

Will you state your name, please?

A. Thomas F. Earling.

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Earling?

A. At 3211 42nd Ave., S.W.

Q. How long have you resided in the City of Seattle?

A. Thirty years.

Q. Mr. Earling, do you know a person by the name of William Pennock?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Do you know a person by the name of Hugh DeLacy?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. This Mr. William Pennock you refer to—is he the same person—the same William Pennock who at the present time is the president of the Washington State Pension Union?

A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Earling, I would like to ask you if anyone ever attempted to recruit your membership into the Communist Party?

A. Yes, William Pennock did.

Q. When did William Pennock attempt to recruit you into the Communist Party?

A. In the latter part of 1946.

Q. When did—where did this attempt—where was this attempt made?

A. Up in Hugh DeLacy's headquarters.

Q. Was Hugh DeLacy present at the time?

A. No.

Q. What did Mr. Pennock say to you in his attempt to recruit you into the Communist Party in Hugh DeLacy's headquarters in October of 1946?

A. Oh, he—up in—in Hugh DeLacy's headquarters, he wanted

Q. He wanted what?

A. He wanted—money—to donate.

Q. He wanted you to donate some money?

A. Yes.

Q. Well, what did he say about the Communist Party, if anything?

A. Well, he says—they always—against racial discrimination, it was FEPC.

Q. Now what headquarters did you say this was?

A. Hugh DeLacy headquarters.

Q. Was that a political headquarters, or what?

A. Yes.

Q. Not a Communist Party headquarters?

A. No.

Q. Now where was this headquarters located—what building was it in?

A. It was on Third Avenue about Spring and Seneca, I believe.

Q. What?

A. About between Spring and Seneca. Had a printing establishment on the floor right below that.

Q. All right. Now what reference did Pennock make to you about the Communist Party on this occasion?

A. He wanted me to get into it, this discrimination—

Q. He wanted you to get in what?

A. This Communist Party.

Q. Thank you. That is all. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Thank you, Mr. Earling.

MR. WHIPPLE: Mr. Chairman, that concludes the testimony we have to offer today.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: We will adjourn until 9:30 next Monday morning.

(ADJOURNMENT until 9:30 o'clock, A.M., Monday, February 2, 1948)

February 2, 1948, 9:40 o'clock A. M.

CHAIRMAN CANWELL: The hearing will be in session as soon as the committee arrives.

Are you ready to call your first witness?

MR. HOUSTON: Mr. Costigan, please.

HOWARD G. COSTIGAN, produced as a witness, after being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOUSTON:

MR. HOUSTON: I will ask you, Mr. Costigan, before we proceed, when you use an unusual name or word that you please spell it, because we are recording these proceedings; and also that you answer, when it's necessary to say "yes" or "no" that you answer instead of shaking your head, because the recording device can't record the shake of the head.

Q. Will you please state your name?

A. Howard Gary Costigan.

Q. Are you a resident of the City of Seattle, Mr. Costigan?

A. Well, I expect to be when we own our home.

Q. You have lived here for a number of years?

A. That's right. I was born in Seattle. I was born just a few blocks from here, as a matter of fact.

Q. How old are you, Mr. Costigan?

A. Well, I've had a birthday just a couple of days ago. I'm forty-four.

Q. Forty-four. Mr. Costigan, have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

A. I was a member of the Communist Party, although not a card-carrying member, from I think about the first of—1937 through the first couple of months of 1940.

Q. You left the Communist Party in 1940, is that correct?

A. That's right.

Q. Would that be about April of 1940?

A. Yes, it was before the national convention of the Democratic Party, and my position was—very clearly was supporting the policy of the Roosevelt administration on foreign affairs, and I felt that the collective security program of the Roosevelt administration was still as sound as it had been before the Soviet-Nazi Pact, although there were other members of the top control of the Communist Party in this area who obviously disagreed very sharply, and took the Commonwealth Federation or the ranks of the opposition, and in

support of the isolationist line an effort was made, of course, to obtain full support for Wendell Wilkie during that period.

Q. Now, Mr. Costigan, I will—I'll withdraw that question. Who recruited you into the Communist Party?

A. Morris Rapport, the district organizer.

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

A. Well, I presume that I—I didn't know his name was Morris Rappaport; I've since seen it in material before the committee.

