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"The activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee...strike indiscriminately at real and imagined foes and limit freedom of discussion...."

(Dr. Edward Teller, noted nuclear physicist and 'father of the H-Bomb,' September 5, 1960)

"How did we come to establish a committee to decide what was 'Un-American'...How did we persuade ourselves that propaganda, speech, was a fit subject for regulation? [that idea]...is at war with our profoundest principles."

(Congressman James Roosevelt of California, April 25, 1960)

"The power of Congress to conduct investigation is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad...but it is not unlimited...investigation conducted solely for the personal aggrandizement of the investigators or to punish those investigated are indefensible."

(Chief Justice Earl Warren, United States Supreme Court, June 17, 1957)

"...the Committee pursues its heresy hunt, endangering constitutional guarantees in the process, weakening at home and abroad America's reputation as the land of the free — and all to what avail? If the security of this nation were dependent on the kind of exposure for exposure's sake that the Committee has repeatedly indulged in...then our country would really be in dangerous condition. But few disinterested persons can any longer believe that this is where the real danger lies...

(New York TIMES, April 30, 1960)

"The Un-American Activities Committee and these rabid so-called Anti-Communists never tried to prove any charges — in their hate, they just made the charges...hoping that something would come of what they made."

(President Harry S. Truman, December 11, 1964)
THE CASE AGAINST
THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN
ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

... A Quarter Century of Failure

The American Civil Liberties Union whole-heartedly shares the expressions of concern by distinguished Americans, printed on the opposite page, about the aims and methods of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The ACLU believes that now is the time to examine the history and record of this Committee, and to analyze closely its effects upon our national life and its participation in the creation of a national climate in which the Bill of Rights and the Constitution are assaulted.

The ACLU urges that this Committee be abolished and, as the first step toward this objective, severe restrictions placed on its astonishing accumulation of power and prestige, money and staff.

The House Un-American Activities Committee's supporters state that it has three tasks: 1) to inform the public of the danger of internal subversion by “exposing the Communist menace;” 2) to provide a check on the Executive Branch’s enforcement of security laws; 3) to recommend legislation bearing on our national security and defense.

The ACLU finds that the Committee, from its inception in 1938 up to the present time, has dismally failed to pursue these goals within the framework of our traditional freedoms. The objectives it has chartered can better be pursued by private citizens, the press and those agencies of government constitutionally authorized and professionally equipped to deal with overt threats to national security.

Opponents of the HUAC recognize the difficult and delicate problems of protecting both the full rights of free speech, press, assembly and association and our national security. They recognize and endorse Congress' duties and responsibilities to investigate thoroughly — to obtain necessary information — before legislating, providing investigative powers are used within the bounds set by the Constitution. But the HUAC, after nearly three decades of mushrooming power and the expenditure of millions of dollars of tax funds, has been utterly unsuccessful in keeping a
proper balance between the requirements of security and the demands of freedom. It has sharply overstepped all reasonable limits to Congressional investigative power; indeed, the basic premise on which the Committee operates violates the First Amendment’s free speech guarantees.

Many citizens today believe that McCarthyism is a forgotten relic of a fear-filled era; most have the vague general impression that bold newspaper headlines and excesses of “witch hunting” have ended. Many think the time is long behind us when a man could lose his livelihood or have a promising career blasted because he signed the “wrong” petition 20 years ago.

This is not so. The HUAC is an active and continuing symbol of that era. The Committee is functioning at a slower pace and somewhat more quietly than previously, but recent incidents show that the cause of civil liberties and the fates of individuals still face bitter assault wherever the HUAC sits.

Because the Committee operates as an arm of the Congress and all its works bear the figurative stamp of governmental authority and approval, it still commands a built-in acceptance from the average citizen; it still maintains great power to influence newspapers and community leaders. The mere decision to hold hearings in any given community, or to investigate any organization, still has threatening implications for individuals and institutions across the land.

Why does the ACLU strongly urge the abolition or, at the least, immediate curbs on the Committee’s power? For these reasons:

1. The Committee’s mandate is, in the opinion of the ACLU, unconstitutional.

2. The Committee’s contribution to legislation is almost nil.

3. The Committee’s methods abrogate many of the elements of due process which make up democracy’s concept of justice and fair play.

4. The Committee is in large part responsible for the silent institutionalization, in many areas of our national life, of “Un-American” investigations and “loyalty” oaths. The collection of dossiers on thousands of Americans describing their political activities, past and present, has contributed actively, in many quarters, to an atmosphere of fear and suspicion. However much the Committee may disclaim such intent, it has had the effect of slowing down free discussion of pressing social issues and thus hampering their solution.

For the consideration of thoughtful citizens everywhere, and particularly those with responsibilities for leadership decision and action, the ACLU submits the following detailed analysis of the major factors behind its opposition to the HUAC.
The Committee’s Mandate is Unconstitutional and Unwise

How the Committee was Established

In the 1930’s, the world experienced the Great Depression and its lingering aftermath, and witnessed the spread of the ideologies of Nazism, Communism and Fascism as antecedents to World War II.

During this troubled decade the Congress of the United States appointed a special temporary Committee of the House of Representatives to look into possible evidence of domestic manifestations of these political forces then sweeping Europe.

One of the earliest and most notorious forerunners of the House Un-American Activities Committee was the Dies Committee which, under the chairmanship of Congressman Martin Dies of Texas, reaped whirlwinds of publicity during its investigations of domestic Communism. But it remained legally a temporary committee of the House.

On the opening day of the 79th Congress in 1945, Congressman John Rankin of Mississippi introduced a resolution to transform the Dies special committee into a permanent, independent, standing Committee, primarily to “investigate the extent, character and objectives of Un-American propaganda activities in the U.S.” It was proposed that this Committee would have 1) independent powers of subpoena, not subject to the supervision of a parent Committee as would be the case if it were made a subcommittee of another standing body, and 2) the privilege to sit, hold hearings and conduct investigations regardless of whether or not Congress was in session.

The resolution was adopted with great haste after having first been voted down by voice vote. At that time, Congressman John McCormack of Massachusetts, now Speaker of the House of Representatives, expressed objections to the unprecedented scope of the proposal:

“...I do not know when in the history of our country the National House of Representatives has ever provided by rule for a permanent investigation committee. Mark what we are doing. This is not a question of establishing an investigating committee to investigate conditions that arise from time to time; it is a question of amending the rules of the House to provide for a permanent standing committee that does not consider legislation, but has one subject, one field, the field of investigating and making a report.

“I hope,” said Congressman McCormack, as reported in the Congressional Record of January 3, 1945, “that the House will not accept this...”

However, the enabling law was passed during the 1946 session of the 79th Congress. Thus, as Congressman William Fitts Ryan of New York has pointed out, the House Un-American Activities Committee became the only standing committee in the history of the House with permanent power to investigate non-governmental activities.
Why the Mandate is Bad

Critics of HUAC contend that the mandate under which Congress set up the Committee is unconstitutional because an order to “investigate Un-American propaganda” must necessarily focus on areas of individual expression such as speech; writings; petitions to governmental authorities; membership in organizations espousing political and social ideas; and such freedom of assembly activities as peaceful picketing and lawful demonstrations.

The rights of citizens to exercise these privileges were specifically placed outside Congressional jurisdiction by the framers of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. To avoid the tyranny of governmental authority over an individual’s beliefs, associations and opinions and his rights to express them freely, the authors of the Bill of Rights created a list of specific privileges with which Congress must not tamper. They knew from ample historical evidence that any governmental attempt to judge what constitutes “propaganda” eventually tends to impose one standard of what individuals may think, speak and write. The lesson of the Boston Tea Party was that one’s man’s “propaganda” is another man’s cherished belief.

This is why the authors of the Bill of Rights made the First Amendment guarantee freedom of expression. This is why they said Congress cannot interfere with free speech. And this is why today, therefore, surely no subdivision of Congress, such as the HUAC, should be allowed to do so.

Is there no time when speech, even “propaganda,” can be curbed? The only exception recognized by the ACLU is the point of “clear and present danger,” when the threat to security is so great that there is no time for government to deal with it. But there is no proof that the nation faces, or faced in years past, a “clear and present danger” from its foes so large that all our law enforcement agencies and defense structures could be immobilized; or so great as to justify a wholesale invasion of First Amendment rights.

Even if investigation of “un-American propaganda” were constitutionally defensible, the ACLU would reject it. The phrase is so vague and ill-defined that no one can know what might at some later time be considered an “un-American” activity. Technically whatever happens in America is American.

The ACLU’s thinking on the unconstitutionality of the HUAC mandate is not shared by the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court narrowly upheld in a 5 to 4 decision the legal validity of the Committee’s mandate in the 1959 Barenblatt case. It ruled that the compelling need for national security outweighed the First Amendment guarantees and the HUAC’s mandate and investigations did not affront the Constitution. But even while approving Congress’ need for broad investigative power in the national security field, the Court warned that it would carefully scrutinize other cases brought before it so that breaches of First Amendment guarantees did not become too frequent. Unhappily, while voiding many HUAC contempt cita-
tions on technical grounds in the years since the *Barenblatt* decision, the high court has stuck by its 5 to 4 decision in two major subsequent challenges of the Committee's constitutionality — the *Wilkinson* and *Braden* cases.

