to attend?

A. From time to time I was asked to—oh, let me illustrate now the situation with different fractions of the Party—I remember once I had to attend, I believe it was a teachers' group. It was very early when I appeared here at the teachers' fraction—shortly after my arrival, and I attended that, and I tried to make head or tail of what the trouble was in there, I don't remember now —I don't remember it who was there, even. And I wasn't particularly interested. I was pretty much overwhelmed with this work of the Timber Worker.

Q. Did you regularly attend Communist Party meetings while you were here in this position?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever attend a Communist Party meeting with Terry Pettus, the editor of another paper here in Seattle at that time?

A. Much later on after my arrival here, I attended a meeting of the Communist Party unit of the Newspaper Guild, with Terry Pettus.

Q. Was Terry Pettus a member of the Communist Party?

A. He was.

Q. Did you receive any other information as in your official position as educational director, that Terry Pettus was a member of the Communist Party?

A. Not in my—not in my official position as educational director. Simply he was discussed. We would talk about Terry Pettus.

Q. We—now who do you mean—you and Morris Rappaport?

A. Well, myself and Rappaport, Harry Jackson, Louie Sass, and other officials of the Party.

Q. Was he discussed as a member of the Communist Party?

A. Well, not very hot, to tell you the truth,—not in a critical sense. He was regarded of course as politically reliable. They knew he wouldn't stray off the reservation. But I remember once we were talking about Terry Pettus. I had never met the gent, and he, I think, was still down in Grays Harbor or Willapa Harbor. He was working on some paper down there. He had a

column there in some local paper, not-Communist in any way, and I had heard he was going to be brought up here to do some work for the Party, and didn't even know what it was, and I said, "Well, who is he?" I knew that his sister, Gladys Pettus, worked in the International Woodworkers' office, so I asked if he were related. I was told he was, and I asked about him, "Well, what do you think of him—what kind of a Communist is he—what kind of a fellow is he?" "Oh," Rapport smiled and said, "Well, you know he is that type—he doesn't have much on the ball, but"—and Harry Jackson said something to the effect, "Well, he is a pretty loud talker. He's a good talker and likes to talk a lot, making speeches," and that kind of banter went on and I said, "Well, I suppose what you mean to say is that he don't sing good, but he sings loud," and they laughed and said "Yes, that is about what we mean."

(Laughter.)

Q. From your subsequent acquaintanceship with Terry Pettus would you say that that was a correct description of him, that he doesn't sing good, but he sings loud?

A. Yes.

(Laughter.)

Q. You have mentioned his sister Gladys Pettus as being employed in the office of the IWA. Was she a member of the Communist Party?

A. She was.

Q. And have you sat in Communist Party meetings with her?

A. I have.

Q. And has information come to you through discussion with other high officials of the Communist Party that she was a member?

A. Oh, I received through discussions with her—I mean, she herself of course, would tell me. I think I asked her once when she joined the Party, how she happened to join and so forth. I don't remember what her answers were, but the direct discussion was with Gladys Pettus herself. I don't think I ever discussed her qualities as a Communist with any officials of the Party.

Q. But you—

A. But I attended Party meetings with her.

Q. Do you know William Pennock?

A. I don't know him personally. That is, I am not a social friend of his. I mean, I never was, but I knew him—that is, I have seen him.

Q. Was William Pennock a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. And how did this information come to you?

A. Well, I had to very frequently be in Rapport's office in my duties with the Timber Worker and as educational director I had to do a lot of that work up there, and once in a while William Pennock would come in there and talk over his problems with Rapport and once in a while he'd be sent for by Rapport and bawled out for something he didn't do the way Rapport wanted it done. Rapport was a man who wanted things done the way Rapport wanted them, and if they weren't, well—

Q. And as an official of the Communist Party over a number of years you are in a position to state that his activities in accepting orders and bawling out from Rapport and because of the discussion among you high officials of the Communist Party, Bill Pennock definitely was a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes. His acceptance was pretty meek. When he got bawled out he was pretty meek about it—promised to be a good boy.

(Laughter.)

Q. Now, during the time you were an official of the district, of the Communist Party, did you know a Tom Rabbitt—Thomas Rabbitt?

A. In the same way that I knew Pennock. He wasn't a fellow that I would go out and have a beer with, but I was present at Communist Party meetings, or rather, at least saw him in Rapport's office. I wouldn't say that I saw him in—I was present at actual meetings with him.

Q. He didn't appeal to you socially, then?

A. He didn't appeal to me as a human being.

(Laughter.)

Q. Yes.

A. He might have as a rabbit, but not as a human being.

(Laughter.)

Q. Was Thomas Rabbitt ever discussed in high councils of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, but not too frequently. He wasn't—I mean, he wasn't the kind of a fellow in the Party that would serve the people like Rapport, Jackson to much—I mean to say that there are other bigger prizes they were more often concerned with, but once in a while he was discussed.

Q. Well, did you ever have discussions about Mr. Rabbitt's ability—what did the Party think of him?

A. Yes, I have heard Harry Jackson to be a little bit derogatory about him in much the same way as about Pettus; that he liked to sound off a lot and he had his use to the Party that way. They didn't regard either one of them as what they would call too politically secure. Those are the words they would use.

Q. All mouth and no brains, eh?

A. Well, I didn't say that, you did.

Q. No, I withdraw that. I am not attempting to testify. Is that the wrong interpretation, then, of what you were trying to say? Suppose you put it in your words.

A. Well, as I said, he—they didn't think he was—there were certain types in the Party that they regarded as—oh, not "Johnny-come-Latelys," but what they would refer to as petty bourgeois, and it is this type of person that you'd mention—consider in that category in the Party. We had our pat phrases for everything and everybody. That was a very good one that we used for quite a while, and there was a lot of contempt toward that type, and of course they never for the world were allowed to know that, but they had their reasons, and still have, I presume.

Q. Was there a rather cynical, contemptuous attitude toward Mr. Rabbitt and Mr. Pennock?

A. I wouldn't say cynical attitude toward them, but they weren't very highly regarded in a political sense—I mean they didn't—Rapport, Jackson, Sass and some of these others didn't think that they were theoretically too well grounded in the Party.

Q. Was that lack of adherence on their part, or loyalty, or ability?

A. No. I wouldn't say lack of ability in some ways. They had ability to do certain types of work that the Party needed and prized very highly.

Q. And did they do that type of work?

A. I assume they did, but I couldn't say for sure, because their line of work with the Party differed from mine, and I didn't pay too much attention.

Q. But you know that they did do Party work?

A. Yes.

Q. During the time you were an official of the Communist Party in this Northwest District did you know a man by the name of Hugh DeLacy?

A. In the same way. I was no friend of DeLacy's—never met him socially. I saw him come into Rapport's office from time to time and get bawled out, take it, like it, at least outwardly and go. Oh, I don't know what—various times I saw that happen, but I did see it a number of times.

Q. Do you know whether or not DeLacy was active in the work of the Communist Party?

A. I know that he was, when I was here in the Communist Party.

Q. Your testimony as an official of the Communist Party here at that time—would Mr. DeLacy be considered a member or not?

A. He was.

Q. He was a member? And you have repeatedly mentioned Harry Jackson. He was an official here also, was he not?

A. He was an official of the Communist Party.

Q. Did you know a man by the name of Howard Costigan?

A. I just saw Costigan come and go occasionally in Rapport's office. I didn't know him personally.

Q. Did Costigan also receive instructions from Rabbitt—I mean from Rapport? And did he from time to time also get bawled out?