Q. Mr. Costigan, will you explain the circumstances surrounding your being solicited for membership into the Communist Party? The occasion, and what brought it about?

A. Well, in 1935 we formed the Washington Commonwealth Federation. It was not formed with the support of the Communist Party; as a matter of fact, the Communist Party was sharply in opposition to its formation. At that time the Commonwealth Federation was an organization of liberals, of labor, and of generally progressive groups that were supporting the Roosevelt administration. In 1935 the Communist Party was intent upon establishing a third party, called the Farmer-Labor Party nation-wide. They considered Roosevelt a social fascist and they considered me a social fascist too. Following the 1936 plenum of the Communist Party held in New York, the Dimitrov Orientation was instituted. Do you want me to spell that?

Q. Will you spell that word Dimitrov?

A. D-i-m-i-t-r-o-v. That's Georgie Dimitrov who is now the Bulgarian Communist czar. But the Dimitrov Orientation become known as the Popular Front, and it was—it was considered the Democratic front in the United States. Following this change of policy, the Communist Party changed its, became complete anti-fascist in its program and was thoroughly opposed to what it had previously called the Class Struggle Line.

Following that decision, the Communist Party through Trade Union affiliations and through liberal organizations, penetrated the Washington Commonwealth Federation to the point where many of the members of the Executive Board of the Commonwealth Federation were Communists. That is, I mean by that, they were not open Communists; they were covered, or secret Communists.

So during that—and I was told then by Morris Rapport that the general policy of the Communist Party would remain one of anti-fascist support, it would therefore not in any sense of the word counter the program of the Roosevelt administration.

Well, one thing that must be said for the Communist Party members, they're very hard workers, and among other things they attend meetings regularly, they are diligent in pursuing whatever line they're at the moment supposed to be pursuing; and from 1937 through 1939, until the Soviet-Nazi Pact was signed, they were the most ardent and perhaps the most conservative supporters of Roosevelt and the Washington Commonwealth Federation. I was at no time put in the position of taking Party discipline during that period. I was at no time asked to perform functions other than that which I would have performed in any instance, because I was completely supporting the W.C.F. policy and the W.C.F. policy became their policy.

However, in 1939, with the arrival of the startling switch in the Party line, I then began to recognize for the first time that the Communist Party membership were primarily interested in the Soviet Union's foreign policy; and that despite the fact that they had been pro-Roosevelt up to that time. They had even gotten—carried around the buttons for the third term that we had been putting out, and had gone so far as to say that Roosevelt was without doubt the greatest leader in the world, as far as the people were concerned. They suddenly discovered, without any change on his part, that he was the number one war-monger in the world. And that was a little difficult for a lot of people to understand.

Included among those who found it difficult, was your witness. I attempted for some period of time thereafter, to get the progressive forces within the W.C.F., many of whom were probably Communists during that period of time, to accept—that is, I mean many of the leading forces—to accept the idea that Roosevelt was still as sound, that collective security was still correct, that we should quarantine aggressor nations then, and later; but I found that it was impossible, and the Executive Board by that time had been so thoroughly penetrated by the Communist Party, that it was necessary for me to leave the Commonwealth Federation, and I organized the Norris-LaGuardia Committee for Roosevelt in 1940 in the Pacific Northwest, and campaigned against the line that DeLacy and the rest of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party, who were also the Executive Board of the Commonwealth Federation, were pursuing.

Q. Can you fix the date, approximately, that you left the Party, Mr. Costigan?

A. Well, it's a little difficult, because in the first place I was never a card-carrying member, I was never in a unit, I met with—repeatedly on political questions, to discuss it with the top leadership, and I had very little contact, as far as the Party was concerned, on any other basis. I didn't pay any dues. I—I frankly, had no real feeling of being in the Party, except to consult with these people, up to that time.

Of course, as soon as the Party line changed, why, I began to feel the heat. And the heat was intense.