The ACLU agrees with these eloquent words of Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black in his dissenting opinion in the *Wilkinson* case:

“This country was not built by men who were afraid and it cannot be preserved by such men. Our Constitution, in unequivocal terms, gives each of us the right to say what we think without fear of the power of Government. That principle has served us so well for so long that I cannot believe it is necessary to allow any governmental group to reject it in order to preserve its own existence. Least of all do I believe such a privilege should be accorded the House Un-American Activities Committee. For I believe that true Americanism is to be protected, not by committees that persecute unorthodox minorities, but by strict adherence to basic principles of freedom that are responsible for our nation's greatness.”

**SUMMARY**

*The Committee's mandate is unconstitutional and unwise because:*

1. It violates the rights of free speech, association and assembly guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

2. It is so vague that a citizen can not know whether his political activity runs afoul of the HUAC's private definition of Americanism.

**SECTION TWO**

The Committee's Record of Legislation

Congressional investigating committees operate primarily to recommend new laws to Congress based on their findings. But the HUAC does not function in this way.

The Committee, now almost 27 years old, has spent several million dollars of taxpayers’ money. During the past two years, its regular appropriations have exceeded $300,000 for each 12-month period; its staff numbers over 60 persons, more than several other important Congressional committees combined. Compare, for example, the Committee's $654,000 appropriation for the two years 1959 and 1960 with other committees of the House. That sum was the third largest appropriation and was twice as much as the two-year funds voted for the Ways and Means Committee ($300,000); Banking and Currency ($205,000); and Foreign Affairs ($150,000). It was also considerably larger than the 24-month amount permitted to the Judiciary ($425,000) and Education and Labor ($328,000). In terms of size, the Committee’s staff was more than three times that of Banking and Cur-
rency (16); Foreign Affairs (14) or Agriculture (11). HUAC personnel also far outnumbered employees of Ways and Means (24), Armed Services (15) and Education and Labor (25) during the 1960 period. These figures, of course, do not include the Committee's enormous printing bills.

Between 1947 and 1962 the Committee traveled thousands of miles, held hundreds of hearings and subpoenaed more than 2,600 witnesses, both friendly and unfriendly, from dishwashers to the President of the United States. President Harry S. Truman, in 1952, refused to turn over confidential information of the Executive Branch, concerning a government employee then under investigation. He stated he could neither turn over such information nor comply with the subpoena because the Committee's action threatened the principle of separation of powers required by the Constitution.

What has been the legislative result of all this time, money and staff work?

The Committee has been directly responsible for passage of two laws, both under sharp attack as unconstitutional, and an amendment to the first of these laws.

The first piece of HUAC-recommended legislation was the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. One of its key provisions requires that the Communist Party and other designated "Communist action" groups register with the Justice Department. From the beginning, this part of the law proved unenforceable; although the idea of registration was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in 1961, its actual implementation was balked by subsequent court decisions.

No representative of the Communist Party registered with the Justice Department and when the government prosecuted Party officials for failing to register, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled they could not be so compelled. The Court held that registration would require them to surrender their constitutionally-guaranteed right to protect themselves against self-incrimination. The Supreme Court left this decision standing, in effect invalidating the primary section of one major HUAC-sponsored law.

In 1962, Congress adopted, on the HUAC's recommendation, an amendment to the 1950 Act which was essentially a correction of an earlier error made by the Committee itself. The original Act had required the Defense Department to publish a list of strategic defense facilities at which members of the Communist Party were barred from employment. After some years of such publication, the Justice Department complained that the list was virtually a "guidebook" for sabotage and for the "selection of military targets for any potential enemy." This requirement was withdrawn when the 1962 bill was passed. It comprised the Committee's sole legislative effort during two years of investigations, reports, and research activities which cost $631,000.

The second major piece of legislation for which the Committee can take direct credit is the 1964 law giv-
The bill permits the Secretary of Defense to discharge any NSA employee without any charges, a hearing, the right to have information against him revealed, the right of cross examination, or the right of appeal. The ACLU, which fought against the bill, believes it denies the basic ingredients of due process of law.

Increasingly sensitive to criticisms of its poor legislative record, the Committee has endeavored to demonstrate its legislative usefulness by issuing two lists of all its recommendations for new laws. The lists show that mere volume of recommendations is no proof of legislative value.

One list, for the years 1941 to 1958, is composed of 79 recommendations, of which 34 are identical — having been made in more than one session of Congress. Of the remainder, 30 were relevant to six statutes, the bulk of which were not reported out as bills by the Committee. Five other recommendations were referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

Most HUAC critics contend that virtually every legislative proposal considered by it could be handled more appropriately by other House committees, notably the Judiciary Committee. Even the late Congressman Francis E. Walter, one of the most active of the HUAC's former chairmen, is on record as having voted originally to have the Committee set up as a sub-group of the Judiciary Committee. And in a 1960 federal court suit, when Congressman Walter was asked whether he still felt the Committee should be under the Judiciary Committee's supervision, he replied, "Of course."

The second list, covering the 86th Congress (1953 to 1960), cites 50 recommendations and 31 bills introduced in the House. Not a single bill was adopted into law.

Furthermore, out of approximately 12,000 bills filed in the House during the 86th Congress, only 11 were referred to the Un-American Activities Committee.

Despite all the HUAC's show of legislative bustle, there is little evidence of one major test of legislative interest and accomplishment — hearings on particular bills. For example, from 1950 through 1959, the Committee did not hold one hearing on specific legislation.

Of course, the Committee does not regard its legislative performance as a poor one. It claims that its "watchdog" function of alerting the nation to dangers of internal subversion has indirectly inspired other Congressional committees to sponsor important legislation; for example, that the statute of limitations in espionage cases was extended from three to ten years partially as a result of its exposure of Communist influences. This hardly offsets the fact that despite a vast outpouring of money, staff and energy, the Committee has produced a "do-nothing" legislative record.
The House Un-American Activities Committee’s record of legislation is marked by these facts:

1. In nearly three decades, it has been responsible for only two pieces of legislation, one of doubtful constitutionality, the other containing serious infringements on civil liberties.

2. It handles a miniscule percentage of the House legislative work load, and most of the bills referred to it could be better dealt with by other Committees.

SECTION THREE

The Committee’s Methods Violate The Bill of Rights and Injure Individuals and Organizations

(NOTE: In the discussion of harm done to individuals, the ACLU refrains except where persons are well-known — from using names. Most of the persons referred to have already suffered extensive damage from their involvement with the HUAC. In some instances years of academic hearings, union arbitrations or court cases followed exposure by the HUAC. All names in the cases covered below are available in ACLU records.)

The House Un-American Activities Committee, which has been assailed often for conducting investigations on the basis of “exposure for exposure’s sake,” has two primary methods of operation:

1) The holding of public hearings, widely covered by major news media, in which the HUAC’s search for evidences of domestic Communism injurious to the nation’s welfare is carried on amidst the fullest publicity.

2) The compilation of extensive “public” files, estimated by Dr. Robert K. Carr in his 1952 authoritative book on the HUAC, to contain the names of nearly a million Americans. These files consist of raw, unevaluated material gathered from newspapers, organization letterheads and other sources.

The ACLU believes that the HUAC’s conduct of public hearings and the irresponsible handling of un-evaluated materials in its files has repeatedly violated not only Constitutional guarantees of free speech, petition and association, but has shown contemptuous disregard for the elementary requirements of due process of law and ordinary ideas of fairness.

The Committee has steadfastly denied any intent to conduct trials, which properly belong in courtrooms, not Congressional hearing rooms, or to prosecute witnesses. But its actual manner of investigating has produced the aura of a courtroom trial and the impression that witnesses are being accused, tried, and either convicted or acquitted by this completely non-judicial body acting without judicial procedures. This activity usurps the functions of the Executive and Judicial Branches of government, and thus ignores the “checks and balances” of the American system which helps to safeguard the individual from the exercise of too much governmental power.
Conduct of Public Hearings

The manner in which the Committee conducts hearings has changed during the past quarter century and falls into two distinct eras. The 1940's and 1950's was a period during which it was responsible for the type of abuses we have come to call "McCarthyism." These abuses took such form as public name-calling of witnesses ("subversive," "Communist-sympathizer"); premature publication of the names of those subpoenaed as a result of leaks to the press; refusal to inform witnesses of the precise subject of the investigation; denial of the right to confront and cross-examine accusers; accusation of wrong-doing in such a manner as to suggest it was the witness' responsibility to prove his own innocence; and failure to provide a meaningful procedure for defense.

The Committee's behavior improved somewhat after the Supreme Court ruled in the 1957 Watkins case that the HUAC's questions to a witness must be directly pertinent to a subject under investigation, thus curbing to some degree the wild-swinging nature of its interrogations.

In the words of the Library of Congress' Legislative Reference Service, the Supreme Court ordered the indictment for contempt against Watkins to be dismissed because: "No clear understanding of the 'question under inquiry' could be gleaned from the resolution authorizing the full committee, the legislative history thereof, the committee's practices thereunder, the action authorizing the subcommittee, the statements of the Chairman at the opening of the hearings or his statement in response to petitioner's protest."

Chief Justice Earl Warren, speaking for the Supreme Court majority, stated that "there is no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the functions of the Congress . . . nor is the Congress a law enforcement or trial agency. These are functions of the executive and judicial departments of Government. No inquiry is an end in itself; it must be related to, and in furtherance of, a legitimate task of the Congress. . . ."

The Watkins decision, combined with both improved U.S.-Soviet relations which reduced public anxiety over Communist aggression and the demise of McCarthyism, brought a retreat from the HUAC's blatantly abusive method of investigation.