A. I heard him get bawled out two or three times and I heard him drop in and talk things over with him—with Rapport as to the work in the WCF—Washington Commonwealth Federation and he never told me he was a Communist. I didn't have to ask him. I knew he wouldn't be up there if he weren't. And Rapport and I when we talked about Costigan talked about Comrade Costigan.

Q. Did you know a man by the name of John Caughlan, an attorney?

A. Never met him. I knew of him, but I never met him.

Q. What did you know of him?

A. Well, I knew that he—only in this, I can't say I knew him the same way as the others—I never saw him at any Communist meeting or at any Communist office, but I have had conversations with Party leaders—Communist Party leaders here, such as Rapport, Jackson and the others that I have mentioned, in which he was referred to as "Comrade Caughlan."

Q. How did the Party consider him? Did they consider him an important man?

A. They considered him as a useful lawyer of the Party. They didn't think he, too, was a heavyweight as far as grounding—theoretical grounding of the Party was concerned. They thought he was quite useful. They were glad to have him.

Q. Did you know a man by the name of Richard Seller? Dick Seller?

A. Very well, yes.

Q. You knew Dick Seller very well?

A. Very well.

Q. Well, did you ever sit in any Party meetings with Dick Seller?

A. Repeatedly.

Q. Repeatedly. What unit was this that Dick Seller sat in?

A. The Communist Party unit of the Newspaper Guild.

Q. When was this?

A. Well, from the very time I arrived here. It started then. I don't remember when Seller left Seattle and went East, I believe he went directly East. He eventually landed up there.

Q. Did you sit in repeated meetings—

A. At his own home.

Q. At his own home. Communist Party meetings were held in his home?

A. Yes. We would revolve these meetings in the homes of different Party members and he was one of them.

Q. Would you say this was in late '37?

A. Starting with late '37.

Q. Starting with late '37 and continuing over a period of time?

A. Continuing over a pretty fairly long period.

Q. Years or months?

A. Well, I suppose at least a year and a half.

Q. A year and a half?

A. Anyway, approximately.

Q. Did he ever visit in your home?

A. I don't recall that he did. I don't recall that. In the first place, when I first came here I was single and I lived in a hotel room, and it was not a good place to have Communist meetings, just a little hotel room downtown here, and I don't believe he ever attended any Communist Party meetings at my home after I was married. He may have, but I don't recall it.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Robert Camozzi?

A. Very well.

Q. Very well. Have you attached—no, I withdraw that. Did Robert Camozzi, or, was he a member of the Communist Party?

A. He was a member of the Communist Party to the day that I quit the Party.

Q. When did you first have knowledge of his membership?

A. I don't think he was a Party member yet when I came here. I think he was in the process of being recruited for the Party, and I suppose maybe it was six or eight months after I had arrived in Seattle that I knew that he actually had become a member. That is a pretty rough estimate.

Q. Then your best fixing of the time would be—Robert Camozzi was recruited into the Party about the summer of '38, then, wouldn't it?

A. No, earlier than that.

Q. Earlier than that?

A. Earlier than that, it would be. Certainly at the very beginning of '38—probably late in '37.

Q. To what unit did Robert Camozzi belong?

A. The Newspaper Guild unit of the Communist Party.

Q. And you have sat, you say, repeatedly in that unit with him?

A. Yes.

University of Washington Library

Q. Do you know Marian Camozzi, now Marian Camozzi Kinney?

A. I knew her as Marian Camozzi, yes.

Q. Was she a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. What unit did she belong to?

A. The Newspaper Guild unit of the Communist Party.

Q. Was she active in that unit?

A. Extremely so.

Q. And have you sat in more than one meeting with her?

A. Yes, many more.

Q. Many more, and what period of time would you place that in?

A. The same as with Robert Camozzi.

Q. Now you mentioned that you have heard discussed that the Party was attempting to recruit Robert Camozzi. How did the Party consider Robert Camozzi? Was he considered a pretty able Communist after they got him?

A. I can answer that best by quoting an example—an incident, rather. When I was editor of the Timber Worker we were in need of a business manager. We had a business manager who was also a Party member, but a very, very poor one, and we were going to get him into some other work, gracefully, and not hurt his feelings too much. We were looking around for another Communist Party member. I was told by the Party—by Rapport and Fritz Scheffner—old Fritz Scheffner was president of the union and a member of the Party, to see if I could find a man—line up a man as a business manager of the Timber Worker, and I thought of some people and discarded them in my mind, and I was pretty chummy with Camozzi—we were pretty close friends, myself and he and Mrs. Honig and Mrs. Camozzi were close friends, and naturally we thought of him. He worked on a newspaper in the circulation department of the Post-Intelligencer, and I figured that might mean he would have some ability as a business manager of the paper. And I came to Pritchett—Harold Pritchett and I said "I think Camozzi should be the man, I would recommend him to be my business manager."

"Well," he said, "I don't know about it—I've seen something of him. I don't care much about him. I don't think he has much on the ball, but I will talk to Rapport about it."

So about two days later he told me that he spoke to Rapport and Rapport said "nothing doing," he wouldn't have the man in such a responsible job, and that will, I suppose, give Rapport's estimation of him, anyway.

Q. Now you have twice referred to Harold Pritchett. Will you identify which Harold Pritchett you are talking about?

A. Well, he is the man who was president of the International Woodworkers Union at the time I was editor of the Timber Worker.

Q. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. I read by this morning's paper that he says he never was. Is that a correct statement?

A. Well, I—I—no, it is not a correct statement. That is all I can say.

Q. You have attended meetings with Harold Pritchett?

A. Numerous meetings with him.

Q. You have discussed the Communist program with Harold Pritchett?

A. Oh, I can almost say almost every day when I was editor of the Timber Worker I would have to do that. He was president of the Union and I was editor of the Union paper. We were both party members. We would have to get together on putting the Party line in the paper, which we did.

Q. Did the Party have any influence in his Union at that time?

A. Yes, a great deal of influence.

Q. Did he further the program of the Communist Party within his union?

A. I think that was his sole aim.

Q. I will ask you if you can identify that picture—have you ever seen that gentleman?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Who is that gentleman?

A. His name is Hurley—I think George Hurley.

Q. George Hurley?

A. Yes, and I met him—I believe that was in 1940—

Q. 1940?

A. No, 1939. Of course it wouldn't be '40—early in '39.

Q. Early in '39.

MR. HOUSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce this as an exhibit for the record.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: It will be accepted as Exhibit No. 12.

(WHEREUPON picture was marked Exhibit No. 12 and received by the Committee.)

BY MR. HOUSTON:

Q. This gentleman you have identified as George Hurley, was he a member of the Communist Party?

A. Well, I will say this about him. He—I was teaching—how I came to meet him and know that he was a member of the Communist Party is this: I was teaching a class for the Communist Party, purely a Communist Party class—only for the members of the Communist Party, a course in the history of the American Labor movement and Hurley was one of my students.

Q. Did any one attend this secret Communist school except members of the Communist Party?

A. No.

Q. And you knew this in your official capacity as educational director for the district.

A. That is right.

Q. And George Hurley attended this secret Communist school as a Communist?

A. Yes. He attended a class.

NEWS REPORTER: Q. Where was this class?

A. Well now, memory—that question—memory serves me badly on that exactly. I believe it was in a place called Norwegian Hall, and I don't know—I know pretty surely that the management of that hall didn't know who was using that class. It was—in hiring that place—we had our classes there weekly—some phoney name was given. I didn't hire the place for the class. The Party—someone from the Party office did. They had no way of knowing what it was.