Q. The Communist Party has pursued a course of vilification and persecution?

A. Well, all you have to do is to take a look at the "New World" during the last 1946 campaign, to find out that I am probably hated more than anyone in the Pacific Northwest by the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, I see no particular reason. I am perfectly willing to testify before this committee. I have nothing I want to cover up. As a matter of fact, I haven't anything to lose; that is, at least I haven't a job to lose, because your headlines last week from these committee rooms, saw to the fact that my job was taken too. So—

Q. You have lost your job since this—

A. Oh, yes,—

Q. —hearing began?

A. —I mean, some of the more flamboyant testimony last week helped to do that.

Q. You mentioned the "New World," Mr. Costigan.

A. Pardon me, for interrupting you, but as I am trying to make that point, in 1946 I spent a lot of money, which I didn't have, to try to make it clear that

I was bitterly opposed to—and this is my fundamental opposition to the whole policy of the Communist Party, other than the fact that it's undemocratic, that the only democracy in the party is the right to pick the various reasons why you're for the Party line, whenever it changes, because I mean there is no democracy otherwise. Anybody who opposes the Communist Party line is immediately out. As a matter of fact, there is only one inexorable rule in the Communist Party, I've learned both as one who has had to oppose it and one who worked with it during the period when it was following the Roosevelt policy, and that is that under any circumstances any compromise can be made, any issue can be promoted or discarded, any—even the people's kind of progressive issues, any movement can be built or wrecked, as long as it satisfies the current policy of the Soviet Union. In other words, its foreign policy line. That is an absolute must, for continuing membership in the Communist Party is that you become complete servant—subservient to the Soviet foreign policy.

Now in 1946 it seemed to me that, and it does today, that appeasement of potential aggressors is just as likely to undermine American security as it was in 1937 and '38, when many of the progressive and liberal forces backing Roosevelt, including at that time, of course, although I say in quotes progressive, as far as the Communist Party is concerned, even the Communist Party was backing the policy of the Roosevelt administration in stopping shipments of scrap iron to Japan, in opposing shipments of oil, in suggesting further sanctions against potential aggressors as long as they were members of the Axis.

Well, it occurs to me there is no difference, except there's a greater menace in the totalitarianism of the Soviet Union than there was in the totalitarianism of the Nazis and of the little Sawdust Caesar, the gentleman from Italy, Mr. Mussolini. So consequently, it seems to me that if we were for the use of sanctions against potential aggressors in 1937 when the headquarters of the Axis was in Berlin, there wasn't any real reason why we should differ if we were consistent in 1947 when the totalitarian movement had moved its headquarters to Moscow. And that was my issue against DeLacy, and that was the basis upon which the campaign was fought. And I think it's generally well known, and it certainly ought to be, I put on enough radio broadcasts on it. At the time, also, one of the things that occurred to me, I find that it received very little mention in any of the—in the Communist press and in the "New World," the Atomic Energy Control Plan of the United States, which is probably the only plan that would safeguard the world against a potential third world war, was completely turned down by the Soviet Union, and was turned down by Henry Wallace, and likewise has been—was turned down during the course of the campaign, by DeLacy and the forces that were supporting him.

Q. Mr. Costigan, is it your testimony that the Communist Party has dual objectives? In other words,—

A. Well, I would say this, that the Communist Party—now, my intimate knowledge of the Communist Party came between, as I say, between their shifts. They shifted on to the Democratic Party line, and before that they'd opposed me, they'd opposed a lot of others who were forming the Commonwealth Federation, and then they shifted off of it again in 1939, following the Soviet-Nazi Pact, although it took a few of them a few days to catch up. They caught themselves coming back a few times. The twist was a little sharp, but they couldn't find the right words to use. Some of them are still a bit confused from that experience.

However, that—in that period they were honestly, in the first place, interested in the social welfare of these groups that they penetrated, but they were interested in it, I later discovered, only in so far as it did not interfere with Soviet foreign policy. And as soon as they were able, they were good willing workers, they were perfectly capable of expressing an intelligent point of view on the subject, and when they had penetrated it sufficiently so that they gained control of an organization, they then put the screws on the organization for purposes of diverting it to Soviet foreign policy, no matter what it cost the liberal group they had penetrated.

Does that answer your question?

Q. Yes. In other words, they had a short-term objective, and yet always—

A. Always, as I said when I opened this, the basic objective of the Communist Party, its members, whether hidden or open, is to always follow the Soviet foreign policy. Now regardless of what compromises they make, for example, right now there's a—in Chicago, there's a candidate for the United States Senate who has been picked by the Democratic Party. He's a—he is a man who served in the Marine Corps during the war, and he is considered an ultra liberal. The forces in Chicago that are head of the P.C.A. are going to oppose him, not because they disagree with his domestic policies, but because they say he is a reactionary because he supports the Marshall Plan. In other words, they are bitterly opposed to him only on one ground, and their line is always that sort of thing.