The second era, the late 1950's and early 1960's, has been marked by fewer hearings, conducted more quietly, and some tightening of the Committee's rules for protecting witnesses.

Despite these mild reforms, reports in ACLU files show that the HUAC's presence in any community still means:

1) Widest exposure of witnesses or persons named in testimony, through local newspaper, radio and TV publicity.

2) Frequent loss of job for persons subpoenaed (sometimes even uninvolved relatives are fired)
and further economic and social sanctions if they are considered “unfriendly” witnesses.

3) An increase in the circulation of “hate” literature in the community and harassing “anonymous” phone calls both to witnesses and their employers.

In short, though some HUAC hearings lack the trumpeting “circus” atmosphere of earlier days and their influence is sometimes more subtly felt, the consequences — right up to the present moment — are severe, both for the cause of civil liberties and individual lives.

Let us examine the two Committee eras.

**THE NOISY YEARS**

During the 1940’s and 1950’s, more than 2,000 persons were called before the HUAC to explain their link, if any, with Communism.

Nearly every occupation and profession was included, as was every shade of political opinion. Some persons admitted an earlier affiliation with the Communist Party but said they had long ago broken their ties; some had long records of militant anti-Communism. The hearing sites ranged the land from Seattle to Buffalo; from Miami Beach to Los Angeles.

The Committee’s behavior can be gauged from a hearing held in Los Angeles in 1956; after it the Board of Governors of the California State Bar protested the HUAC’s infringement of the principle of the right to counsel. The criticism dealt with HUAC Counsel Richard Arens’ attack on attorney John W. Porter, who appeared before the Committee along with a number of subpoenaed clients. Counsel Arens departed from the scope of the hearing to ask the clients whether they knew their attorney “as a Communist named Porter” in a relationship other than attorney and client. The HUAC Counsel addressed a witness as “Comrade” and repeatedly referred to Porter as “Comrade Porter” (Porter was not a witness). In addition, Arens did not permit any of the attorneys for other witnesses to address the Committee or to make objections to the manner in which the proceeding was being conducted. The attorneys were repeatedly told that their “sole and exclusive right” was to advise their clients.

The State Bar was so disturbed by the “courtroom” atmosphere that it recommended that the American Bar Association draft proposals to Congress for reforms in Committee procedures. The group’s Board of Governors stated in its formal report that the HUAC proceeding and its staff counsel’s conduct were “improper and lacking in the dignity and impartiality which should govern the conduct of agencies of the United States and ... posed a threat to the right to appeal by counsel and to the proper independence of the bar.”

The HUAC’s disrespect for the traditional Anglo-Saxon legal idea that every man is innocent until proven guilty was illustrated in a 1959 incident in which the Committee subpoenaed 110 public school teachers in California. Simultaneously their names appeared in the press. In the face of mounting public
outcry, the Committee twice postponed the hearings at which these teachers were to have appeared and then finally cancelled them altogether. The San Francisco Chronicle editorialized: "Forty Northern California teachers and 70 in Southern California are under subpoena, their names have been made public and they stand accused with no opportunity to clear themselves. This kind of procedure is hardly in accord with the best American practice, though it is not new with the House Un-American Activities Committee."

The Committee also sent copies of its files on these teachers to local school boards. And even though the state Attorney General declared the files "worthless" as evidence against the teachers, a very large percentage of those named had continuous trouble in being re-certified, in gaining tenure, and in having contracts renewed. Figures compiled in 1961, two years after the original subpoenas were served, show that more than a third of the group had left the teaching profession altogether, at least in California.

It is difficult to estimate exactly the human suffering that HUAC caused during the "noisy years." The harms done to individuals in terms of careers ruined, jobs lost, teaching and research opportunities blasted, creative work hindered or killed altogether is impossible to assess precisely. However, information is available which illustrates the wreckage that the HUAC leaves in its path — despite the Committee's disavowal of responsibility for economic and social sanctions imposed by the community. In 1961 the ACLU reviewed its files to compile some of the ways in which individual lives had been damaged:

... in Seattle, a member of the Molders' Union was called a Communist by a HUAC witness, but he himself was never called to testify. A woman kept calling his employer every day for weeks; he was finally fired.

... A Rhode Island housewife who refused to testify found her family socially ostracized; she was refused an active role in the state PTA in which she had formerly been an important participant, and her youngster was so affected that the family was forced to transfer him to another school.

... a successful Miami businessman-builder who relied on his Fifth Amendment privilege before HUAC, lost his business and finally had to leave Florida; he was forced to earn a living doing odd jobs and carpentry.

... a girl with a job as a potwasher was fired because her husband and father invoked the Fifth Amendment before the Committee. Her husband, a draftsman, lost his job, too. In a similar case in another city, a girl who worked for a county government division lost her job because her father declined to testify before the HUAC though she herself was not involved in the hearings.

... a fire-department captain who denied he was a member of the Communist Party at the time of his testimony but refused to discuss his past political activity, was dismissed from his post when he lacked one month and 10 days of 25 years' service and retirement benefits.

... a woman laboratory technician at a Detroit hos-
pital was fired after 20 years' service because she declined to answer questions.

. . . a fund-raiser for a service organization in Chicago candidly discussed his own former Communist Party membership and explained how he came to leave the Party in 1958, but invoked the Fifth Amendment in declining to give the names of others; he lost his job.

. . . a Buffalo couple — the husband a steel factory worker, the wife employed by a service organization, denied they were Party members at the time of the HUAC hearings, but both lost their jobs because they declined to testify about the past.

. . . a San Francisco news broadcaster on a local station was suspended the moment he was subpoenaed by the HUAC and subsequently resigned. He turned to working as a poll taker to support his family.

. . . a violinist with the Detroit Symphony was expelled from the Musicians' Union, as well as losing his orchestra job, when he refused to answer the HUAC's questions; he became a door-to-door brush salesman after loss of union privileges made it impossible for him to work in music.

The Informers: A Crisis of Conscience

The Committee has also caused an acute crisis of conscience among persons called to testify which created a moral dilemma.

The Fifth Amendment in the Bill of Rights protects individuals against self-incrimination; the problem of incriminating other persons in allegedly wrongful activities is not included. But American custom and tradition, based on deep-rooted ethical concepts, have long disapproved of the informer, the person who betrays companions to authorities who may take reprisals against them. Whether such betrayal takes place for monetary gain or to save oneself from reprisals by the same authorities, the informer has been castigated and shunned.

Yet the position of potential or actual informer was one in which many Americans reluctantly found themselves during the HUAC's "noisy years." The familiar dilemma of being asked in Committee hearings to "name names" and identify former companions, or run the risk of being jailed for contempt of Congress, was a dark one indeed.

The conflict was articulated in many ways. A Philadelphia high school teacher testified freely in 1954 that he had been a Communist Party member because he had mistakenly believed that the Party was devoted to world peace and disarmament; that he had broken with the Party seven years previously and that he would speak openly of his own activities. He refused, however, to identify his former associates in the Communist Party. He told the Committee:

"It is a matter of deep and abiding conscience with me. . . . I have always believed and I have been told, that to be an informer as to the friends you might have and the acquaintances you might meet along the pathway of life is contrary to every tenet of the American way of thinking."

This teacher was suspended from his position and
cited for contempt. He subsequently cleared himself by reappearing before the HUAC and identifying a list of persons he said were Communist Party members in the early 1930’s and 1940’s.

Other witnesses who volunteered to tell of their own activities also begged to be excused from naming former associates, on the grounds that the persons had long since severed their ties with any questionable groups, were now living in different parts of the country, pursuing different lives, and that to take up associations of 20 years earlier would be unfair and damaging to former friends. Few, however, escaped the Committee’s pressure. Some relented and “named names;” several accepted contempt citations and jail sentences as the alternative to becoming informers. Still others found that perhaps an articulate defense or a famous name shielded them from the final ignominy of a jail sentence.

One university professor in California phrased his struggle of conscience before the Committee this way:

“You can be sure that if I had at any time pursued activities inimical to the best interests of my adopted home, I would immediately have gone to the proper authorities. The mentioning of names would save me a great deal of practical trouble, but it would smash me in side and ruin me as a man. It would have taken from me my ability and authority as a teacher. I have tried to be a scholar all my life.”

Although he lost his job, he was not jailed.

Similarly, playwright Arthur Miller was cited for contempt because he refused to name persons he had known 10 years before, in the 1940’s, who may have had Communist sympathies or affiliations. However, when Mr. Miller was cleared on technical grounds by a federal court, the government did not pursue further the possibility of jailing one of the nation’s foremost writers because he refused to become an informer.

Of the Miller case, Congressman James Roosevelt, an outspoken HUAC critic, asked: “What good did it to do the free world to subject this talented man, regardless of his past political attitudes, to a criminal prosecution because he refused to name associations of ten years before? . . . there is no question of the harm it did to our status as leader of the free world.”

Perhaps the most alarming philosophical note on the moral issue created by the Committee was struck by film producer Robert Rossen. He remarked, in a “confession” before the Committee: “I don’t think . . . that any one individual can even indulge himself in the luxury of individual morality.”

**THE “QUIET” ERA**

In 1964 these cases are painful to recall, but equally serious and painful consequences are still flowing from the HUAC's present activity. In 1963 and 1964, for example, the Committee held hearings in two widely separated areas: the Minneapolis-St. Paul area of Minnesota and Buffalo, New York.