Q. Did you, or can you fix the date that you taught this particular Communist group, approximately?

A. No, I can't fix the exact date. I can't do that. Possibly Mrs. Honig could. She has the best memory on exact dates than I have. Possibly she could.

Q. Was it shortly after you came here, or was it—

A. No, it was—it was about two years after I came here.

Q. About two years. That would be late '39 or early '40, then?

A. No, it wouldn't be early '40. I left the Party in late '39, so it would be either in the middle of '39 or early '39, I believe.

Q. Middle of '39 or early '39. And all these activities you are now detailing occurred between the time you came here in '37 and late '39?

A. That is right.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Claude Smith?

A. I knew him then.

Q. You knew him then. Would you identify what Claude Smith this is?

A. He was Claude Smith who once was executive secretary of the Newspaper Guild local in Seattle and he was a member of the Newspaper Guild Unit of the Communist Party.

Q. Have you sat in meetings with Claude Smith?

A. Yes, many times. You mean Communist Party meetings?

A. Communist Party meetings.

Q. Do you know his wife?

A. I knew his wife—I don't know if she is his wife now, but Betty Smith then.

Q. His wife was named Betty, then?

A. Betty Smith.

Q. Was she a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know a woman by the name of Hazel Wolfe?

A. I knew her, yes. Not well, but I knew her.

Q. Was this the Hazel Wolfe that was employed down at the Washington New Dealer?

A. I can't recall that. I didn't know her very well. I do know that Hazel Wolfe was a member of the Communist Party. Somebody by that name.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Carl Brooks?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you identify as near as you can, who Carl Brooks was?

A. Carl Brooks is a Negro. He was a member of the Communist Party and he worked with me. For a short time I worked on a writers' project here, a very brief period. He worked there.

Q. Have you sat in Communist Party meetings with Carl Brooks?

A. I am pretty sure that he attended one Newspaper Guild unit of the Communist Party. But Brooks himself, of course, discussed the Party activities —we called each other "Comrade," occasionally. Then also he was discussed in Rapport's office in my presence as "Comrade," doing work among the Negroes. I remember that.

Q. Do you know a man or did you know a man by the name of John Williamson?

A. Yes. John Williamson I knew very well back East, long before I ever came to the west coast.

Q. Who is John Williamson, or who was John Williamson?

A. Well, John Williamson had always been, since long before I joined the Party, and all during my Party days, a to—a very top official of the Communist Party. He has been a member of the central committee of the Party of the political bureau which is a small select group of the Party right at the top. He held positions in various parts of the country as district secretary or district organizer as they then called it. One of them was Cleveland, I remember. For a long time he was a Party leader in Cleveland.

Q. Did you ever know a man known as Jay Rubin?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Will you identify for us who Jay Rubin was?

A. Jay Rubin was a leader of Party work in the Culinary Unions in New York. He was a member of the executive board of the Trade Unions Unit League to which I belonged and whose meetings I attended when I was there for Labor Unity.

Q. Was Jay Rubin a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. And have you sat in meetings with Jay Rubin?

A. I have, many's the time.

Q. Did you know a man by the name of John Steubin?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Was John Steubin, S-t-e-u-b-i-n a member of the Communist Party?

A. I don't believe that man had ever been anything else in his life, because he—he was a member of the Communist Party when it was formed, as I understand. I think at that time he practically—I don't think he ever worked for anybody but the Communist Party.

Q. Will you identify for the record just who John Steubin was?

A. He held various positions for the Party and for the Party organizations. Once he was District Organizer for the New York district of the Communist Party, which is the main district of the Party. Another time he was head of the New York district of the Trade Unions Unity League.

Q. Did you know a man by the name of Carl Reeves?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, who is Carl Reeves?

A. He—among many Communist Party jobs he had, he was for a while head of the International Labor Defense, which was the Communist Party's legal organization, for defending Communists who were arrested for various activities.

Q. Was Carl Reeves a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. Did the Party control the activities of the International Labor Defense?

A. Completely.

Q. This was a Communist Party organization?

A. Yes. That was a Communist Party organization. Not openly, of course.

Q. I will ask you if you have ever seen or know this lady?

A. I have. I can't remember her exact name.

Q. You cannot remember her exact name?

A. No, I can't. I have seen her in Eugene Dennett's office. She was his secretary when he was the head of the C.I.O. council.

Q. You mentioned Eugene Dennett. Was Eugene Dennett a member of the Communist Party?

A. That he was.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Mr. Houston, have we reached a place where we can conveniently recess?

MR. HOUSTON: Yes, in about three minutes' time, if you please, Mr. Chairman?

Q. Have you sat in Communist Party meetings with Eugene Dennett?

A. Oh yes, many times.

Q. Your testimony is that Eugene Dennett also was a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. Just one more question. You continually refer to Rapport's office here. Where was Rapport's office located?

A. Rapport's office was located, the major part of the time that I was in the Party here, in the Empire Building on Second near Madison—I am sure it was near Madison. And a funny thing, of course, in a place called the Empire many an anti-Imperialist demonstration was hatched here in Seattle.

(Laughter.)

MR. HOUSTON: I think we have reached a point where we can recess for lunch.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: We will have a recess until 1:30 o'clock.

(Recess)

(1:45 P.M. January 30, 1948.)

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Shall we proceed.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (resumed)

BY MR. HOUSTON:

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, before we recessed at lunch, you had discussed some of the people you knew here. During the time you were in Seattle, did you know a man by the name of Al Bristol?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that B-r-i-s-t-o-l?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you identify Mr. Bristol?

A. Well, when I arrived in Seattle from San Francisco, Al Bristol was the county organizer for the Communist Party. They had their office up on Second Avenue, and I do forget the address—quite a ways up on Second Avenue —down close to Stewart, anyway.

Q. Was Al Bristol a member of the Communist Party?

A. He was a member and employee of the Communist Party.

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, I will ask you if you recognize this document. Have you ever seen that before?

A. I have never seen this document before, but I recognize the author and—

Q. Who is the author?

A. Well, they call him the Red Dean in England. He is Dean of Canterbury and he is pretty well known as a Communist.

Q. And in Communist Party circles?

A. And in Communist Party circles. He has managed to retain an extremely high position in the Church of England and has become a convert of the Communist Party at the same time. It is one of those exceptional cases.

Q. What is the title of the book that you have there?

A. Secret of Soviet Strength.

Q. Now I will ask you to look on the reverse side. What does that rubber stamp insignia say?

A. Well, it says Frontier Book Store, 710 Olive Way, Seattle 1, Washington.

Q. Do you recognize that book store?

A. Yes. That is a Communist Party book store.

Q. That is the Communist Party book store, and was while you were an official of the Communist Party here in the City of Seattle?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you consider this Communist propaganda?

A. I haven't read the book but I couldn't conceive of anything written by Hewlett Johnson, the Dean of Canterbury that wasn't and I know for a fact—I notice here the International Publishers are given as the publishers. That is 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, and I know that as a fact, they are the official publishers of Communist literature. They have published and as a matter of fact it even lists books here by Stalin and so forth—Maurice Dobb, who is an English Communist leader, and—

Q. How do you spell that Dobb?

A. D-o-b-b. I—I used to know the—when I was in New York in the party, I used to know who was in charge of the International Publishers pretty well. I have met with him in very tough Communist Party meetings. I knew the man who ran it—Alexander Traxenburg, an old time Communist, that is an official actually—I don't know if it—if they will admit it is official, but they have never published anything but—but outright Communist literature.

Q. And that is the publishing house who put this book out?

A. Yes, that is.

Q. As a high official of the Communist Party for some twelve years, would you class this, then, as a Communist publication?