For instance, they were opposed to Claude Pepper when Pepper was supporting the Roosevelt program, and as soon as he became friendly to the Soviet position, regardless of the fact that he had voted for lynch—that he had filibustered against the lynch law—anti-lynch law, I should say, he had been for—at one time he even defended the poll tax, as I recall it, nevertheless as soon as he became pro-Soviet in his commitments, he was suddenly a progressive. There is only one line upon which they pick them, and that is that you're progressive if you're for the Soviet foreign policy, and you're reactionary if you're against it.

You can be for old age pensions, you can be for any liberal principle, and you're still reactionary as long as there is only one definitive issue. I just want to make that point absolutely clear. There's one definitive issue. If you're anti the Soviet policy, no matter what it is, if it happens to be pro-Nazi at the moment, which it was during the period of the Soviet-Nazi pact, and remained so until Russia was attacked in 1941, and then suddenly like an electric shock on June 23rd the boys suddenly woke up to find out the imperialist war had turned into a people's war and they were blasting at Roosevelt then for not getting into the war in time.

He had been, of course, the number one war-monger up until the moment the Soviet Union was attacked.

Q. Now you mentioned, Mr. Costigan, that you carried no card in the Communist Party. You were recruited into the Communist Party definitely?

A. Yeah, I was recruited. I said that. I said that Morris Rapport recruited me.

Q. Did you sign an application?

A. Well, I didn't sign an application. I signed my—I signed a name, Jack Robinson, I think, which should have been more significant than it was. But anyway, that was all. That was the end of it. I mean, it was only Morris and me.

Q. Do you know whether or not that's a common practice in the party, for the purpose of shielding those whom they do not wish to be known as Communists?

A. Well, I don't know what it is today. I know what it was then. I mean that the—

Q. Was it at that time?

A. The point then was that there were just thousands of people who were looking for an opportunity to—effectively work within the framework of the progressive movement in an organized sort of fashion, who were being recruited, and they were not Marxists. Many of them were actually—they had never heard of Karl Marx. And they certainly had never heard of that terrific hyphenate known as the Leninist-Stalinist—wait a minute, Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist prospective. And so—but they were in, many of them certain of one thing, and that is that they were working with other people who were also interested in the same objective in various mass movements. So consequently, they weren't necessarily conscious of Party membership, and I imagine many of them never carried cards.

Q. Did you from time to time, during this period, meet with high officials of the Party—

A. How could I avoid it? I mean, after all I was on the—I presume I was on the political bureau. They kept calling me into meetings, and some of the meetings they held at my place and various other places around—I mean, I can't remember all of the facts that most—that some of these witnesses who have terrific memories, almost photographic memories, can remember. Probably it is because I know too much. But—I mean, the point is that there were just too many meetings, and so on. So I'm not going to be able to give you statistical information of the type that I understand several witnesses gave, including the throwing of Party cards in people's faces and all that sort of thing.

Q. Let's not discuss the other witnesses, Mr. Costigan. Now, you were continuously in meetings then, would you put it that way?

A. Well, whenever it was necessary to meet for the purpose of following out a policy on questions of—and remember, I want to repeat this, that during that period there was never anything at all discussed, except how better to build the liberal movement and the Democratic Party, and particularly the Roosevelt point of view on the Democratic Party.

Q. You have testified that the Communist Party secured complete control through penetration and infiltration of the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

A. That's right.

Q. Do you know—

A. They didn't do it by open party membership though. I mean, see in 1935 they attempted to penetrate the Commonwealth Federation as the Communist Party, then—then they wanted to convert it to a third party movement. Well, similar to what they're doing with P.C.A. right now. But they weren't able to do that. Now, subsequently they attempted to get into the W.C.F. through front organizations which affiliated with the Federation. And they did that quite successfully because there wasn't any essential difference. You couldn't spot a Communist in the period when the party line was absolutely identical with that of the—of the Roosevelt program.