In three days of Twin Cities hearings in the summer of 1964, the HUAC subpoenaed 11 persons, without telling them why they were being summoned to testify. As far as can be determined no new informa-
tion became available as a result of the visit that was not already in the Committee's possession.

In addition, the names of the 11 were leaked to the press ahead of their appearance, although the newspapers did not use the proffered names (a tribute to their growing sense of fairness about the practice). The Committee has denied responsibility for these premature disclosures, which are specifically forbidden in a present Committee rule, and has said that if any of its employees were found guilty of this rule infraction, they would be "fired in five minutes." But in this instance, as in others, there is no indication that the Committee has been diligent in tracing the apparent breaking of one of its own rules.

A report on the hearings by the ACLU's Minnesota Branch stated that there was no apparent legislative purpose in all of this, and that a primary objective of the Committee was to expose to the community those subpoenaed, rather than to elicit information from them. To substantiate this charge, the ACLU group pointed to the Committee's final statement that its aim had been to "awaken" the community to the dangers of Communism.

The community got the message. One witness was fired from his job as a mechanic in an automobile repair shop shortly after the hearings. Five of his fellow union members asked that he be expelled for refusing to answer seventy questions put by HUAC and for "invoking the 1st, 5th and 6th amendments to the United States Constitution, which resulted in these charges being preferred against him." He was expelled from his union and his case is now in litigation.

A draftsman employed by the city was suspended from his job after he was subpoenaed and the Civil Service Commission is presently considering charges brought by the city asking for his dismissal. Among the questions asked of this witness by HUAC was whether, in his employment with the city engineer's office, he had access to information as to where the bridges of the city were located!

Perhaps the most important point about the Minnesota hearings is that even now, almost a decade after the worst abuses of the McCarthy period, if a witness invokes the guarantees of the Bill of Rights the wrath of the community is likely to be unleashed.

A similar pattern of events can be found in Buffalo, N.Y. where the Committee conducted two days of hearings in April, 1964, with particular attention to the faculty of the State University of Buffalo as well as those employed by a variety of public and private firms in the Buffalo area.

Of the 14 persons called by the Committee, eight witnesses or their spouses suffered severe economic reprisals. An instructor of English at the State University, subpoenaed in April 1964, was dismissed. A Buffalo design draftsman was fired after nine years with one firm and his former employers, when called for references, said that the man had been subpoenaed to testify before the HUAC; he has been unable to get work despite a shortage of draftsmen with his skills. Two public school teachers found
their right to the normal progression to permanent status challenged. Only after months of intense controversy did the Buffalo Board of Education by a 5 to 1 vote grant tenure to the teachers who had been involved with the HUAC (one in 1957, one in the 1964 session). Thorough local investigations had failed to produce any evidence of misconduct.

The Upstate New York Division of the ACLU urged employers to reconsider the imposition of sanctions, pointing out that so far as it could ascertain no employer had claimed any employee lacked ability to perform his job—surely the only relevant criterion.

The vaunted position that HUAC holds in the government’s security fortress today sometimes makes it unnecessary for the Committee to subpoena citizens or track down suspected subversives. Other agencies do it for them.

A recent striking example was the case of a Minneapolis businessman who had decided on the basis of conflicting reports in the U.S. press that he wasn’t getting enough information about Communist China; through Peking he subscribed to a Chinese publication printed in English.

To his dismay, he learned from a newspaper article in November, 1964, that the Post Office was keeping a list of persons who received such “Communist propaganda” and had probably turned over this list to the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Minneapolis Star-Tribune, which ran an article

headlined “HUAC May Have Name of Area Man,” was sympathetic to his plight. The Minneapolis resident was quoted as saying “I’m not a Communist and I work for a great capitalist organization (a national steel company). I’m a little concerned they suspect me without even finding out who I am.”

The Post Office practice is carried on under a federal law granting the agency the power to screen foreign political propaganda. The law was declared unconstitutional recently by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco, which held that a citizen’s right to receive controversial literature may require constitutional protection if disclosure of his wishes might subject him to “social disapprobation or economic injury”. The court stated: “That a person may be reluctant to disclose his desires (to receive controversial literature) under the circumstances of this case is not fanciful. Similar lists under earlier nonstatutory screening programs were routinely turned over to the House Committee on Un-American Activities . . . .”

Several cases involving this issue are currently being considered by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Whether it be the “noisy years” or the “quiet” era, the continued existence of the Committee means continued invasion of civil liberties and the rights of many individuals who may be guilty of no misdeed.

The Mis-Use and Abuse of HUAC Files

Other nightmares confronted those caught in the
Committee's net. They grew out of what is known as "the Committee files." It was possible to pick up a newspaper, book or magazine and find that you had been "cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee," or that information about you from the HUAC files was being publicly circulated, or, even more complicated, that someone else with a name identical to your own had apparently been "cited" and the consequences would now be yours.

None of these bad dreams have been dispelled. The files still exist and still function in much the same manner as when their contents were more splashily publicized.

What ARE the House Un-American Activities Committee files?

In 1962, the late Congressman Walter, then Committee chairman, attempted to answer this question in a letter to an inquiring Congressman which was reprinted in the Congressional Record. According to Congressman Walter, the Committee maintains two sets of files. One, referred to as "investigative" files, consists of "lead" material and confidential reports of Committee investigators. Such information is available only to the staff, according to Congressman Walter.

The second set of files, in the Committee's words, is called the "public files." It is a hodge-podge of information from all kinds of sources about an individual. It may, for example, include ordinary newspaper stories about a person, or stationery of responsible organizations carrying the letterhead listing of officials; but it also may include charges emanating from a wide variety of totally unreliable sources. Much of the material could be, according to Congressman Walter, found by "any competent researcher" since it includes magazines and newsletters found in any public library. These files are the source of the many controversies swirling around HUAC, since they contain 1) raw, unevaluated information which 2) is easily available and 3) carries the authority of an "official government source" — for the average citizen the automatic stamp of truth, despite the fact that the information may be misleading, outdated or just plain untrue.

Officially, according to Congressman Walter, these files are the source for two types of "reports." One is an official Committee report, a printed document which may be based on either the file information or Committee hearings, and is approved by all members of the Committee for public release. In these reports various organizations are "cited" for some kind of Communist connection. (Such reports do untold damage to people and organizations who have their names linked with the emotional charge of Communism in widely-circulated, "official" government documents.) The other type of report is simply a typewritten reproduction of all the material on a given individual that is in the Committee's file.

Technically both these documents are called "reports," but in general usage, they both have come to be referred to as HUAC "citations" and "listings" and "reports." All these terms are synonymous
in newspaper and popular language and account for the bulk of difficulties encountered by individuals and groups.

The typewritten compilations, taken from the files, are furnished in response to specific requests by government agencies and members of Congress. However, as we shall illustrate, they frequently fall into unofficial hands.

According to Congressman Walter, they “do not express official opinions of the Committee and must therefore be written as nothing more than compilations of information from public sources in our files — without added comment or evaluation. Evaluation and use of the information become the responsibility of the recipient.” (Italics ours)

Congressman Walter apparently saw no threatening specter in the circulation of raw, unevaluated file material about an individual. He said: “It would be a virtually impossible task to ‘prove’ the many thousands of references in our files, even if we did not have the problem of limited personnel.” Furthermore, he said, those who felt wronged could file an affidavit, which “would become part of their record.” How a person might know that he had been included in the file in the first place was not explained.

Congressman Walter claimed that the files were “documented” because each entry was identified as to its source. He also claimed that the “references reported are not selected in indiscriminate fashion. Our staff has a set of rules, reflecting committee policy, which it follows in compiling and reporting information from committee files.” Whatever the rules may be, much of the “documented” material comes from thoroughly discredited sources.

Congressman Walter further argued that the Committee has never made the judgment, on the basis of information in an unevaluated file, that anyone was a Communist or a Communist sympathizer, and that a printed statement is attached by the Committee to each entry in the file which says: “This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by, or findings of this Committee. It should be noted that the individual is not a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise noted.” (Italics ours) While he declared that if any person or group used the raw file material without including this statement the HUAC was not responsible, this “disclaimer” is meaningless because the files contain many “otherwise noted” items alleging Communist connections.

Despite all these explanations, highly damaging charges have snowballed to injure reputations and livelihoods. The HUAC has not supervised the way in which its material is gathered, processed and released.

Numerous cases show that:

1. Committee rules on who may be authorized to receive file information have been repeatedly violated and material has been given directly to members of the general public.

2. There is no requirement that recipients who use the material provide the original source of the
Committee's unevaluated information. They usually credit the HUAC as their source giving the impression that governmental authority stands behind the information.

3. There is no requirement that recipients consider the dating of information; organizational affiliations, for example, sometimes are made to appear current when they have occurred 10, 15 or even 20 years before.

Three classic cases concerning individuals of stature demonstrate the abuses inherent in the Committee's raw files.

1. The case of the Reverend Stanley I. Stuber, Executive Director of the Missouri Council of Churches of Jefferson, Mo.

This case arose in the early 1960's when a minister of another church in the Reverend Stanley Stuber's home community, acting as a private citizen, asked for and apparently obtained from the HUAC material on Dr. Stuber contained in its raw file.

This material contained data on Dr. Stuber's alleged associations with five organizations considered "suspicious." Without reprinting the Committee's introductory statement that the material was unevaluated; without including the dates of Dr. Stuber's alleged memberships in the organizations (some as long ago as 1949); and claiming to have the information "direct" from Congressman Walter himself, the borrowing clergyman simply reproduced portions of the unevaluated file and sent it to all members of the Missouri state legislature.

The publicity on Dr. Stuber was subsequently widely circulated throughout the state, and he spent two years endeavoring to clear his name. Part of Dr. Stuber's effort to counter-act this smear was an explanation of his association with each organization in a letter to his Congressman, Thomas B. Curtis, to whom he protested the HUAC-based attack.

Dr. Stuber accompanied his explanation with a vigorous statement denying any improper affiliations and asserting that if confronted with the same circumstances today, he would do everything as he had before, since in each case his actions had stemmed from a concern to express a "Christian conscience."

Congressman Curtis, recognizing the injury done to the reputation of this important church official, characterized the publicity as "degrading." While stating his general support of the HUAC, he recommended that serious thought be given to devising ways of avoiding such abuses of the Committee's file. To the ACLU's knowledge, nothing has been done.

2. The case of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.,

Winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for his leadership of the non-violent civil rights movement, Dr. King is a target for hate groups of all kinds throughout the nation. The American Nazi Party, the Ku Klux Klan and Billy Hargis' Christian Crusade have attacked Dr. King as a Communist sympathizer and collaborator, and these defamations have been — and
are today — broadly distributed throughout the South. To trace the origin of such statements is like running through a maze, but yet in the end it reveals how the HUAC material, combined with unscrupulous use of “guilt by association,” smeared Dr. King.

The trail begins with Dr. King’s attendance in 1957 at the 25th anniversary of Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tennessee, where he was photographed. Several weeks after, the Georgia Education Commission, an official state agency organized to fight school desegregation, published a booklet branding Highlander as a “Communist training school.” Its major evidence was unsupported charges from the HUAC hearings and files involving Highlander and some of the people connected with it. The booklet also included the photograph of Dr. King at the School.

The School, a 27-year old interracial education center, has long been the target of Southern segregationists. Highlander has stressed interracial educational improvements as a key remedy for social and economic problems confronting the South. Many civil rights leaders active in integration movements throughout the country have attended Highlander, and it had received the support of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and the Reverend Reinhold Niebuhr.

A Tennessee “little HUAC” investigated the School exhaustively and temporarily forced its closing under a legal subterfuge, but could not prove the “Communist training school” label. Nevertheless, photographs of Dr. King at the anniversary celebration, coupled with the Georgia Education Commission’s scurrilous booklet based on HUAC information, are frequently used in Southern communities to besmirch him and the civil rights movement.

3. The case of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

The international fame of the late First Lady did not shield her in 1961 from becoming the center of a Providence, R. I. controversy when a school teacher there accused her at an ACLU public meeting of being a Communist sympathizer — on the basis of an article he had read in a magazine, which in turn had accused her of being “cited” 57 times by the HUAC. The charge brought this denial from the late Frank S. Tavenner, then chief counsel and staff director of the Committee: “I don’t know anything of that nature whatever and I have been here 12 years.”

Mr. Tavenner explained the confusion by offering as a possible reason for the charge a description of how the Committee’s reports are indexed. During Committee hearings each time a name is mentioned it is placed in the index of the hearings, no matter what the context may be. (Italics ours) Annual indices and appendices for each year have been combined in two cumulative indices. It was true, Mr. Tavenner pointed out, that Mrs. Roosevelt’s name appears many times (many more than 57), but so do the names of J. Edgar Hoover, the late President Roosevelt, Richard M. Nixon, and virtually every other person in the public eye who may have been mentioned, either favorably or
unfavorably, in connection with many public issues. The “citations” of Mrs. Roosevelt include being labeled as a “fascist” by a witness before the HUAC, a complaint from a woman that she objected to the recipes published by Mrs. Roosevelt’s daughter, and the fact that a group sent her a telegram while she was First Lady. In all cases, the Committee staff director pointed out, she is “cited” because her name appears in some statement in Committee hearings or other records. But she had never been “cited” by the Committee as organizations are, or legally cited for contempt of Congress, as were some witnesses, Mr. Tavenner stated.

All these important distinctions are lost when zealots, breathing the hot fire of the “subversive” hunt, regard any HUAC reference as proof of a person’s involvement with Communism. Even today the same kind of “citation” which presidents receive through mere mention during a hearing, can create for an ordinary citizen whispers of suspicion throughout the land. The fault lies not with the Committee’s indexing system, but with the very existence of files from a Congressional committee whose subject matter is “un-Americanism.”

THE NIGHTMARE OF MISTAKEN IDENTITY

At least six known cases of mistaken identity in the 1950’s provide further graphic evidence of how badly Committee files are handled.

One of the most dramatic — and tragic — was that of a Hollywood screenwriter whose work, after a promising beginning, was suddenly unsalable anywhere in Hollywood. After five years, as he was beginning to believe he had lost his talent, he discovered his name was almost identical with that of a California clothier who had been “cited” by the Committee. The writer “cleared” himself, finally, in the movie industry, by carrying around a letter from the HUAC indicating that he was not the same person listed in the files. As New York Times reporter Murray Schumach wrote in an interview with the screenwriter: “(He) took back the letter and folded it carefully in his portfolio. He shook his head. ‘Now I feel numb,’ he said. ‘But I can’t help thinking that in those five long years nobody ever asked me once: Are you this man? Could you be this man? Nobody ever asked me.’”

But even the HUAC “clearance” made no difference to fearful movie executives. The New York Times, in reporting the screenwriter’s death in 1964, said: “Despite the clearance, (he) found Hollywood doors still closed to him, and during recent years he turned to TV scripts under an assumed name — the only way, he said, that he could sell his work.”

In another case, Mrs. Agnes Meyer, an outspoken Committee critic and influential Washington, D.C. educator, was accused by the HUAC of writing a pro-Russian article for a Russian newspaper. Close investigation showed the article was written by a Canadian woman with a closely similar name. It took the threat of a libel suit to make the Committee admit its error. However, Congressman Harold Velde, the
HUAC chairman, justified the incident by saying “it was better to wrongly accuse one person of being a Communist than to allow many to get away with Communist acts . . .”

A schoolteacher in Mexico City found her name listed in a newsmagazine article written by Congressman Walter, claiming that “Mexico and Cuba now become the links of an underground railroad that carries Communist sympathizers from the U.S. to Moscow.” When the teacher protested to Congressman James Roosevelt that she was about to lose her job because of the mention, Roosevelt asked for a check of the HUAC files and was told they revealed nothing against the Mexico City schoolteacher. She lost her job anyway.

In still another mistaken-identity case involving the HUAC files, a young Denver physician who had established a growing practice in a neighboring suburb, and his wife, were called to testify before the Committee and explain allegations in the Committee file that he had been a member of a Communist Party “cell” in Denver. He was able to prove that he had been in the East attending medical school during the period in question. But his practice dropped significantly after news of his appearance before the HUAC was publicized, and it took several years to rebuild.

The Committee’s propensity for fingering “the wrong man” was shown also when two young people from New York and New Jersey were referred to as Communists by Congressman Walter during a HUAC investigation of American youth participation in alleged Communist-controlled worldwide youth congresses. Congressman Walter later admitted he was in error.

**SUMMARY**

The House Un-American Activities Committee’s methods violate the Bill of Rights and greatly injure individuals and organizations. Despite some change in its pattern of operation over the years, the Committee violates constitutional rights by:

1. Conducting public hearings without traditional due process safeguards; seeking vast publicity, then tossing witnesses to the community and the local press for later punishment; attempting to act as prosecutor, judge and jury of witnesses (all functions of the Executive and Judicial branches of government); and inviting economic and social sanctions against uncooperative witnesses by holding them up to public exposure and scorn.

2. Encouraging Americans to become informers on past associates’ political beliefs and associations.

3. Allowing abuses of its raw, unevaluated files; failing in effective supervision of the use made of information it has gathered, which results in character assassination and
widespread smears grounded on admittedly unproved listing and “citations.”

SECTION FOUR

How the Committee Hurts Vital Areas of American Life

The House Un-American Activities Committee believes that it is a sentinel, searching out evidence of subversion and protecting innocent Americans from being “duped” by Communism. But in reality it has sapped the strength of America’s heritage of free discussion and dissent, assailed religious and social conscience, and lent comfort to those who malign efforts toward Negro equality.

Examination of the Committee’s action in these vital areas underscores the harm done to the whole nation.

ATTACKS UPON EDUCATION

Despite Committee protestations that its concern is only with individual teachers rather than the field of education as such, the educational enterprise in the United States has been investigated and accused by the Committee on an alarming scale — all in the glare of full publicity. The public schools, the colleges and universities, large and small, old and new, public and private — all have found their faculties cast under clouds of suspicion.

The HUAC formula is to summon faculty members to public hearings and challenge their political beliefs and associations. The result usually has been the triggering of further investigations by school administrations, firings, and bitter and divisive controversies among faculties.

A description of just two sets of hearings in 1953 and 1954 shows the hurtful effect.

The Committee’s hearings in Philadelphia in October and February, 1953 resulted in the dismissal of a highly-placed faculty member at Temple University when he pled the Fifth Amendment. Then school administrators began to “survey” their own staffs in terms of the Pennsylvania Loyalty Act, a state law which requires state-aided institutions to take steps to make certain no “subversive persons” are in their employ.

Accordingly, administrative officials at Jefferson Medical School began a five-month inquiry into the political activities and affiliations of three faculty members, under no direct spur from the HUAC in the initial stages of the inquiry. Several months of dialogue with the medical school’s officials followed, during which the most persistent problem seemed to be the professors’ unanimous refusal to become informers. After having been threatened with subpoenas if they persisted in their refusal to name other persons, the three teachers were served with subpoenas from the House Un-American Activities Committee in the Dean’s office.

Subsequently, only one of the three teachers appeared before the Committee and he refused to an-
swer questions dealing with activity prior to taking the state loyalty oath. All three, however, were summarily dismissed under conditions of shocking discourtesy; they were not permitted to complete current research, were given brief time to remove personal belongings and the locks on their offices and laboratories were changed within hours of their leaving.

Since all three teachers were given letters saying that their job termination "was not (italics ours) based upon a finding that you were a subversive person as that term is defined in the Pennsylvania Loyalty Act," the teachers never were given reasons for their dismissal and the Jefferson Medical School stated it had no intention of furnishing an explanation. All this created enormous tension and controversy within the academic community.

A more direct approach by the HUAC was exemplified in the case of an Ohio State University professor who, in March, 1953, declined to testify before the HUAC at a Washington, D.C. hearing. He was suspended by OSU, which then launched its own investigation into his loyalty during which he testified he was not and never had been a Communist Party member.

Apparently angered by the OSU teacher's defiance of the HUAC but cooperation with his own institution, Congressman Gordon Scherer, a Committee member, promptly led a HUAC delegation to the professor's campus, and "exposed" him for having made such a denial to a University committee while refusing to answer the HUAC. The teacher's suspension became dismissal.

The Committee's intimidation of the teaching profession has reached to the very edge of bookburning. In 1949 it brazenly solicited lists of textbooks and reading lists from dozens of universities, and its files have been used as a handy tool for super-patriots who seek to expose and ban books written by "subversive" authors. In the mid 1950's a battle raged in San Antonio to save the city from Communism by flushing out "subversive" books from the public library. Mrs. Myrtle G. Hance, a former officer of the Minutewomen of America, and six assistants produced a list of 600 books written by authors with allegedly Communist-front affiliations. To aid their compilation they checked the work of the HUAC, proceeding on the theory that if the Committee said a person was "Un-American," then he was dangerous and all of his writings was suspect. (Included in the list were Thomas Mann's "Joseph in Egypt," Einstein's "Theory of Relativity" and Melville's "Moby Dick" because the illustrator was Rockwell Kent.)

Teaching faculties on many levels, recognizing the serious threat that the HUAC presents, have voiced strong protest against its incursions on freedom.

In 1961 more than 250 professors in the fields of Economics, English, Modern Languages, Government and Political Science, History, Law, Natural Sciences, Philosophy, Physical Sciences, Sociology and half a dozen other disciplines, called on the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee. Joining with
the ACLU, they stated that while “the Committee has latterly improved its hearing manners; it has also attempted, through consultations, to examine the causes for the spread of Communism throughout the world . . . it continues to be careless or unscrupulous in villifying its critics.

“Students who assert their legitimate belief that the Committee has seriously damaged freedom have been labeled Communists or dupes of Communists*. The same fate has befallen others who have sought openly to discuss the merits of this governmental organ. Democracy cannot flourish when a legally unaccountable body intimidates dissenting citizens.”

The 250 educators who signed the statement pointed out that the “unrelenting” quality of the Committee’s harassment of teachers has resulted in so many teachers being driven from the field that “educational abilities and skills developed through long years of training have been withheld from the community. And this at a time when qualified teachers are in tragically short supply.”

*One of the prime examples of this kind of smear was a film, sponsored by the Committee and produced by a private film studio, titled “Operation Abolition.” This film purported to show that student opposition to the 1960 San Francisco HUAC hearings was purely the work of Communist agitators. The film caused a furor and was called a “forgery” and a dishonest report by many of the country's leading newspapers and organizations. Using newsreel footage shot by local television stations, events were arranged out of sequence by splicing together pictures of happenings actually separated by hours or days, and many other reporting errors were committed — in sum giving a false picture of the student demonstrations. Members of the press, observers from the local Bar Association and student leaders have all agreed that while there may have been some Communists in the crowds milling outside the hearing room, the large portion of student opposition was led by legitimately dissenting students and community groups still disturbed by the fate of the 110 California teachers subpoenaed by the Committee the previous year. (See page 12, “Conduct of Public Hearings”)

Whatever the Committee’s intent, the educators agreed, the total effect of its activity was that “many teachers in the colleges and universities as well as in the public schools, have grown timid about stating, even for classroom discussion, ideas which might later be interpreted as ‘subversive’.” The same point was emphasized by Dr. Stanley Livingston, a former president of the American Federation of Scientists, who noted that top scientific personnel hesitated to enter government service because of the fear of public embarrassment or because they may have once spoken to or cooperated with groups the Committee later defined as “wrong”.

Illustrating the harmful impact on the quality of free inquiry created by the HUAC, the ACLU-educators critique quoted these wise words of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas: “There can be no academic freedom in that environment. Where suspicion fills the air and holds scholars in line for fear of their jobs, there can be no exercise of the free intellect.”

ATTACKS UPON THE CLERGY AND PEACE MOVEMENT

If further evidence is needed to show how the HUAC’s existence has interfered with causes and conscience in the United States, it is provided by the Committee’s long-sustained attacks upon the leaders of organized religion and peace and disarmament movements.

The HUAC files still contain such outlandish state-
ments from the distant past as the charges that Rab-
bis Judah L. Magnes and Stephen S. Wise, two of the
most distinguished leaders produced by American
Jewry, and the Reverend John Haynes Holmes, pastor
of New York's famed liberal Community Church,
were, in their social action work, "carrying out the
instructions of the Communist Party or collaborating
with it."

These astonishing statements were made in 1953
in executive session of the HUAC by a paid ex-Com-
nist informer, Benjamin Gitlow, referring to activi-
ties which allegedly took place approximately 30 years
previously, during the period of Gitlow's Communist
Party membership. The HUAC's conscienceless at-
tack upon the clergy permitted it to release this and
similar testimony to a McCarthy-burdened public at a
time when the two rabbis were dead and Dr. Holmes
had retired from his pulpit.

Among the chief targets in the religious area have
been Bishops G. Bromley Oxnam and Henry Knox
Sherrill, leading Protestant church officials, and Dr.
Reinhold Niebuhr, famous theologian.

Bishop Oxnam first became a favorite mark for the
HUAC's attacks in 1946; finally, in 1953, the Bishop
requested a hearing to attempt to rebut the HUAC
files which he said had pilloried him for so long. In a
stormy 10-hour session, Bishop Oxnam stated that the
Committee's file and reference service (see section
on HUAC files, page 17) produces "a new and vicious
system of Ku-Kluxism in which an innocent person
may be beaten by unknown assailants, cloaked in
anonymity and at times immunity. . . ."

Charges against many religious leaders originated
in 1953 secret testimony, later made public, of five
ex-Communist paid professional witnesses, including
in addition to Benjamin Gitlow, Manning Johnson.
The latter had admitted several perjuries in the
course of his career and said he would commit perjury
"a thousand times" in the interests of the FBI.

Johnson achieved a kind of fame for calling UN
official Ralph Bunche a Communist. Because of his
unreliability, various courts and government review
boards refused to accept his testimony in numerous
proceedings. Nevertheless he was used by the HUAC
in 1953 as a friendly witness, when he claimed links
between the clergy and espionage and sabotage.
Equipped with photostats of public pronouncements
by various clergymen, Johnson attempted to develop
the theme that almost every aspect of liberal Chris-
tianity could be traced back to the Communist move-
ment. For example, he charged that a group led by
Dr. Niebuhr followed a policy "based upon the pro-
gram of the Communist Party for the infiltration of
the various Protestant denominations. . . ."

In addition, the HUAC's opposition to the National
Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. has
been ruthless. Contributors to the National Council's
huge project, a Revised Standard Version of the Bible,
were under constant scrutiny by the Committee and
its files are peppered with references to their affili-
tions with HUAC-determined Communist-fronts and
causes.
In January 1960 the National Council was the subject of a Committee onslaught in an incident involving an Air Force Training Manual. The Secretary of the Air Force ordered the withdrawal of the manual when the publication was found to contain such outrageous charges from the HUAC file as "The National Council of Churches officially sponsored the revised standard version of the Bible. . . . of the 90 persons who served on this project, 30 have been affiliated with pro-Communist fronts projects and publications."

The HUAC immediately applied severe pressure to reverse the withdrawal. Chairman Walter accused the Secretary of Defense of making a "groveling apology" to the National Council when it protested the manual and suggested an investigation, not of the manual, but of the reasons for its recall and a further investigation of the National Council as well.

The Committee called the Air Force Secretary into executive session, which was later made public. The hearings showed astonishingly belligerent questioning and intimidation of the government official. This was a typical exchange:

HUAC Counsel Arens: "Did you mean [by repudiating the pamphlet and apologizing to the Council] to intend a repudiation of the integrity, validity or accuracy of the testimony before the Committee which is quoted in this material?"

Air Force Secretary: "No Sir."

During the session with the Air Force Secretary, Arens said that original Committee statements in the manual indicating that the Council was infiltrated by hundreds of leadership people affiliated with Communist fronts and causes were an understatement, and the figure should really have been in the thousands.

Before the hearing was over, the HUAC Counsel had so browbeaten the Secretary that he agreed that any revised material would be checked with the HUAC; furthermore, the Air Force official said he hoped no one would interpret what had happened to mean that the Air Force "cast aspersions" on the HUAC and that he regretted if anyone might interpret the manual's withdrawal to mean the Air Force didn't believe the material contained in it.

It is not surprising that the San Francisco Chronicle editorialized on April 24, 1960 that the HUAC's preoccupation with the National Council was a "fanatical vendetta" and that the Committee "has never let up on its longstanding effort to blacken the name" of the Council.

Many clergymen view as a moral imperative the lending of their prestige to the search for a peaceful world and the avoidance of nuclear warfare. They have been joined in this quest by many citizens who have never before been politically active. These people possess such a deep concern with problems of peace and disarmament that many are joining various organizations for the first time in their adult lives. For them a HUAC investigation, accompanied by the usual publicity, is an especially frightening experience.
This was the case when the Committee undertook in 1962 an investigation of the extent of Communist infiltration into American peace groups. One of the groups singled out for attention was the Women's Strike for Peace, a volunteer group of women who had banded together to express concern with ways of avoiding nuclear war and attaining worldwide disarmament and peace. The group consisted of mothers and housewives, teachers, writers, social workers and other professional women.

Two-day hearings held in Washington, D.C. in December 1962 evoked country-wide opposition to the Committee's tarring with a broad "Red" brush the loosely-organized WSP and other groups working for increased public discussion and action on peace issues. The barrage of criticism leveled at the Committee can be understood in light of the HUAC's statement, issued prior to the hearings, explaining the purpose of the investigation: "Excessive concern with peace (Italics ours) on the part of any nation impedes or prevents adequate defense preparation, hinders effective diplomacy in the national interest, undermines the will to resist, and saps national strength. For these reasons, in today's world, intense peace propaganda and agitation in non-Communist nations obviously serves the aggressive plans of world Communism."

Although the Committee added that it believes many persons sincerely seeking peace are not Communists since the desire for peace is "universal," it maintained that the utmost vigilance is still necessary in the conduct of peace activities to prevent Communist infiltration. The kind of vigilance exercised by the HUAC's own "exposure" practices will, as the ACLU said at the time, "stifle the voices of those who dissent from government policies in the Cold War. The immediate effect of the investigation will be to deter private citizens from participating in groups and activities which are concerned with a deeply felt need, and thus impose a mantle of conformity over a segment of our society..."

Other voices raised against the Committee's philosophy and tactics during this hearing included that of famous cartoonist Herblock, who showed a late-arriving Committee member asking a colleague: "What are we against—Women or Peace?" Also airing criticism were editorial columnist Russell Baker of the New York Times, and syndicated columnists Inez Robb and Sydney J. Harris who spoke out sharply against the HUAC efforts to link peace groups with Communism.

"It is monstrous," wrote Miss Robb, "to permit peace and its advocacy to become criminal matters merely because the Russians have cynically used peace for propaganda." Columnist Harris defended WSP members as "women [who] are taking their responsibilities of citizenship seriously; unlike the bulk of us who awaken out of our torpor once every few years to vote and then subside into self centeredness."

Newspapers and publications joined Columnists Baker, Harris and Robb and Cartoonist Herblock in criticism of the HUAC's attempt to discredit peace workers. The Washington Post said the HUAC was
trying to “stifle protest” and added that it was “probably inevitable” that Women’s Strike for Peace would be subpoenaed “as soon as their group won any degree of . . . public recognition . . . (because) they are engaged in a protest, and to the Un-American Activities Committee, protest is synonymous with subversion.” An editorial of The Christian Century, a leading Protestant weekly, predicted that the Committee would draw the wrong conclusions from hearing WSP members and would decide that “the only true patriots are those who display belligerence and take intransigent positions at all times.” Attacking this point of view, The Christian Century stated that the HUAC would also attempt to prove itself as the nation’s first line defense against subversion, but, it said, “the fact is the exact opposite. The Committee is not our first line of defense . . . that first line is in the uncoerced loyalty of Americans to democracy.”

Congressman Leonard Farbstein of New York, among whose constituents were several of the women subpoenaed to testify at the WSP hearing, objected strongly to the Committee’s “excessive concern with peace” statement (see page 29) and asked, in a speech on the House floor: “Are we not here all committed to peace? The Senate has ratified the partial nuclear test ban. Are the members of the Senate thereby servants of the ‘aggressive plan of world Communism’”? He pointed out that the test ban treaty had been urged by many peace groups before it became national policy.

After two days of hearings on the Women’s Strike for Peace, in which the group’s spokesmen used humor and feminine innocence to puncture the Committee’s stand, the investigation was adjourned. There was no resulting legislative recommendation, but, of course, the women had been “exposed.” And the Committee still wasn’t finished with them.

Despite the unproductive nature of its initial inquiry into Communist influence in the peace movement, the Committee held another hearing in late 1964 at which it again summoned Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, founder and international representative of WSP, and another WSP worker, Mrs. Donna Allen.

This time they were interrogated about a 1963 protest they made to the State Department when the Department initially interfered with a planned speaking tour in the United States by Professor Kaoru Yasui, Chairman of the Japan Council Against A and H Bombs, and Dean of the Law Faculty at Tokyo’s Hosai University. The women had sharply criticized the State Department when the Department had refused to grant Professor Yasui a visa; the Department subsequently changed its mind and Professor Yasui spoke in 10 American cities to both peace and academic groups.

Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Allen challenged the secrecy of the HUAC executive session, asserting that what they did in exercising the First Amendment right of free speech in complaining to the State Department in no way involved national security or derogated any individual. They refused to answer the HUAC’s questions and have been cited for contempt of Congress.
If their cases are lost in the courts they may go to prison.

**ATTACKS UPON THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT**

Unquestionably, the most critical area of American life is race relations.

The pace of Negro citizens' long march toward the end of second-class citizenship has quickened since the Supreme Court's 1954 school desegregation decision, despite bitter last-ditch opposition. In this tense period, when Americans should be seeking to strengthen the national consensus on equal treatment for all, the existence of the HUAC helps to further divide us. The Committee has been an important resource for those forces in our society which have sought to equate integration with subversion, the civil rights movement with Communism.

**ITEM.** The New York Times published early in 1964 a story describing how an "intelligence network" of state agencies and officials in Alabama was compiling data about civil rights advocates — and that a sizeable amount of information was being fed into this network from the HUAC's unevaluated files.

According to Times reporter Claude Sitton, Governor George C. Wallace had directed several state agencies to investigate both Southerners and others (including Justice Department officials and newsmen) coming into the state, as "possibly subversive persons." To carry out these orders, Major W. R. Jones, head of the Investigative and Identification Division of Alabama's Department of Public Safety, told the Times that files were being maintained to enable officials "to keep up with people in the state of Alabama who are apt to cause us trouble . . . people who have been involved in racial disturbances." The 1963 annual report of Major Jones' Department of Public Safety (which supervises the "Subversive Unit") states that it received "One hundred and one files on reports from the House Un-American Activities Committee; they were added to the files and indexed." (Italics ours)

**ITEM.** A number of state legislatures have established "little HUAC's," using the House Un-American Activities Committee as a model and mentor. In the South, not surprisingly, integration activities bear the brunt of these groups' action. In Florida such an investigating committee emulated the HUAC by using a discredited informer, J. B. Matthews, to testify that the NAACP leadership in that state was Communistic; two civil rights leaders cited for contempt because of their refusal to cooperate with the state committee were later vindicated by the courts.

**ITEM.** In October, 1963 the Southern Conference Education Fund, a New Orleans-based organization working for integration in the South, was the target of simultaneous raids by city and state police. The police raided the homes and offices of two well-known New Orleans civil rights attorneys, Benjamin E. Smith, and his law partner, Bruce Waltzer, and the home and office of Dr. James A. Dombrowski, executive director of the SCEF. Smith was treasurer of SCEF at the time of the raid.
Police confiscated a truck-load of books, records and personal possessions from the men's offices and homes and charged that they were guilty of criminal conspiracy and of managing a subversive organization as defined under Louisiana's newest "anti-subversive" law.

The raids were staged at the request of a Louisiana legislative "little-HUAC" committee, whose Chairman, James Pfister, justified the foray on the grounds that the House Un-American Activities Committee had "cited" the SCEF as a "Communist-front," had claimed its forerunner, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, was organized by the Communist Party, and had "cited" Dombrowski for various other organizational activities. Smith was arrested in his function as treasurer, and his partner, Waltzer, for membership in the National Lawyers Guild.

Pfister also claimed, as proof of SCEF's "subversion," that the "organization has been engaged in open racial agitation throughout the Southern part of the U.S. It is closely tied in with other organizations carrying on racial agitation. Under the guise and sham of the racial issue, many good and well-meaning people have been duped into supporting this Communist-led group."

(The Louisiana's committee's staff counsel, in response to a question on a television program, said the Committee had not contacted the FBI for aid in planning the raid because they were convinced that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy would have warned New Orleans SCEF officials.)

The charges against the SCEF officials and Waltzer were dismissed by a Louisiana Criminal District Court, which ruled that the state had failed to produce sufficient evidence to bring the men to trial, and also that the police had acted on "conclusions, rather than evidence" in staging the raids and making the arrests. However, they were subsequently indicted by a New Orleans Parish Grand Jury; the indictment is pending because of the men's challenge in the federal courts of the constitutionality of the Louisiana "anti-subversive" law. The ACLU is supporting the challenge as a violation of free speech and association, in an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Strong protests were made by the American Civil Liberties Union to Attorney General Kennedy. The actions against Smith and Waltzer which originated with the HUAC "citations" were, in the ACLU's judgement, "reprisals" against them for their handling of many civil rights and desegregation cases. This kind of harassment of attorneys who have publicly put their reputations and careers into the civil rights battle will cause many lawyers to retreat into the safety of non-involvement.

ITEM. At the height of the Congressional debate on pending civil rights legislation in 1963, just before the famous "March on Washington," Congressman C.C. Gathings of Arkansas read into the Congressional Record 30 pages of quotes from HUAC files. The material labelled 59 persons who have been prominently associated with the National Association
for the Advancement of Colored People with Communist affiliations or sympathies. He concluded that the character of the NAACP was “subversive.”

Repeating an attack he had first made in 1956, Congressman Gathings was careful to begin his attack on these people with the Committee’s printed statement introducing material from its files. Then Congressman Gathings read a long list of affiliations, publications, organizational ties and other activities, all tending to suggest that the named individual was either a Communist or a Communist sympathizer.

For example, among the many outstanding Americans on the NAACP Board of Directors is Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Nobel peace prize winner and presently UN Undersecretary for Special Political Affairs. Congressman Gathings’ handling of this famous statesman was a model of innuendo and implication, without a direct statement that could effectively be challenged outside the privilege of his Congressional immunity. In discussing the “subversive” nature of NAACP leadership, Congressman Gathings read, without any explicit comment whatever, three pieces of information about Dr. Bunche. The first was the usual HUAC introductory statement attached to file information. Then followed information concerning Dr. Bunche’s long-ago support of three organizations which either had been “cited” by the HUAC as “Communist fronts” or were derogatorily mentioned in its files. Finally, the section on Dr. Bunche closed with the information that a federal loyalty board had cleared him without question and had issued a unanimous opinion that “there was no doubt as to [his] loyalty . . . to the Government of the United States.” Congressman Gathings made no attempt in his speech to weigh the relative merits of this federal security clearance against the earlier alleged affiliations nor did he attempt to indicate how important (or unimportant) the Committee’s own cautionary introduction might be to any individual’s record in the file. He simply recited truths, half-truths and unproved possible truths in one continuous string of data which raised doubts as to whether Dr. Bunche was a threat to the U.S. or a maligned citizen whose honor had been restored by a federal security check.

Other nationally-respected Negro leaders were attacked in the Gathings speech, such as Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP, and A. Philip Randolph, one of the key organizers of the 1963 March and for many decades an important national labor leader as well as civil rights figure. The charges against Randolph in HUAC files were the usual ones of affiliation with the “wrong” Negro organizations, although Congressman Gathings admitted that Randolph had fought against the possibility of Communist domination in one group to which he had belonged.

Thurgood Marshall, now Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and formerly head of the NAACP’s Legal Defense and Education Fund, was considered a part of the NAACP “subversive conspiracy.” Supposedly incriminating information about him not only included past membership in two
legal groups attacked by the HUAC as "Communist fronts," but also the fact that he had criticized the federal loyalty program.

Another Negro subjected to smear, who plays an important role on the national scene despite the HUAC's attacks, was Robert C. Weaver, presently Administrator of the federal Housing and Home Finance Agency. One of Mr. Weaver's "mistakes," as catalogued in the HUAC files, and twice repeated in the Congressional Record by Congressman Gathings, was the writing of a book on Negro housing called "The Negro Ghetto," which was reviewed in a Communist publication!

Congressman Gathings' speech gave similar treatment to respected white persons who were in the NAACP's leadership. The late Reverend John Haynes Holmes, who as pastor of New York's Community Church won world-wide respect for more than 30 years of support for peace, civil rights and many other liberal causes, was an NAACP founder. He was a HUAC file target, and therefore, included in Congressman Gathings' attack, along with two eminent white civil liberties attorneys who served on the NAACP's legal advisory committee, Morris L. Ernst, director emeritus of the ACLU, and Shad Polier, an official of the American Jewish Congress.

The Gathings statement is a perfect example of how the names of Negroes and whites, no matter what their stature, who have been militant in the pursuit of Negro rights and vigilant in the cause of civil liberties, are found in HUAC files. They and their cause are vilified by the charge of Communist sympathy.

ITEM. Governors George C. Wallace of Alabama and Ross Barnett of Mississippi and Attorney General Bruce Bennett of Arkansas appeared before Congress in 1963 to testify against the proposed Civil Rights law. They made the inflammatory argument — carried on the front pages of newspapers — that the civil rights movement was Communist-led, featured by their allegation that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. associated with Communists. Their proof? The Georgia Education Commission booklet (described on page 20) which stitched together its charge that Highlander Folk School was a "Communist training school," based on HUAC file and hearing data, and the photograph of Dr. King attending the School's 25th anniversary celebration in 1957.

ITEM. The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, a major civil rights organization, came under attack early in 1964 when the group was spearheading new efforts to desegregate places of public accommodation in Atlanta.

After about two weeks of SNCC demonstrations and peaceful picketing of restaurants in January and February, the Atlanta Constitution carried articles stating that "several supporters" of the student group had been "linked" to "Communist activities," through listings in the HUAC files.

Because of the demonstrations, the Atlanta Board of Aldermen was considering at the same time whether it had the power to pass a local public accommodations ordinance. Instead of dealing with
this matter the Board, without debate, passed a resolution calling on the House Un-American Activities Committee to investigate the subject matter of the Constitution's articles, "to the end that local Communist activities be exposed and legitimate organizations cleared of any suspicion of disloyalty."

The city governing group said it was necessary to invite HUAC to conduct this investigation because "various racial demonstrations in the public streets and in business houses (have been) calculated to injure the good name and image of Atlanta throughout the nation. . . . Some of these demonstrations," said the resolution, "would indicate a desire to injure not only Atlanta, but the entire nation. . . ." The resolution claimed that a "number of professional agitators have come to Atlanta lately and aligned themselves with certain organizations which said persons are either Communists or Communist-front organizations." (sic)

ITEM. In 1955 Georgia's Attorney General, Eugene Cook, addressed a police officer's convention on "The Ugly Truth About the NAACP." The HUAC file furnished the basic material for this speech; it has been reprinted by the White Citizens Council and extensively circulated throughout the South as a definitive statement by the state's highest ranking legal officer on the "subversive" nature of the civil rights group.

Mr. Cook defined the NAACP as the "most ominous threat to arise in our lifetime." Quoting liberally from extensive HUAC files, he said they showed "the subversive design behind the current crusade of the misnamed NAACP and its fellow-traveling fronts to force upon the South the Communist-inspired doctrine of racial integration and amalgamation.

"The issue," said Mr. Cook, "is not one of race, but rather of subversion, . . . none of the organizations which have exploited the race issue in this country has ever had the welfare of the negro (sic) at heart." He claimed the NAACP's original impetus and leadership has always come from "South-hating white people with records of affinity for, affiliation with, and participation in Communist, Communist-front, fellow-traveling and subversive organizations, activities and causes."

The Georgia Attorney General said he could authenticate these charges with evidence from the HUAC files which numbers "121 pages of single-spaced typewritten copy that would require more than six hours to read. . . ." In giving highlights from this "evidence," Mr. Cook selected five well-known Americans who were "cited" many times in the HUAC files and whom he characterized as "apologists for left-wing causes." These "apologists" were Senator Wayne Morse; the late Eric Johnston, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Motion Picture Association of America; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Walter Reuther; and the late Senator Herbert Lehman.

Mr. Cook also used listings in the HUAC files to attack Gunnar Myrdal's famous book on American race relations, "An American Dilemma." Mr. Cook denigrated the Myrdal book because one of its contribu-
tors, the late sociologist W.E.B. DuBois, a NAACP founder, had more than 70 “citations” in HUAC files, and because more than 15 other writers who contributed to the book had HUAC-determined “lengthy records of pro-Communist activity.” Mr. Cook explained that the “racial aims of the Communist Party and those of the NAACP are virtually identical.” He listed these aims as: 1) full racial equality; 2) abolition of all segregation laws; 3) abolition of laws forbidding intermarriage; 4) abolition of laws preventing Negro children from attending general public schools or universities; 5) full and equal admittance of Negroes to all waiting rooms, restaurants, hotels and theaters.

“Through its activities, the NAACP is fomenting strife and discord between the white and Negro races in the South and is disrupting relations between these races which heretofore have been—and at present are—harmonious and friendly in every respect. These activities, carried out to their ultimate conclusion . . . will deliver this nation into the hands of international Communism,” Mr. Cook concluded.

**SUMMARY**

The House Un-American Activities Committee has hurt vital areas of American life. The Committee has done this by:

1. Attacking education and educators so persistently that discussion of controversial issues was curbed.

2. Assaulting individuals and groups which, motivated by religious or ethical concerns, are active in various social movements.

3. Establishing files on individuals which have been used to attack the civil rights movement and its leaders by attempting to link civil rights activity with subversion and Communism.

This is the case against the HUAC. This is why the ACLU and many other organizations and individuals call for its abolition, or at the very least, drastic curbs on it. This is why we urge all Americans to join with us in this vital effort to preserve freedom.
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