A. I would be inclined to do so even though I had not read it.

MR. HOUSTON: May I admit this in evidence, Mr. Chairman? The relationship will be brought out by a later witness.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: It will be admitted as No. 13.

(WHEREUPON, book entitled "Secret of Soviet Strength" was ADMITTED in evidence as EXHIBIT No. 13, and is attached hereto and made a part hereof.)

BY MR. HOUSTON:

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, before lunch you had detailed your experiences until the time you arrived in Seattle, and then we branched off into your experiences as educational director, or what do you call it—agit prop?

A. That was the former name, and when they decided to Americanize the Party, as the phrase was, they started to change these old names, European style names, and they started to call that job educational director.

Q. Does the Communist Party go in for educational directors in these various organizations?

A. Every district of the Party has an educational director—section of the Party—every subdivision of the Party to the lowest unit.

Q. Whether they needed one, or not?

A. Well, from the Communist Party's point of view, for the carrying out of its work and its propaganda, they needed one.

Q. Was that also their policy on the front organizations they controlled?

A. No, I don't believe that I can remember any front organizations that would have that title—that had anybody with such a title, because the educational director of the Party itself would carry out that work in the front organization, so that would be a duplication.

Q. Did you receive any salary as editor of the Timber Worker's publication?

A. Yes.

Q. What salary were you promised, when you came here?

A. Fifty dollars a week—well, when I left San Francisco, with the intention of resuming—assuming that job, I wasn't promised any salary and I didn't ask about that but when I came here with Rapport—I was told that would be my salary.

Q. Your salary was—you were advised of your salary by the District Organizer of the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. Despite the fact that you were to publish a journal for a labor organization?

A. That's right.

Q. What, if any, conversation did you have pertaining to your salary?

A. Well, I was pretty glad to hear that I was going to get $50 a week, and I at first assumed that was what I was going to get—then pretty quickly Rapport disillusioned me—Harry Jackson was there with him, of course Jackson was the trade union secretary for the Party in the district on that business, too, so they both pretty quickly told me that I was going to have to kick back $12.50 a week of that. I didn't protest that because I thought, "Well, the Communist Party had gotten me the job and I had no right to question their right to do that."

Q. To whom were you to kick back this $12.50 a week?

A. Directly to either Rapport or Jackson, or one of the members of the district executive committee in Rapport's office.

Q. Was this a private graft on their part or was it a money raising scheme of the Communist Party?

A. I had discussed that with them later on what the money was used for—not that I questioned—hadn't decided that I wasn't going to give it any more, but I just wanted to know—and they told me well it was to help pay their salaries for one thing. And, oh, they claimed that they were really existing on very little money, maybe $15 or $10 a week when they could get it and just by doing those things they were able to themselves live.

Q. Now this—would you say then that this cut of twenty-five per cent out of your salary went for purposes of the Communist Party?

A. Yes. I knew that.

Q. You knew that. Is that a rather common practice within the Communist Party?

A. It was at that time. It was, I think, all the time that I was in the Party.

Q. Correct me if I am wrong here. Do I understand you that you were working for the International Woodworkers Association?

A. International Woodworkers of America.

Q. International Woodworkers of America, a trade union, and they were paying you $50 a week, but of that $12.50 was going to the Communist Party?

A. That's right.

Q. Indirectly then, the Woodworkers Union were helping to finance the Communist Party?

A. Yes, without the knowledge of its members.

Q. Now, what editorial policy did the paper follow?

A. Well, naturally since they had grabbed the paper away from the anti-Party elements in the Union, I was brought there to make sure they followed a strict Communist policy—a policy that fit in in every respect with the Communist line, and I set out to do that.

Q. Were you more interested in publishing and advancing the Communist Party line, or the cause of the woodworkers in this paper?

A. Well if you mean I myself, personally, I must admit that I was more interested in advancing the Communist Party at that time than I was in the interests of the workers of that union.

Q. Did the Communist Party have a direct control over the paper?

A. Direct, yes.

Q. Do you—did you know the publication then known as the Sunday News?

A. Yes.

Q. Was this paper an unofficial organ of the Communist Party?

A. Well, its editors were named by the Communist Party leadership. I don't know whether you could hold some minor job—somehow get a minor job and not necessarily be a Communist, although you would have to be a left-winger, I guess. But I know you couldn't have a leading job on the Sunday News and not be a member of the Party.

Q. Was this paper also controlled by the Communist Party?

A. To my knowledge, from my conversation with other Party members, with leaders of the Party, it was controlled in the same way as the International Woodworkers paper was, by the Party.

Q. And you have testified that the control of your paper was complete?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know who was editor of that paper?

A. Well, I couldn't give you any chronological order—I think they had a succession of editors—I am a little hazy on what succession it was—who came first or last. I know I could name one editor of Sunday News, James Cour.

Q. Is that C-o-o-r?

A. I think it is.

Q. James Coor—is he a small fellow?

A. Not C—no, I don't believe it is C-o-o-r, I think it is C-o-u-r, but I am not altogether sure on the spelling.

Q. Rather small fellow, isn't he?

A. Yes.

Q. Was James Cour a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. You have sat in Communist Party meetings with him, and you have transacted Communist Party business with him?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know, or did you know a paper known as the Washington New Dealer?

A. Yes, in the same way that I know the Sunday News.

Q. Who controlled the policy of the Washington New Dealer?

A. The Communist Party did. I know that because I heard the Washington New Dealer discussed in Rapport's office and sometimes criticized, and sometimes I have mentioned that Costigan sometimes would be bawled out by Rapport, sometimes he would be bawled out about the—the failure to print something that Rapport thought should be printed and so forth.

Q. Was Mr. Cour ever editor of the Washington New Dealer?

A. I wouldn't say absolutely—I believe he might have been for a short time. I know he was editor of the Sunday News, and when it changed its name I don't remember whether he continued on. I think he did.

Q. Now, do you know a gentleman by the name of Abe Cohen?

A. Yes.

Q. Who is Abe Cohen?

A. Abe Cohen is an employee of the Post Intelligencer and—in the editorial department. He was a member of the Communist Party when I was. I don't know whether he still is, but he was then.

Q. Did you ever sit in Communist Party meetings with Abe Cohen?

A. Yes. Frequently.

Q. And you have transacted business with him?

A. Yes.

Q. Communist Party business?

A. Yes.

Q. While you were in Seattle, you testified you were a single man when you came here, did you get married?

A. Yes.

Q. Whom did you marry?

A. Well, my wife is sitting here.

Q. What was her name?

A. Her name was Erla Page, then.

Q. How do you spell that?

A. E-r-l-a P-a-g-e.

Q. Erla Page?

A. Yeah.

Q. When did you marry Miss Page?

A. In May, 1938. May 1st.

Q. Was Miss Page a member of the Communist Party?

A. She was, at the time.

Q. You and she set up housekeeping?

A. Yes.

Q. Well, did you find it a little more difficult to live on this $37.50 a week, and kick your $12.50 a week back after you were married, than when you were single?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Well, did you say anything to anybody about it—did you ask for more money?

A. I didn't ask for more money, but I asked for less kickback. (Laughter.)

Q. Whom did you ask for less kick-back?

A. I went to Pritchett who was the head of the IWA and told him that I didn't think I would be able to get along on $37.50 now that I was getting married, and I told him I was agreeable to a kick-back but not quite that much any more, and he again went to Rapport and he said he would see him about that. And Rapport didn't get in touch with me, but he sent down Harry Jackson and Louie Sass who were members of the Rapport staff there in district headquarters of the Party, and they pinned me right in the International Woodworkers' office at my job—at my desk as the editor of the Timber Worker and told me, and I don't think they even bothered to lower their voices. This was of course the union office, and said, "We hear that you are griping a little bit about giving this money to the Party." "Well," I said, "I do think that I ought to give a little less money now that I am getting married," and they said, "Well, you know who got you this job," and I said, "I am well aware of that," and they began to get a little bit abusive about it, where money was concerned they would. And I told them that, I said, "You don't have to get nasty about it," I said, "You are taking that money from me, you can at least be decent about it," and they said, "Well, we are not decent people. That's a bourgeoise term."