Q. Do you know—did you know anything of an organization called the Old Age Pension Union?

A. Yes, I know quite a bit about the Old Age Pension Union. I ought to; I founded it.

Q. Was the Old Age Pension Union opposed—I'll withdraw that. Did the Communists oppose the Old Age Pension Union after it was founded?

A. Yes. As a matter of fact, I got into quite a bit of hot water about that, because the Pension Union was—it occurred to me, I talked to a lot of older people who were really very hard pressed and who had been rooked by a lot of politicians who merely wanted to use their mass strength in the state to get themselves elected to office. "When you Elect me Governor" was the general slogan, "Then I'll get you an Old Age Pension." And it seemed to me they were getting the old people nothing.

So I got out on the air one night, and, incidentally, I was not the voice of the Communist Party on the air—I got on the air one night and simply said that I thought that it might be wise if these people would organize themselves to fight for higher pensions with less red tape for more deserving older people. And it seemed to me that—that they ought to organize themselves so that they wouldn't be used by somebody else. And I repeatedly said that, terrific mail came in, and so somebody wrote me and asked me if I'd organize the group. I said no, I didn't want to organize the group, I'd be glad to explain what I thought ought to be done, from an organizational standpoint, because I felt that no one, including Costigan, should be in the position to use it as a political machine to build himself for office, particularly after I'd made the statement that that had been done before. I suggested they organize, and not tax themselves and affiliate with the trade unions and the other groups that were part of the progressive movement, the W.C.F., for the purpose of fighting for more adequate old age pensions, and so we organized.

For about six months thereafter, the Communist Party leaderships still busy with the Workers Alliance cause, which was pretty much a lost cause, charged me with establishing a dual union. As a matter of fact, they didn't attempt to take over the Pension Union until after it became clear they were not going to be successful in rehabilitating the Workers Alliance, which flopped with the W.P.A. project, you know.

Q. Did the Communist Party subsequently take over the Pension Union?

A. Well, the easiest way for me to answer that, is to say, which was characteristic of the W.C.F., that the W.C.F. movement or position of being primarily interested in the needs and welfare of the local people in the area, which means that it was reflective of popular sentiment to the fact that it became finally in 1939, after the Soviet-Nazi Pact, completely an instrument of Soviet foreign policy, I would say that the Pension Union is in about the same position from the top-leadership principle that today, for instance, the—everything is subjected to the same kind of discipline, you've got to be pro-Soviet in your policy in order to—that is, in their resolutions, and so on, I know that some of the leadership of the Pension Union are, of course, Communist Party members.

Q. Did you ever meet with a man by the name of Hugh DeLacy?

A. Yes, of course.

Q. Was Hugh DeLacy a member of the Communist Party at that time?

A. I never saw his card at any time. As I've explained to you, I don't know, but I mean if I was a member of the Communist Party, Hugh DeLacy was a member of the Communist Party.

- Q. Did you discuss Communist Party program with Hugh DeLacy?
- A. Not very—not that I can recollect. I mean, it was just tacitly understood that this was the Party line, but—
- Q. Did he further that Party line?
- A. Oh well, that's automatic. I mean, he didn't jump off at any turn. He's never been blasted by the Communist Party. That's the best barometer.
- Q. Did you know a man by the name of William Pennock?
- A. Certainly, he used to be my secretary.
- Q. Will you explain the circumstances of his leaving you as secretary?
- A. Well frankly, I had too many secretaries, and it occurred to me that as long as the Pension Union—the policy was then being adopted largely by the W.C.F., that it would be a good thing for him to get out from under the W.C.F. administration, so I can get into the Pension Union. I put him in there.
- Q. Was Mr. Pennock a member of the Communist Party?
- A. Well, I've never—again, I would just assume that he was a member of the Communist Party, by reason of the fact that I mean he was in all top fraction meetings at various times, and met on policy. It's certainly every indication. If you mean by seeing a Party card, I can't say that.
- Q. No, I don't mean that. The members of the Communist Party don't go around displaying their cards do they, Mr. Costigan?
- A. No, I've never seen one. And that's why I can't understand about having one thrown in somebody's face. And, it seems to me that we ought to keep to the realistic approach to this thing, as far as we can.
- Q. Well, Mr. Costigan, we'll—
- CHAIRMAN CANWELL: Pardon me, let me state here that that is not an issue at the moment. There has been Communist Party cards admitted in evidence here, and I don't think—
- THE WITNESS: Well, I've never seen one, that's all. I'm sorry.
- Q. I might say, Mr. Costigan, that every Communist Party card that's been admitted in this hearing has been identified by the holder and owner of it as his own card. There's been no other cards submitted here.
- Now, do you know a man by the name of N. P. Atkinson?
- A. Yes, I know N. P. Atkinson.
- Q. Was N. P. Atkinson active in the same way that you've described these others?
- A. I would certainly say he was active. I don't know exactly whether it's in the same way, but I would say that he was a far more obstreperous, belligerent follower of the Communist Party line than anyone I ever ran into contact with. He was always attempting to lecture people on what was the proper course to take, and how to properly interpret the Party line.
- Q. Would your testimony be that Mr. Atkinson was a member of the Communist Party?
- A. Well, I would say that if he weren't a member, they were certainly missing some good dues-paying prospect.
- Q. Do you know a man by the name of Jess Fletcher?
- A. Yes, I've known Jess long before the—he entered the Communist Party and before I entered the Communist Party.
- Q. Did you meet with Jess Fletcher during this period of time in furtherance of the Communist Party line?

- A. Yes, I met with Jess Fletcher in—during the Democratic front period. Jess Fletcher, of course, remained in the Communist Party afterwards, so he could give you more information on some of the later dates than I could.
- Q. Do you know a man by the name of Terry Pettus?
- A. Terry Pettus is the editor of the "New World." He was the editor of the "New Dealer" or was the "New Dealer" until the change in the Party line and it became the "New World" then.
- Q. Was Terry Pettus a member of the Communist Party?
- A. Well, I've met with him in fraction meetings, and so on, I presume he was.
- Q. Do you know a man by the name of Harry Renton Bridges?
- A. Yes, I know Harry Bridges. As a matter of fact, Harry Bridges was active in the attempted formation of this Western Conference for Franklin Roosevelt that we were planning in 1939, and on which I went to Washington, D. C. and talked to the President, and to Henry Wallace who was then supporting the Roosevelt position, and to a number of other people, including Norris and LaGuardia, arranging for this conference to be held in the West, in Salt Lake City, with the objective that we would help to get a bloc of western delegates to make possible the combination of Franklin D. Roosevelt for a third term without the support of the deep south, which of course meant that he would be in a better position to take an action against the poll tax bloc; and Bridges was quite active in that, and I had met with him on the—he was then regional organizer for the C.I.O. and I met with him and discussed that question up here, and down there.
- Q. Have you discussed with Mr. Bridges the things that the Communist Party were interested in?
- A. I never have. I've never discussed with Harry, to my knowledge, or never to my memory, I've never discussed with Harry Bridges anything except a straight Democratic Party policy. But, I did meet with Bridges in places where there were Communists present.
- Q. Did Mr. Bridges ever meet in your house?
- A. Well, he was up there—I can't remember how many times. He was there at least once, and at that time he—he was there on a—I think he was up here on longshore business from California, and I think they were getting ready to form the California Federation for Political Unity. That was an organization that was built a little bit like the W.C.F., of the pre-primary organization of Liberals and Progressives in California, which I subsequently addressed at Fresno, California, at the time they nominated Olson, Patterson and Downey, I believe.
- Q. Who—did you invite Mr. Bridges to the meeting at your home, or was he invited by someone else?
- A. I didn't invite Bridges there. I think that Morris Rapport, if I remember correctly, arranged the meeting. I think that he was there, and I think Bridges was there.
- Q. And at that time Morris Rapport was the district secretary of the Communist Party.
- A. District organizer.
- Q. District organizer. Do you recall who else was at that meeting, Mr. Costigan?
- A. No, I don't. As a matter of fact, I think there was always a—I mean there was a changing group of people at a top fraction meeting, and I don't

remember who was in at that time, particularly. I mean if—there might have been most anybody, that is anybody who was topped.

Q. Were they followers of the Communist Party line that met at your house on this occasion, people that you believed to be Communists?