Q. And they continued to take it from you?

A. They continued.

Q. And you continued to protest?

A. No, I didn't any longer.

Q. You were a good Party member then, you accepted it?

A. Oh, I knew it would be useless.

Q. Now did you join the Guild—Newspaper Guild while you were here?

A. No. I had been a member of the Newspaper Guild long before that, in San Francisco—a year or two after it was first organized.

Q. Did you associate yourself with the local Seattle chapter of the Guild?

A. Yes, as soon as I came here.

Q. Was your wife a member of the Guild?

A. Yes.

Q. Were you active in Guild affairs?

A. Well, we attended meetings fairly regularly, yes. We didn't take an active part in the Guild—just—we were members. My wife had been more active than I was because she had been involved in a strike at the Seattle Star before. She—she wasn't leader of the Guild or anything like that.

Q. Did you hold any office in the Guild?

A. Not for some time after I came here.

Q. I will ask you whether or not you were ever elected as a delegate to the convention—national convention of the Guild?

A. Yes. Well, I didn't consider that holding office. I was—my wife and I both were elected as delegates to the national convention of the Guild in Toronto in 1938.

Q. Did you attend the national convention?

A. Yes.

Q. Were there other Communists present at this national convention?

A. Yes, many of them.

Q. Did you have any commingling or inter-relationship with them?

A. Yes, aside from purely personal get-together of other party members, we had had a fraction—a special fraction set up for the convention. The Party always did that in trades in conventions. We had a member of the political bureau of the Communist Party from New York, Roy Hudson.

Q. Is that H-u-d-s-o-n?

A. Right. He was a seaman—he had been a seaman. He was there to whip us into line—make sure that we followed the party line, instructed us all the way down the line.

Q. In other words, he was there to control the activities of the Communist Party delegates at this convention?

A. That's right.

Q. And to hold you in line in the name of the National Committee of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, to make sure that we carried out every instruction.

Q. Did you hold fraction meetings at various times at this convention?

A. We did.

Q. Did you organize your strength?

A. Yes. That was the purpose of our meeting.

Q. The purpose of it. Did you succeed in controlling the convention?

A. I think the Communist Party pretty well did that year.

Q. Do you care to detail for us any of the plans, or how they did it, seeing you testified they were a well-organized minority group there?

A. Very well organized, and that is how they did it. They were not a majority, of course, there. The majority of delegates and members of the Guild had always been hostile to the Communist Party.

But the Communists were able in the first place to elect a majority of delegates by being the one group—to be an organized group. Communists would attend meetings, local meetings where delegates were elected, where others would not, because Communists could be ordered to do so, unfortunately, and since they would be the most numerous group at the local guild meetings they would elect delegates to many of these important places, and as at that 1938 convention we are speaking of, why they had a majority of delegates or else the outright Communist Party members was always pretty close to it.

Q. Did you fight and carry out the Party line at that convention?

A. Yes. There was a lot of fighting about it. The anti-Communists were a minority, but they fought pretty bitterly about that.

Q. And you and your wife carried out every desire of the Communist Party?

A. That's right.

Q. At that convention. Did you subsequently return to Seattle?

A. Yes.

Q. And to your job?

A. Well, that was my intention, but when I arrived at my job I found the desk was occupied by the man I had picked to replace myself while I was away and he was supposed to have been gone by then, and I wondered about it. So I told my—I don't know who told me—to go in and see Mickey

Orton, who was the vice president of the International Union. I went in to see Mickey and he hung his head and he wouldn't look at me, he wouldn't face me, he said, "Well, Nat, Rapport told me to tell you that we didn't think you could serve here any more as editor, that you wouldn't be the man for it," or words to that effect. I don't know his exact words, but that I was fired, in other words. And I asked him why. He wouldn't tell me. Nobody ever did tell me.

Q. Do you know why?

A. Yes, I have a pretty good idea why.

Q. Why were you fired?

A. Well, the International Woodworkers, just like the Guild and many of the C.I.O. unions and some of the A. F. of L. unions at that time and probably since—although there might be a majority of Communists in control of these unions, there was a very strong minority fighting to oust Communistic control. We had that situation in the International Woodworkers. The group, particularly in the Columbia River District of the unions, was very strong to control their district completely, and they even had one of their members as secretary-treasurer in the International Office. Well, the rank and file down there, were particularly, I mean very openly anti-Communist, and one of my first—one of the first things I did when I became editor was to establish a page in that paper that they had never had before, which I called the Voice of the Union Members, and it was to consist of letters from any member of the union who wanted to write on any subject he felt like. I thought that was a fair thing. Of course their dues put out the paper—paid for that paper and paid my salary. Well, I started it and at first I was told, of course, that we were only going to print letters that didn't in any way clash with the Party line. I faithfully did that. Later on, I got the idea that—not that I was altruistic particularly toward the workers, although I did get to find—get to know and like a lot of these opposition workers on the Columbia River, and met them at various conventions. They were pretty fine people, as were some of those who followed the Communist line. They were just workers. And I got the idea that if we would print their letters too, it would not only be the fair thing to do, but it would enhance the Communist Party position in the union. I tried to—I figured that if Pritchett were accused of being a Communist, which he was by the opposition, or Horton or any of the others, they could say, "Well, here is our union paper. We give everybody a voice in it." So I started to print those letters, and pretty soon I got started to get bawled out for that.

Q. Who bawled you out?

A. Pritchett. He told me that Rapport was very much put about that, printing these opposition letters, that he didn't mind a few harmless ones that might talk about the weather or something like that, or about conditions in the logging mills, or camps, or I mean lumber mills, but when I printed a letter that took a stand on union affairs or on issues that the Party was interested in, took an opposition stand, why they wouldn't go for that, so I tried to convince Pritchett and later Rapport that that would be—wouldn't do the Party a bit of harm, it would certainly make them seem to be fair-minded, they wouldn't go for that at all, and I was told to discontinue it and I just couldn't do it. I had promised a lot of these people that—got to know them and liked them. I knew it was their paper too, and I couldn't do it, and I kept on printing. Maybe I did—I know I did print less of their letters,

trying to appease Rapport, Pritchett, Orton—but I kept printing some of—some of them, and that again made my position pretty untenable, there.

Q. The majority of the letters you printed were favorable to the Communist Party and the Communist Party line?

A. Yes.

Q. Just a small space was given to these anti-Communist letters?

A. Well, it wasn't a corner or anything, I scattered them around, a small percentage.

Q. Small percentage?

A. Yes.

Q. And they were the most vicious of the anti-Communist letters which you chose, were they not?

A. No, not particularly. I chose—I had a limited space and I was going to give the majority of space to the friendly letters—that is, friendly to the Communist line, but I chose them without regard to their viciousness or otherwise, the anti-Party ones. As long as they weren't the kind of stuff you couldn't print in any papers. They weren't abusive to the extent of being obscene or something. Both factions would sometimes step out of line some—some that would do that.

Q. You figure this was the reason why you were released from the paper?

A. Well, I knew that. It wasn't a total surprise to me, although I let on that it was; because gradually Pritchett would hardly talk to me, and as long as we had been pretty close friends to each other—not that we had spent a lot of time together, but we were very friendly and got along swell together—but then I remember when something came up, some—some important political event in the country, I'd go to Pritchett, I used to, always got a statement from him to pin on the front page of the paper. The union president's attitude on an issue like that—it got so that he never would give me any statement any more. He didn't want to cooperate in any way. He was trying to make it impossible for me to continue.

Q. What did you do after you were released from this position, or how did you feel to be back fighting for the Communist Party line at a convention and then stealing your job while you were gone?

A. Not good.

Q. What did you do then?

A. Well, I remember a peculiar thing that had been done, just to show—at the office there. This J. Richard Seller. I don't remember his first name, H. Richard Seller, I believe, but Dick Seller, we always called him—had been the leading Party hatchet man in the Guild, and he had come over with the bright idea of establishing a Guild unit in the Timber Worker. We only had a staff of two editorial workers, and one secretary, and I believe it was even a rule in the Guild that you had to have a minimum of five to get a Guild unit, but somehow or other we fixed that up by bringing in a couple of girls who did some part-time work occasionally when we needed some help, and making them members, and we had our unit. And Dick said, and I thought that was right, it looked pretty good. Here is a union paper—it should have a Guild unit, too. Well, of course, we signed the best Guild contract we could, to make that look very good, for our sakes. The minimum was something like sixty or sixty-five dollars a week, which we never got, although I don't doubt that on the books it was made to appear that I was getting paid sixty-five dollars a week, in conformity with the Guild contract. Of course, I never got anything like that. And I remember that one of the clauses in there was on severance pay, which is a standard Guild clause, that if a man is ousted from his job for no reason of neglect, of his job, he is entitled to severance pay based on the amount of weeks he has worked on that paper. So I felt pretty sore about that and I decided I—first of all, I needed the money. We had not been married very long, and we needed it, and I thought—I decided I was going to get that severance pay. I dug up the Guild contract which had been buried, gathering dust, because it only had been a formality, and this time it wasn't going to be a formality. I brought it to Pritchett and he just laughed at it. He says, "You know what that's worth." So I said, "I think it's going to be worth something." So I was a member by that time, elected member of the Gulid Executive Board—local executive board. At the very next meeting I brought it up there and none of the executive board members dreamed that I had any beef with the Party. Some of them I had approached on joining the Party. They knew I was a Party member, but they didn't hold it against me. But anyway, I brought that up and I said I wanted to get my severance pay which would amount to, oh, I think between three and four hundred dollars, which I could use. So the majority of the executive board voted that I was to get that severance pay, that the Guild was to prosecute that case with everything—with all its power. The only one that voted against me were the other Communist Party members on the Board, Camozzi, and Claude Smith, I believe.

Q. That is Robert Camozzi and Claude Smith?

A. And Claude Smith.

Q. Now may I just interrrupt you just a moment? You referred to a man a while back as Mickey Orton. Do you mean O. M. Orton?

A. Yes, O. M. Orton.

Q. Now continue, the Commies on the—

A. Well, the board on the Guild—the Guild board voted that I was to—that they were going to go after that pay for me and some of them even asked me if I wanted them to picket the Arcade Building, where the headquarters were, and I said, "No, by all means, I don't want that." And they didn't. They would have, I think, if I had asked for it. And Claude Smith, I believe it was, and Camozzi both, volunteered to go before the Executive Board to Pritchett and fight the case for me.

Q. Yet they had voted against you?

A. Yes. And I was woolly-witted enough to let that get by at the time. Then they left and they never did fight the case. They come back to me and tell me, "Oh, Pritchett is out of town, Orton is out of town, we can't do anything until we all get together," or "Pritchett is occupied with this and that." And of course it appeared pretty quick to me that they were stalling there. And it got other members of the board a little sore too. Then they changed the committee that was taking up my case and they put non-Party people as the representatives of the board to go before Pritchett. And Pritchett said some pretty harsh things to those guys, those men defying him. Here was an International C. I. O. union president telling responsible officers or board members of another C.I.O. union that he didn't have any respect for any demand that they made or anything they wanted. And it made them hopping mad, but they couldn't do a thing about it because they couldn't strike the Timber Worker—couldn't call a strike on it, because long time had elapsed

there. I had given the thing up for lost—probably a year. "We know you need the money and we are going to be good to you," he said. "I have here a blank I.W.A. check, not a Communist Party check, an I.W.A. check." He said, "I want you to endorse the back of it." It was blank. Well, I was a little leary. I said, "Well, what's the amount of the check, how much am I getting, am I getting the full four hundred dollars that I am entitled to?" "Oh," he said. "now, don't be silly." He said, "If we give you anything—anything we give you is just so much gravy for you now." So I felt that way, too. I felt—I knew that I would get nothing if they decided that—if Rapport himself decided that. So I felt it was better to take peanuts than nothing. So I signed the back of that check. It was a blank check and of course it didn't require much imagination on my part to know what was happening there. That the check was probably being made out for the full amount that was due me, and I was handed, oh, I think it was a hundred and twenty-five dollars. I believe Mrs. Honig would remember that better than I do, she was the housekeeper. And the difference was undoubtedly pocketed by Rapport and the Party union.

Q. Again the difference—

A. I got that in cash, that hundred and twenty-five dollars, after signing the blank check.

Q. Again the Woodworkers paid the full bill?

A. Well, you mean the membership? Yes, whatever was paid, of course, was paid out of the I.W.A. check and the members paid for that.

Q. And the cut—the large cut went into the pockets of the Communist Party?

A. Well, that—that of course, I could see. I didn't ask about that. It wasn't necessary.

Q. Now, Mr. Honig, while you were an official of the Communist Party in the Northwest District, did you ever hear or know anything of an organization called the Old Age Pension Union?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you tell us what you know about that organization, or what you knew then?

A. Well, I knew, of course, that the Communist Party ran it—controlled it, because it was a frequent subject of discussion at district bureau meetings—district executive committee meetings in the office of Rapport. And the conduct of it, how the Party was—how the Party representatives at the head of it were carrying out their work was discussed.

Q. And as an official of the Communist Party in the Northwest District you are positive that the Party held control of this union?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Did the Party use it to further the activities of the Party?

A. Yes, of course, it used any organization controlled by it for that.

Q. Now, after you left the Woodworkers as their editor, where did you go?

A. Well, I got a very—for a very brief period I worked on the Writers Project of the W.P.A.

Q. Did you meet any other Comrades there?

A. Yes, a great many.

Q. Would you say they were in the majority?

A. I think they were, although were a sizeable minority of non-Party people there, but the majority were.

Q. And where did you go after that?

A. Well, I began to buck the extra board on the PI copy desk. By that I mean I got a job as an extra man at first, as you usually do when you come into a newspaper office cold, and I was an extra, and pretty soon I got more and more work as an extra and I got pretty nearly as much work—oh, before the year was over—as any regular man there, and then in the course of time I got to be a regular member of the PI staff.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Honig, if in 1939, the latter part of the summer, you attended a plenum of the delegates of the Northwest District of the Communist Party in the Polish Hall?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you describe the nature of that meeting, who the speakers were, and what the Party line was at that time?

A. Well, it was a rather routine meeting—Jack Stachel who was a member of the Party central committee was in town, he was making a tour of duty around the country for the Party, and the plenum, is what it's—it's a gathering together of functionaries of the Party—leading members of the Party—and they come from the three Northwest states—it became a rather routine talk, and the banners there were the usual banners that we had had for the last two years of Communism—Americanism being the Communism of the 20th Century, and Defend Democracy With All Our Strength, and Down With Fascism, and so forth, the routine thing, without any real meaning behind it—any heartfelt meanings.