A. Oh yes.

Q. Do you recall anyone being present at this meeting that was not a Communist?

A. Well, I wouldn't—wouldn't know whether there was anyone present who wasn't a Communist, I'd say that I was accepting them as—as Communists. Otherwise I doubt that they'd be meeting with Morris Rapport, in a closed meeting.

Q. Now can you—do you have any idea as to the time that this occurred, can you fix it as to year, and maybe the season?

A. No, I can't. I—I mean, I'd assume it was in 1937, because I'd certainly fix it prior to the—or early '38. I'd fix it before the California Federation for Political Unity meeting, which was held in 1938.

Q. Do you recall whether Mr. Bridges met at your house more than once?

A. No, I don't think so. Isabel might know more about that than I know. I don't think so.

Q. Now, do you know a man by the name of Thomas Rabbitt?

A. Certainly.

Q. Mr. Rabbitt hadn't been here very long when you were a member of the Party, had he?

A. No, Rabbitt wasn't in the—wasn't in any top fraction meetings or bureau meetings. He wasn't considered very reliable by Morris Rapport.

Q. From your discussions and information that came to you from meeting and discussing with top fraction Communists, did you gain the information that Mr. Rabbitt was a member of the Party? Was he a follower of the line?

A. Well, I don't know how trusted he was, but I would say that he was ardently attempting to be trusted.

Q. By the Communist Party?

A. By the Communist Party.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of John Caughlan, an attorney in the City of Seattle?

A. Yes, I know John.

Q. Will you state what information, if any, you gathered about Mr. Caughlan at this time?

A. Well, I don't know exactly what you mean, other than the fact that are you attempting to ask me whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

Q. That was what I intended to work up to.

A. Oh. Well, I would assume that John Caughlan was. I didn't meet with John on that level. John wasn't, at that time, was certainly not anywhere near a top apparatus, personnel and top apparatus personnel.

Q. From Party sources, did you gain the information that he too was a follower of the Party line, and one who would carry out the wishes of the Party?

A. Well, I wouldn't only have to take it from top information; I could just simply take it from my own knowledge, that is, that—I mean, I never saw him deviate once from the Party line at any time. Did you?

Q. Would your testimony be here, as an expert witness, one who knows the Party line, as a former member, that John Caughlan is a member of the Party then?

A. Well, I don't know how you qualify as an expert witness on these things. I only know that I—that John Caughlan has—let's put it this way, he has never been attacked, and I presume at that time he followed the line at the time of the Roosevelt program, he switched with the line. Then he switched back when the line switched back, then he switched back again, so I assume that if you keep on that twisting, turning international policy railroad long enough that you must be a pretty good rider of the Party line.

Q. Now, to clarify this picture, during the period of time that you were in the Party, you were a hidden secreted member, your membership was not made public at any time, by them or by you, during the period of time you were cooperating with them—

A. No.

Q. —is that right? And did you ever attend unit meetings?

A. Never.

Q. They kept you away from the rank and file of the Communist Party meetings.

A. That's right.

Q. These meetings you've testified to were high fraction meetings.

A. That's right.

Q. That explains why you wouldn't sit in meetings and know some of these smaller fry. Is that correct?

A. Absolutely correct.

Q. Now, I want you to clarify just a little bit, Mr. Costigan. You speak here of this always following the Party line. Is the Communist Party a democratic party? Does the line originate down in the unit meetings and work up to the top until they say, "This is what our people want to do."

A. No, it works the other way, down. I mean, what—for example, right up until the Soviet-Nazi Pact, as I think I previously indicated, the Party line was full support for Roosevelt for a third term, and there were a lot of Communist Party members who were wearing third term buttons when the blitz came along and caught them short. As a matter of fact, some of them were still confused the following spring, they were still wearing third term buttons in one lapel and "The Yanks Aren't Coming" in the other lapel, which was a little bit confusing to most everybody.

I would assume that you have—you have the right to agree either today or tomorrow with the new line, if you happen to be in a unit or a section; you might take until next week to agree, if they think you're worth that much attention. But, ultimately you either agree or you're out. And the line is sent down from New York, of course, because the "Daily Worker"—if the "Daily Worker" were late, they couldn't make up their minds on some of the questions.

Q. During the period that you—the time that you were in the Communist Party, was the paper which is now the "New World," I believe then it was the "Washington New Dealer," was it not? Was that an unofficial organ of the Communist Party?

A. Well, I would say it was certainly—it was certainly, if it wasn't controlled openly, it was certainly remarkably intuitive. It—every time the "Daily Worker" talked it sputtered; I mean the reaction was almost auto-



matic. I'd say that it was the most remarkable case of parallelism in history, if it weren't for the—

Q. Today—no, let's—I'll withdraw that. Is it your testimony that membership in the Communist Party and continued membership, means undeviation from the foreign policy of the—

A. Yes, it's automatic. That's why I—I mean, I feel, as a liberal, that it's—the Communist Party penetration of progressive and liberal organizations and people's movement, is extremely dangerous to those movements by reason of the fact that ultimately the test that is applied after the hidden Party members have gained control of those movements is that that movement shall follow the Party line or be crushed.

MR. HOUSTON: I believe that's all. Thank you, Mr. Costigan. Thank you very much for appearing.

MR. HOUSTON: Just one question, Mr. Costigan. You have appeared here voluntarily this morning, have you not?

THE WITNESS: Why, yes. I mean there's no—as I say, it became perfectly obvious that it was necessary. I thought the 1946 campaign had cleared that all up.

MR. HOUSTON: Thank you, Mr. Costigan.

(Witness Excused)

MRS. ISABEL COSTIGAN, produced as a witness, after being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOUSTON:

Q. Will you please state your name, Mrs. Costigan?

A. Isabel Harris Costigan.

Q. You are a resident of the City of Seattle?

A. I am.

Q. And you are the wife of Howard G. Costigan, the former witness?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now I'll ask you, Mrs. Costigan, have you ever belonged to the Communist Party?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you first affiliate with the Communist Party?

A. In the fall of 1938.

Q. Were you subsequently, for a period of time, active in the Communist Party?

A. For a few months, yes. It would start perhaps the—the summer of 1938, it was late summer or early fall.

Q. It was prior to the birth of your child?

A. Yes.

Q. Were you assigned a unit in the Communist Party in which to attend meetings?

A. Yes, I was.

Q. What unit was that, Mrs. Costigan?

A. It was a secret University unit.

Q. And did you attend meetings?

A. I attended some meetings, yes.

Q. Mrs. Costigan, I'll ask you if you ever sat in any Communist Party meetings with Hugh DeLacy.

A. Not in those meetings—not in those meetings in units.

Q. Not in unit meetings.

A. No. No.

Q. But did you sit in fraction meetings with Hugh DeLacy?

A. Yes, we attended them. There were some at our house, at our home.

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

A. Well, to my knowledge, he performed as one and came with people—he was in attendance with such people as Morris Rapport. And Harry Jackson, who was a—worked with Morris Rapport, who was a Communist official.

Q. Did you understand these meetings being held in your home to be Communist Party meetings?

A. Yes. Yes.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of William Pennock?

A. Yes. Bill lived at our house at one time.

Q. Mr. Pennock lived at your house. Did Mr. Pennock ever attend any of these meetings?

A. Yes.

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

A. To my knowledge he still is.

Q. You mentioned that you attended unit meetings of a secret University unit. Do you know Ralph Gundlach?

A. Yes, I know Ralph Gundlach.

Q. Did Mr. Gundlach attend any of these Party meetings?

A. No, Mr. Gundlach was in another unit.

Q. He was in another unit.

A. Yes.

Q. Have you ever attended Communist Party meetings with Mr. Gundlach?

A. No, before I was a Communist member, I broke up a unit meeting at his house one night. I went up to his house, not—and some of the members afterwards told me that that was a Communist Party unit meeting that I had invaded, and—

Q. While you were in the Communist Party, did you receive information that Mr. Gundlach was a member of the Communist Party?

A. No, one doesn't receive information, one—on those, one merely attends the same meetings, works on the same program, it's—it's implied and understood rather than—than—that is, once in there, those things are just—aren't discussed. The program that is being worked on is the—

Q. While you were a member of the Party, was there any doubt in your mind that Mr. Gundlach was a member of the Party?

A. None whatsoever.

Q. Do you know a Mr. Eby?

A. Harold Eby, yes.

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

A. Yes.

Q. Have you ever sat in Communist Party meetings with Mr. Eby?

A. Yes, he attended, or was—spoke at the Communist unit, University unit.