Jack Stachel gave the usual peppy talk on how we must defend democracy from the Fascists, the Fascists were aggressors, how the Soviet Union was foremost among the democracies, and the United States was a democracy to us—it was then, and the usual rot, of course. That was about the size of it.

Q. Were there any other national figures there besides this Stachel?

A. I don't recall any, I don't.

Q. Now did any event of significance in world affairs occur shortly after that plenum?

A. Yes. Two days later the famous pact between Russia and Germany was signed.

Q. Two days before you had had a plenum and had cheered the Party line which is in direct opposition to Fascism and National Socialism of Germany?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Well, what did the Party do?

A. Well, two days later the plenum was very hastily re-assembled. And the same Jack Stachel was there and gave the same pep talk word for word, only directly the opposite. This time democracy was the enemy. The war-mongering enemy, all of a sudden, overnight. We had made many mistakes, the Party had, not Stalin had, nor in Moscow, but we had. And we must retrace our steps and erase these mistakes, realize that America, Britain and France, the democratic capitalist countries were preparing for war on Russia, on the workers' fatherland. All that stuff. Just the opposite to—yet the cheers were exactly the same for that, and not a questioner in the audience. Nobody got up and said, "Comrade, you said the other way around just two days ago." Nothing like that.

Q. Was there just as much applause at this direct reversal of Party line as there had been, before?

A. Just about, pretty near.

Q. But you didn't have any of the same banners out?

A. Oh, no. The banners were gone. There were no banners.

Q. They didn't have time to make new ones. Well, how did you personally accept this direct reversal of Party line?

A. Well, I went home, discussed it with my wife, and we decided we were through, finally and at last. We couldn't feature being partners of Hitler.

Q. Did you openly break with the Party?

A. No. We said to ourselves, to each other, "We are going to—not going to make any show of it—we are not going to denounce the Party, we still feel that at heart the ideals that had brought us into the Party still ruled us, but we were not going to even tell the Party we were quitting, we were going to sit tight, try to forget the whole darned business, and that was all to it. We hoped to be left alone.

Q. Did the Party leave you alone?

A. No, it didn't. Oh, about two weeks later somebody, some young person came over to see us—some fellow—he came from the county headquarters of the Party and wanted to know why we hadn't been attending meetings lately. We told him that we were through with the Party, and he said—to the best of my recollection, not his exact words—here was a fellow that seemed to us couldn't have been in the Party much more than a few months, and I had been in for twelve years, and he started to tell me how this line—this new line, explain it to me, you know. It amused me a lot. Not that I wanted to appear snobbish about it, but it really was funny. And I told him that the line was phony, we didn't believe in it, and we were through. And about two weeks later, I may not be spacing my time right, but somewhat later, somebody else came and wanted to know wouldn't we reconsider—wouldn't we come back to the Party. He tried to tell me that I had been so important in the Party. He could not understand why we were leaving. And I told him why. I said, "Now, go back to whoever sent you and tell them if they will leave us alone, we will leave them alone and never say a word about the Party to anybody, we will never mention anybody as being a Party member, and that is all we want." And we didn't hear anything for a while. Then I began to see that some of the Party members, one of them employed at the PI, Camozzi, were trying their best in their crude way to get me out of my job there at the PI. They were booming a Party member, who worked in another section of the editorial department to try to push him in as apprentice on the copy desk, and we didn't have room for an apprentice, at the time. I was the extra man. I guess they were trying to push him in as an extra man. First as an apprentice for a while, then as an extra man, and that would have pushed me out. Of course, there was no doubt about that. The man they were pushing was this Abie Cohen, and Claude Smith came right out at a PI unit meeting—now this is a different kind of a unit than a Party unit—the Guild also uses that terminology for the Guild group on the individual paper. It was then, anyway, called a unit. I don't know what it is called now, because we don't have a Guild where I am. But at this P.I. meeting of the Guild members, Claude Smith mentioned that he was going to try to bring Abie Cohen in on the copy desk. I didn't say anything at the meeting, but I buttonholed Smith and I said, "What are you going to try to do? You are going to try to get me out of my job there, aren't you?" I said, "Now, you know what I told the Party I had also told Camozzi meanwhile, that if they would lay off me I would lay off them, and would not bother the Party in any way." I could see that they were not keeping their end of the bargain if they ever had made a bargain with me. Well, Claude Smith hedged. He wouldn't commit himself one way or the other. I spoke to some of the non-Party people there and they agreed with me that it was pretty obvious just what Claude was aiming at. And it made me pretty darned mad. I got ahold of Camozzi and I said, "Now, if this is what you are trying to do—"

Q. Was that Robert Camozzi you got ahold of?

A. Yes. I said, "If this is what you are trying to do, I am going to open up on you people." The opposition to the Party in the Guild which was growing stronger all the time, had approached me several times, particularly the fellows we had, the wife and I had, at one time tried to recruit into the Party, they knew we were Party members, and had told us rather guardedly at first, they didn't know whether they could trust us yet—of the fight that was brewing against the Party, to oust the Party from the leadership in the Guild. And I had turned them down each time—so had my wife. We just felt that it would be wrong for us to do anything against the Party. We thought it would mean that we were stool pigeons, and so forth. We had been so imbued with that kind of psychology in the Party, so we never would have anything to do with any of these attempts to get us to work with the enemies of the Party in the Guild. But when this happened and I saw obviously what they were trying to do to me—trying to deprive me of a livelihood, I did approach—I forget which one of the anti-Party leaders in the Guild and I told them that whenever they wanted me, I would be ready to get up on the floor of the Guild and tell just which members of the Guild were Party members, just what the Party had been doing in the Guild and to the Guild. And that happened.

Q. And this was in 1940?

A. Yes, this was early in 1940.

Q. And you have not at any time re-affiliated with the Party?

A. No.

Q. —since that time?

A. No.

Q. Now, you have mentioned once or twice about Party members denying membership. Will you discuss that—is—does a member of the Communist Party deny that he is a member?

A. All but a few. The only ones who admit, of course, openly, that they are members, are those like Rapport, who is the open leader of—was at that time the open leader of the district Party, had to issue statements in the name of the Party and sign his name, you know, in leaflets given out—people like Earl Browder, of course, like that, who were openly Party leaders. Otherwise Party members will never admit to a non-Party member that he is a Party member, unless it is somebody that he feels he can trust implicitly and is trying to recruit into the Party.

Q. And you, from having been an official of the Communist Party, for some twelve years, can you conceive of a case where a non-Party member would ever recruit anyone into the Communist Party?

A. Where a non-Party member would recruit—

Q. Yes.
A. No. No.
Q. Is it good evidence of Party membership if you can prove that someone tried to recruit someone else into the Party?
A. In my judgment, is it unimpeachable evidence.
Q. Unimpeachable evidence.
A. Unimpeachable evidence.
Q. Is the Communist Party revolutionary in character?
A. Yes.
Q. Do they teach revolution?
A. They have always taught that.
Q. Always taught that. Is that a bloodless revolution or a revolution of blood?
A. It is a revolution of blood. Of course, the Communist Party, if it could get away without the difficulty of sacrificing any of its own members or anybody would like to have that, but they know that it is practically impossible anywhere. So Communists are taught that a bloody revolution is generally necessary, and that we mustn't flinch from that.
Q. You mustn't flinch from the blood?
A. From the shedding of blood to achieve Soviet power.
Q. Does the Communist Party teach the liquidation of the opposition?
A. Oh yes, teaches it and practices it if it can.
Q. Would you interpret that for us?
A. Well, the Communist Party teaches it—not only does it teach it, but the founders of the Communist Party, such as Lenin, have written repeatedly in their works that on seizure of power by the Communist Party, the first thing that must be done is to wipe out the enemies of the workers' power, as they call it, the Soviet power. They mean wipe out physically. They say so. And what they have done when they have seized the country—they don't purge generally—they did in Russia, of course, take the Czar's family, killed them first, but as far as purge liquidation is concerned, I found—I know by knowledge by speaking to foreign Communists from other countries in Moscow, the first ones there they are bounded to do, seize hold of and execute all the liberals, and the people who have been Socialists, Liberals and so forth, they feel that these men have quite a control of trade unions, for one thing, and stand between the Communist Party and the people who work in factories and on the farms, and I think that was brought out by their behavior in the Balkan countries. First ones who have been killed have been the peasant leaders and the Socialist leaders, Liberal leaders generally, are imprisoned and then later on such of the more conservative leaders that still haven't been able to flee the country, they kill them, too. But sometimes, it has been done just lately in the Balkans, they have taken men who have worked with Hitler and incorporated them into the Communist movement and killed the Liberals.
Q. Do they teach the liquidation of the capitalists?
A. Oh yes, they teach the overthrow of the capitalist class.
Q. This overthrow, is that to be a complete overthrow of our counties, cities, states, national government?
A. Well, it inevitably would mean a revamping of the entire structure and set-up of the government as we know it. They had that in Russia, so I assume. They don't have that in black and white because they don't know in advance exactly what conditions will be when they have their seizure of power.

Q. Do they have mapped out the form of government that they would wish to institute in this country?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Is that a form of government similar to the form of government in Russia?
A. As far as can be done practically, it actually duplicates it.
Q. From your knowledge of the Communist Party and your time spent in Russia, can you state what kind of a form of Government they have in Russia?
A. They have, I would say, the most extreme form of dictatorship of one machine and one man that I have ever heard about, or read about, and I really—
Q. All powers vested in one man—
A. All power is vested in one man and in a machine which that one man himself controls.
Q. Is there—is the Communist Party a democratic organization?
A. No. If you can think of anything that could be just the antithesis, the exact opposite, that would be the Communist Party.
Q. Does the Communist Party teach the use of legal means of obtaining power?
A. It teaches the use of legal means of electing people to office but not of obtaining power. It doesn't believe that legal means can obtain power for the Party, the Communist Party.
Q. Does the Communist Party confine itself to legal means to advance its purposes in the cause?
A. No.
Q. Would it, if the occasion presented itself, use illegal means?
A. Oh, yes. It reconciles itself to the fact that it would have to.
Q. Is this taught in the Communist schools?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. And to Communists. To whom do the Communists owe loyalty?
A. Communists of any country owe loyalty first of all to Stalin and to the —and the only country they owe loyalty to is the Soviet Union.
Q. In the event of war between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, to whom would the Communists be loyal?
A. Well, I think every Communist has no doubt in his mind, that his first loyalty would be to the Soviet Union.
Q. Would their disloyalty here take the form of attempting to sabotage and undermine our war?
A. I think that is the absolute understanding among Communists. It was when I was in the Party, always.
Q. Is the Communist Party—I withdraw that—is Atheism a tenet of the Communist Party?
A. Not openly any more, but once it was. When I joined the Party in '27 it was, openly. You had to declare yourself an Atheist. Or at least you had to declare yourself not a member of any church. If you had any, you had to

declare that you had disconnected yourself from it. But when they changed their line in 1935 to making appeal—a bid for Americans, and started the slogan of Communism being the Democracy of the 20th Century, and so forth, they also realized that they could get a great many members into the Communist ranks who thought of themselves as Liberals and who were churchgoers—who went to church, particularly in such organizations as the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. And so, they adopted a new attack then, in regard—an open attack, that is, toward the basic anti-religious attitude hadn't changed one bit, but in order to get a big mass of new members into the Party they would go to people and tell them, now, whether you are a Catholic, or Protestant, or Jew, or anything else, we don't ask you to give up your religion; on the contrary, the Communist Party realizes the importance of these religions and wants you to continue in them and so forth.

They figured and what they did do is get them in to join them—have them join—and then, by Communist propaganda within the organization when you had them sewed up, after a period of time they would naturally, of their own inclination, ditch the religion they were attached to.

Q. Educate their religion out of them?

A. Yes.

Q. Well, from that will you say that the Communist Party advocates duplicity?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Does the Communist Party exercise any discipline over its people?

A. Yes. Very complete discipline. Tries to as far as it can.

Q. Does it tolerate other than complete obedience and submission on the part of its members?

A. No, you cannot bluff Communist Party policy or line on any matter and remain a Communist Party member. You would be ousted.

Q. Do you think that Communism is a present day threat to the United States of America?

A. Very much.

Q. Do you think that they have made sufficient inroads to where they are a threat to the future existence of our country?

A. I personally don't think that they have made sufficient inroads to the point where they can seize power now or in the immediate future. I don't think they could do that—I don't think they have too much confidence in the people of this country. I think what they can do, is sow so much dissension, in all kinds of organizations in which they work, raise so much chaos and sow so much hatred and distrust between groups and classes and so forth, that they can really make it duck soup at some future time. Almost any kind of dictator can step in and take over.

Q. With the chips down as they are—I withdraw that as not a proper question.

With conditions as they are between Russia and the United States today, would it be your testimony that a loyal member of the Communist Party is a traitor to the United States of America?

A. Well, it's kind of hard to define that. He is a traitor at heart. Of course, he hasn't always committed an actual deed of treachery to the United States, but he certainly is potential actual traitor.

Q. He is a potential actual traitor.

MR. HOUSTON: Mr. Chairman, that concludes my questioning of this witness.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: That will be all.

(Witness Excused)

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: I wonder if this would not be a time to take a short recess. I would like to have a little more air in here.

(Recess)

MR. HOUSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall Mr. Honig to the stand for just another question or two.

NAT HONIG, having been previously sworn, testified on direct examination as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed)

BY MR. HOUSTON:

Q. Mr. Honig, you testified that the Communist Party at one time here had control of the Newspaper Guild. Is that correct?

A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Did the Communist Party control of the Guild affect or in any way influence the editorial policy or the news of any of the Seattle daily papers?

A. It did not, for the simple reason that most of the working newspapermen who actually worked on daily papers in Seattle, at that time, who were in the Guild were not Communists, and strictly abided by the Guild clause in the Guild constitution that the Guild would never permit its members to do such a thing.

Q. Did—to your knowledge was control of the Newspaper Guild wrested from the Communists?

A. Yes. It was wrested from the Communists while I was still in Seattle.

Q. And you assisted in that?

A. Yes. It was done by a series of trials of Communist members who were leaders or officials of the Guild. They were removed by democratic trials of the membership of the Guild.

Q. And expelled from the Guild?

A. No. We would not expel them as members of the Guild. That would mean depriving them of their jobs, and we weren't ready to do that, then. They were just ousted from leadership.

Q. Ousted from leadership?

A. From holding any office.

Q. And when you left here, and to the best of your knowledge now, the Newspaper Guild is not controlled or influenced by the Communist Party?

A. That is right.

MR. HOUSTON: That is all.

(Witness Excused)

MR. HOUSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall the witness Manning Johnson for just one or two questions.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: You may do so.

MR. HOUSTON: May we have Mr. Johnson?

MANNING JOHNSON, having been previously sworn, testified on direct examination as follows: