



No \_\_\_\_\_











700, 7 23  
1501-4

# FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

---

---

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

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

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

APRIL 29, MAY 5, OCTOBER 10, 1960  
TOGETHER WITH HEARING HELD  
JANUARY 10, 1961

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

T 1



MAR 3 1964

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina	KENNETH B. KEATING, New York
JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado	NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut	
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan	
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri	
WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY, Texas	

---

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

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut, *Vice Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina	KENNETH B. KEATING, New York
	NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

J. G. SOURWINE, *Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*



# CONTENTS

---

Testimony of—	Page
Beals, Carleton.....	1
Grant, Joanne Alileen.....	67
Santos-Buch, Charles A.....	77
Taber, Robert.....	13
Tynan, Kenneth.....	53



## RESOLUTION

*Resolved by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, That the injunction of secrecy be removed from testimony given in executive session by Carleton Beals on April 29, 1960; Robert Taber and Kenneth Tynan on May 5, 1960; and Joanne Alileen Grant on October 10, 1960;<sup>1</sup> and be it further*

*Resolved, That said testimony be printed and made public.*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Chairman.*

THOMAS J. DODD.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

JOHN L. McCLELLAN.

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.

ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

KENNETH B. KEATING.

NORRIS COTTON.

Approved February 27, 1961.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Santos-Buch testified in public session.



# FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

---

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1960

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, Senator Olin D. Johnston presiding.

Present: Senators Johnston, Thomas J. Dodd and Kenneth B. Keating.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research and Frank W. Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator JOHNSTON. The subcommittee will come to order.

Will you please raise your right hand and be sworn?

Do you swear the evidence you will give before this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to be the truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BEALS. That 'is right.

## TESTIMONY OF CARLETON BEALS, KILLINGWORTH, DEEP RIVER, CONN.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is your full name, sir?

Mr. BEALS. Carleton Beals.

Mr. SOURWINE. And your address?

Mr. BEALS. Fire Tower Road, Killingworth, Deep River, Conn.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have a telephone there?

Mr. BEALS. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the number?

Mr. BEALS. Montrose 9-7466.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you employed, sir?

Mr. BEALS. Self-employed.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is your business or profession?

Mr. BEALS. Writing, lecturing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you, Mr. Beals, a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. BEALS. It is a rather anomalous position. I think I am.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you describe for the committee the circumstances of your joining the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. BEALS. I would be happy to, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes?

Mr. BEALS. I first received a letter from Robert Taber of CBS News. I have never met him, but I knew of some of his journalistic

exploits which were quite considerable and shortly before that, a magazine sent me an article of his and asked my opinion on it and I said I disagreed with some of it, but I thought it was a good article.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that his Nation article on Cuba?

Mr. BEALS. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Proceed.

Mr. BEALS. And then I got a letter from him that he was forming this committee; that he felt there had been a lot of misinformation and so on, and which has, along with some good information.

Well, I thought if that was his aim, was to merely bring out the facts, that that was a good thing for anybody to do, any American citizen to do and I said: "Yes; I would be interested."

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you signify that reply? Did you write him back?

Mr. BEALS. Yes, yes, I wrote him.

Senator JOHNSTON. And when did that take place?

Mr. BEALS. Let's see, this is April—that must have been in March, early March.

Senator JOHNSTON. This year?

Mr. BEALS. Yes.

Senator JOHNSTON. Proceed.

Mr. BEALS. And so he said, "Well, we want to run an ad in the New York Times."

Mr. SOURWINE. He said this? You mean he wrote you this?

Mr. BEALS. Yes, he wrote this.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was a second letter?

Mr. BEALS. I wouldn't know whether that was the first letter or the second letter.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see.

Mr. BEALS. And that they might try to get out a regular bulletin somehow. And so he said he had started this because some contractor in Brooklyn had written him about his article and was very much interested in it and wanted to put up \$500 and he was putting up the \$500. That was for this ad and they were going to see if they could raise some more.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he name the contractor in Brooklyn?

Mr. BEALS. He did. I don't have his name. I could send it to you.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have Mr. Taber's letter?

Senator JOHNSTON. We would like to have that for the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. Do you still have Mr. Taber's letter?

Mr. BEALS. I think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you be willing to let the committee have it and make a copy of it and return it to you?

Mr. BEALS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. May the Chair ask that that be done, if you would let us have it?

Senator JOHNSTON. Yes, that will be fine.

(The letter referred to was ordered marked "Exhibit No. 1" and reads as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 1

CBS NEWS,  
February 9, 1960.

Mr. CARLETON BEALES,  
Deep River, Conn.

DEAR MR. BEALES: I took the liberty of obtaining your address from Cary McWilliams because I was anxious to inform you of a development which I think will be of interest to you—in view of your broad knowledge of and long interest in Cuba.

A committee is being formed here in the city, for the express purpose of combating some of the anti-Cuban (counterrevolutionary is perhaps the more accurate expression) propaganda with which we are being deluged. The prime mover is a man of whom I know literally nothing, a chap named Alan Sagner who is, I understand, a builder in the Livingston, N.J., area. He contacted me after reading my recent article in the Nation, and said he wanted to bring along Reverend Reed, executive secretary of council of churches in Long Branch, N.J., and could enlist some other people. His idea: To form a Fair Play for Cuba Committee, or some such name, to seek some prominent names in the country at large, and to launch a sort of counterpropaganda campaign, perhaps even send a fact-finding committee to Cuba, with adequate attendant fanfare, via ads in the Times or whatever other means might recommend themselves.

Clearly all of this is not so simple. It will require a fund-raising effort, a letter-writing campaign, etc. I'm not at all sure of how it will go. However, it seems to me that the mere existence of such a committee will be of some use or benefit, and I would like to make bold to ask your help, in any event your counsel. I've had a very good mail response—and not only from Cubans—to the Nation article and to various radio broadcasts which I've made of late, and so have good reason to believe that the basis of a Fair Play Committee does exist. There is a deep skepticism in the public at large, I believe, with regard to the stuff doled out by the mass media, and the right kind of countercampaign might well have more effect than one would think at first glance.

Let me make my invitation specific: A few of us (I've invited Waldo Frank) are meeting at my apartment this coming Saturday, 118 West 79th Street, Manhattan, 2 p.m. to discuss plans. Perhaps you might like to come? In any case, I wonder whether I might not ask you to write and tell me what you think about the project that I have outlined here, and whether you would care to be associated with it, or to lend your name to it. Your help could be very valuable indeed, and I'm sure you will agree that the cause is a good one.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) ROBERT TABER.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, go ahead.

Mr. BEALS. He called me up once long distance and then wrote and wanted to know whether I would be cochairman. I said I didn't think I wanted to be cochairman. I didn't have the time and energy and I didn't want the responsibility. I didn't attend any. They held two committees, I think. I don't even know who was on those committees and I said I didn't know enough about it and I didn't want the responsibility, but I might consider it, and as you see, I am an honest man and I don't know whether I should be on as co-chairman or not.

Anyway, I wrote him on April 5. I thought this over some more and said I couldn't act as cochairman because I simply didn't have the time and secondly, I would have to have very definite assurances that the membership and sponsors, there would be no Communists and that no funds should be derived from the Cuban Government.

Mr. SOURWINE. That letter was quoted in part by Mr. Sokolsky in his column, was it not?

Mr. BEALS. That is right.

I wrote Mr. Sokolsky a letter, correcting some of his statements about myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you be willing the committee should have the full text of this letter, the one that you wrote Mr. Taber on April 5?

Mr. BEALS. Oh, yes, anything I have is at your disposition, gentlemen.

EXHIBIT No. 2

DEEP RIVER, CONN., April 5, 1960.

Mr. ROBERT B. TABER,  
CBS News, New York, N.Y.

DEAR TABER: In my last in reply to your suggestion that I become cochairman of the Fair Play to Cuba Committee, I replied that I might do so if you wished, but would prefer not to as I had no time to devote to it and did not feel I should accept the responsibility.

I have been hoping for a reply on that, but in any case I feel that I would not wish to accept the responsibility. As you know I have attended none of the sessions for organizing this committee, and I would have to know more about it and just who is on it.

Two things I would have to be reassured about: (1) That no Communist is part of the committee or is asked to become a sponsor. This would blow the whole thing out of the water. (2) That funds are from voluntary contributions and that no money is derived from the Cuban Government or their representatives, either directly or indirectly.

In other words, I would not want to be part of an inspired propaganda organization. It would be as bad, in my eyes, to twist any part of the record in favor of the Cuban Government as to falsify the record against Castro and his government.

Another reason for declining the honor is one which I do not like to mention. I do not believe that this cochairman idea is a good one. An organization such as this, and probably any organization demands direct responsibility, and in any case complete basic harmony. I am a great admirer of Waldo Frank and his writings; I think his "Virgin Spain" is a truly fine book, for instance. On the other hand, I am sure we do not see eye to eye on a great many things, particularly in the political field. I think he is a fine chairman, and should have the full responsibility.

Please know that I am as anxious as ever to further fair play to Cuba, which has been so sadly lacking in many of our press services.

Sincerely yours,

CARLETON BEALS.

Could I see your proposed ad, just as it is to be run?

C. B.

Senator JOHNSTON. All right, proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was the telephone conversation about?

Mr. BEALS. Oh, just that he was drawing up the ad and one thing or another and then I think the night before the ad came out, he called up and said, "Would you be willing to be honorary chairman," and I said, "Well, that might be all right if it didn't entail any responsibility with the committee," because I don't want to be responsible about something I didn't have full knowledge about and—

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. BEALS. And that more or less was our conversation and then the ad came out the next morning and my letter had just gone to him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is this the ad that you refer to, sir, an ad which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, April 6, 1960, page C33?

Mr. BEALS. Yes, that is the ad.

Senator JOHNSTON. You want to make that a part of the record?

Mr. SOURWINE. I thought perhaps you would wish to make it part of the record; whether you want to print it in the record or insert it by reference—

Mr. BEALS (interposing). I should say also that in rejecting the idea of being cochairman in my letter, I said that what I thought was that Mr. Waldo Frank was a very brilliant writer and quite competent



to head the committee without having a cochairman and it would be much better because my political opinions did not fully coincide with Mr. Frank's and it would be unfortunate to have a committee in which there was——

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you want to give us for our record a copy of that letter, Mr. Beals?

Mr. BEALS. Which?

Senator DODD. Senator, I suggest that we include this ad in the record as a whole. I think it is rather informative.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have the text of it printed? Do you want it reproduced as to size and format?

Senator DODD. As long as it is legible, I would suggest that.

Mr. SOURWINE. That can be done.

Senator JOHNSTON. Let me make this part of the record then.

(The advertisement referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 3" and is reproduced on the following page.)

Mr. BEALS. I would like to correct this. This is an exact copy of the letter, so I won't have to send you that.

Mr. Sokolsky was thrown off a bit. It is incorrect to say that I did not see the original ad.

Mr. Taber sent me the original ad and I don't know what I said on that or whether I said anything, but he wrote me that they were going to revise it and I asked him to send me the final, revised ad which I did not see until it came out in the paper so that there is just——

Mr. SOURWINE. You say this is a correct copy of your letter?

Mr. BEALS. That is correct.

Senator JOHNSTON. You saw the original ad as prepared, but you did not see it in its corrected form until it came out in the newspaper?

Mr. BEALS. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you saw the ad as published, did you note any changes from the original that you had seen?

Mr. BEALS. I really didn't examine it very closely. I think chiefly in the foreword——

Mr. SOURWINE. When you talked with Mr. Taber on the telephone the day before the ad came out, I think you said——

Mr. BEALS. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you and he discuss the fact that you had written this letter?

Mr. BEALS. I am not sure whether I mentioned it or not. I didn't really want to discuss it on the phone. I want it on the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you make to him, over the phone, any request such as you made in this letter, for assurance that this ad was not being paid for in whole or in part by Cuban money?

Mr. BEALS. I don't think so. I think our talk was very brief and I thought it was covered in this letter anyway.

Mr. SOURWINE. He said nothing to you on the telephone about that?

Mr. BEALS. No, no. He did, however, write me a letter saying that so far as he knew, none of the sponsors were Communists and making no out-and-out statement that there was no money from the Cuban Government but defining—well, what he said is "we have all dug down into our jeans." I told him from the start that I couldn't dig down into my jeans.

# REALLY WHAT IS HAPPENING IN CUBA?

From Havana come charges of sabotage, economic aggression, counter-revolutionary intrigue, air raids on Cuban cane fields, sugar mills, homes. Against this background, the great news agencies and a powerful section of the U. S. press raise a barrage of equally grave accusations. What can we believe in the welter of conflicting reports?

"WE ONLY REPORT THE FACTS," U. S. NEWSMEN ARE ACCUSTOMED TO SAY. IS THIS TRUE? COMPARE THE FOLLOWING "FACTS."

The public appeal for Fair Play for Cuba has the support of a group of leading individuals, including a number of political leaders whose reputations as able and respected leaders have been damaged by the anti-Cuban propaganda of the U. S. news agencies. The following are some of them, whose names are listed alphabetically with no regard to the order of their names in the list.

James Baldwin  
Simone de Beauvoir  
Frank London Brown  
Truman Capote  
John Henrik Clarke  
Prof. Robert G. Colodny  
Richard Gibson  
Dr. Maurice Green  
Edmond Haddad  
Rev. Donald Harrington  
John Killens  
Sidney Lens  
Norman Mailer  
Julian Mayfield  
Elva dePue Matthews  
Prof. Eugene Noble  
Rev. John Papandrew  
James Purdy  
Joseph Quintana  
Alao Sagre  
Jean Paul Sartre  
John Singleton  
Robert Taber  
D. A. Thurston  
Kenneth Tynan  
Dan Wakelield  
Sidney Weinstein  
Robert F. Williams

Waldo Frank, Chairman  
Carleton Beals, Co-Chairman  
Fair Play for Cuba Committee

**COMMUNISM:** "A pro-Communist state has been established in Cuba with the clear objective of bargaining with Soviet Russia for the munitions of war. . . . —Sokolov in the New York Journal-American, True or False?

False. Not a shred of evidence has been produced to support such allegations as the one above, charges consistently used to create a smoke screen behind which the social objectives of the Cuban revolution can be attacked and sabotaged. Cuba's recent trade pact with the Soviet Union represents an effort to find new markets for Cuban sugar, and to obtain, not arms, but agricultural implements and industrial machinery for which credit has been denied in the United States. Many other American republics trade with the Soviets—as does the United States itself. Cuba's Communist Party is a tiny minority, with about 16,000 members. In the 1959 labor elections, Communist candidates won in only eight of the 243 locals of the 500,000-member Sugar Workers Federation, and none was elected to the executive council of the national labor organization, the C.T.C. In international affairs, Cuba finds its natural affinity with the

**CONFISCATION:** "In Cuba, Castro is stealing American property with impunity."—U. S. News & World Report.

False. Although the word "confiscation" has often been used by the press in a context which would suggest illegal seizure, nothing has been stolen from any American—or any Cuban. The Agrarian Reform Law, designed to diversify Cuban agriculture and to give 130,000 landless peasants to stake in their own rich agricultural country, conforms in all respects with international law and the practice of all civilized countries. In some cases, it has been necessary to put property under the supervision of government representatives in process known as "intervention", pending a decision as to formal, legal expropriation.

**CHAOS:** "All that now remains is for Castro to give the word, and the Terror, the ruthless hunting down and shooting of Fidel's opponents, will begin."—Newsweek.

False. Despite the above prediction, Nov. 3, 1959, and the incessant references to "terror," "chaos," and "dictatorship" in the U. S. press, the great work of revolutionary reform and reconstruction now in progress in Cuba is going forward in an atmosphere of extraordinary optimism and energy, as any tourist can testify. The island is being governed by a provisional government under the Constitution of 1940, which is notable in the Hemisphere for its liberality. Cubans—and visitors to the island—remain freer in many respects than do U. S. citizens. For example, no police permit is required for a public meeting or demonstration, as in New York City. There is no censorship, not even a libel law. A foreign newsman needs no special visa, as he would

in other small, under-developed nations of the world. It is true that a profound social and economic revolution is in progress in Cuba, and that the sweeping reforms that are being inaugurated undoubtedly must affect the one-billion-dollar U. S. investment in the island. But only those who equate Communism with all forces that threaten the status quo of property interests will find the Cuban Revolution "Communist." Efforts to drive a wedge between the Roman Catholic Church and the Revolutionary Government, on the issue of Communism, have been forcefully repulsed by the Church itself. To quote the latest of several recent declarations on the subject, Monsignor Manuel Rodriguez Rozas, Bishop of Pinar del Rio, says: "There is perfect harmony between the Church and the State." "Our Revolution," says Fidel Castro, "is not Communist but humanist."

Owners whose property is to be expropriated (much as it would be acquired by condemnation in the United States, to meet any legitimate public need) have been promised compensation in 20-year government bonds, bearing interest at the rate of 4½%. This compares favorably with, for example, the U. S. land reform program imposed on Japan by General MacArthur after World War II, providing for compensation in 24-year bonds at 3½%. The Cuban bonds have been printed and await only the proper signatures.

in the United States to tourist card will do, and no restriction is placed on his movements. Even the air raids on Havana—the occasion of real terror, and in one instance of the death of two Cubans and the wounding of 45—have failed to force the government to take any but the most obviously urgent security measures. Despite an attempted invasion from Santo Domingo, a widespread counter-revolutionary conspiracy, and numerous small acts of sabotage and terrorism on the part of former Batista henchmen, the government has refrained from invoking the death sentence against convicted counter-revolutionaries. Newsweek notwithstanding, not one of these has been shot.

"WHAT HAVE WE DONE . . . ?" asks a new and hopeful generation of Cubans, viewed with hostility in Washington and Wall Street, accused of "impudence" for seeking their independence, threatened with economic and diplomatic "isolation" in the Hemisphere.

Perhaps their crime is their youth. (The average age of the Cuban revolutionary leaders is 29.) Perhaps they have opted toward too much, too soon. (Three thousand low-cost housing units built in the first year of revolution, more than 7,000 classrooms, hundreds of miles of new roads, 500 flourishing agricultural co-operatives, thousands of jobs created in new industries established through the voluntary contributions of a million Cuban workers.) Perhaps the explanation is simply that there are, in the United States, powerful interests bent on frustrating the primary purpose of the Revolution: to give Cuba back to the Cubans.

It is true that the young leaders of the Cuban Revolution have little patience with considerations of profit and loss, in the face of poverty and human need. Nor have they any saving experience with the amenities of public relations, or the intrigues of dollar diplomacy, or the sagacity of journalistic "facts" which distort truth. But if so, they are in the American tradition. Certainly they deserve a hearing. This much the American tradition owes them. This much we, as Americans, owe them.

Would you like to know more of the truth about revolutionary Cuba as it is today?

ADDRESS YOUR INQUIRIES TO:

THE FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE  
BOX T249 TIMES, NEW YORK

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you asked to?

Mr. BEALS. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, on the telephone, discuss with him the question of whether there were any Communists on the committee?

Mr. BEALS. No, I don't think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know all of the people whose names appear in the ad as members of the committee?

Mr. BEALS. The only one I ever met in my life was Mr. Waldo Frank and that was many, many years ago.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you addressed—

Mr. BEALS. Oh, I have had correspondence with Mr. Sidney Lens, of Chicago.

Mr. SOURWINE. About this committee?

Mr. BEALS. I think I mentioned the committee was being formed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is he a member of the committee?

Mr. BEALS. Yes, and you might be interested to find out if he wrote to Mr. Taber.

Mr. SOURWINE. You think he wrote to Mr. Taber as a result of your contact?

Mr. BEALS. Quite possible.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you wrote your letter to Mr. Taber on the date of April 5 did you have any reason to believe that any funds for the committee did come from a Cuban or Cuban Embassy source?

Mr. BEALS. No, I had no reason to believe that. I realized from Mr. Taber's conversation that he was apparently pretty close to the Cuban authorities. That is all I could say on that.

Senator KEATING. May I interrupt? Is he still with CBS?

Mr. BEALS. So far as I know.

Senator KEATING. What is he, in their news?

Mr. BEALS. The news department.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Beals, during the past years have you written books and articles on Mexico and Cuba?

Mr. BEALS. Oh, I have written books on Mexico and Cuba and Peru and this and that.

In fact, I would say that I was the first writer in this country that told about Communist activities in Latin America and this was published in Current History first, and later on in Harpers, Saturday Evening Post, and Reader's Digest, in a book, "The Coming Struggle for Latin America." I have a very definite chapter called Red Star Over Latin America.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was that book written?

Mr. BEALS. 1938.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was your thesis in that chapter with regard to the Red star over Latin America?

Mr. BEALS. The thesis was that the Communists were very active. Apparently they had money that was beyond their means, that the organization, their influence in organizing the confederation, Latin American Confederation of Labor, and so on.

Mr. SOURWINE. You could see it coming that early?

Mr. BEALS. Yes.

Senator JOHNSTON. What year was that?

Mr. BEALS. 1938, but I had articles on it before that, a number of years before that.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have been in general, friendly toward the Castro regime in Cuba. You are not a Batistaite?

Mr. BEALS. Certainly not a Batistaite. Let us put that on the record very firmly. I have written quite a number of articles about Castro and Cuba. I think if you check back they were fairly balanced. They were friendly but they were also—had their very definite political aspect.

Mr. SOURWINE. At the time Castro came into power, you were not an opponent of Castro or in opposition to him?

Mr. BEALS. I had some very critical things to say at that point because I was not sure what path he was going to follow and so on and so forth and some of the things in his previous career would seem a little suspicious to me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your articles about the Castro regime appeared in Nation, January 17, January 24, January 31, and May 2 of 1959?

Mr. BEALS. I imagine you have the dates correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. I don't ask that those articles be made a part of the record, sir, but the reference will be sufficient to identify them.

Mr. BEALS. I also wrote several pieces for the Christian Century.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you want to identify the dates or approximate dates in which those pieces appeared?

Mr. BEALS. I think one appeared—several appeared toward the end of the Batista period and the last one I am almost certain the date is March 9.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, were you, with Clifford Odets, coauthor of a pamphlet entitled "Rightful Rule in Cuba"?

Mr. BEALS. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was published by the Provisional Committee of Cuba, sponsored by the American Committee To Investigate Labor and Social Conditions in Cuba.

Mr. BEALS. Yes, that was way back. It must have been about in 1934.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you acquainted with any of the members of the American Committee To Investigate Labor and Social Conditions in Cuba?

Mr. BEALS. Only Clifford Odets.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not know Frank Gifford, Celeste Strack, or Paul Crosbie?

Mr. BEALS. No, I was not a member of that and the only thing I did was this with Clifford Odets.

There was one other person went down I knew. He was a professor at Oklahoma and he was at Boston University, I think he is pretty much a fellow traveler.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that the persons I named, that is Crosbie, Gifford, Strack had been candidates for office on the Communist Party ticket and members of this American Commission To Investigate Labor and Social Conditions in Cuba?

Mr. BEALS. No, I didn't know who was on anything.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you, yourself, ever been associated with organizations engaged primarily in the defense of Communist legal cases?

Mr. BEALS. That would be hard to say. I think there was one that took over general defense of labor cases, one thing or another. It may have defended some Communists. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a writer of the pamphlet "Blood on the Sugar" for the International Labor Defense?

Mr. BEALS. I may have been, I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't remember?

Mr. BEALS. I can't remember. May have picked it up somewhere else.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a member of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners?

Mr. BEALS. I was for a time. Then they put out some false material about the zinc industry somewhere in the Middle West. I wrote them a furious letter and said that I wasn't—couldn't stand for false information of that sort.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a sponsor of the Harry Bridges Victory Committee in 1940-41?

Mr. BEALS. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were a speaker for that committee?

Mr. BEALS. What?

Mr. SOURWINE. You were also a speaker for that committee?

Mr. BEALS. No, never.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were a sponsor of it?

Mr. BEALS. I was a sponsor. The final committee I would not go on because I became convinced that Communists were involved.

Originally, Mr. Bridges was acquitted by immigration authorities and courts and one thing or another of being a Communist and then it was brought up again and I thought that this was—I just felt that this was pushing it a little too far. I had a sort of feeling, as an American, that double jeopardy and triple jeopardy is not a good thing. I think you ought to have your facts and then proceed. But that is the only interest in Harry Bridges.

Mr. SOURWINE. Ever connected with the Prestes Defense Committee?

Mr. BEALS. The what?

Mr. SOURWINE. The defense committee for Luis Prestes.

Mr. BEALS. Never heard of it and never was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your name appeared on a cable in behalf of the Prestes Defense Committee. Was that with your authority?

Mr. BEALS. Not that I know of. I also might say that I am supposed to be a member of the Soviet something Friendship Committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes?

Mr. BEALS. And I never authorized the use of my name and, as soon as I found it out, I protested very vigorously.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know who Luis Prestes was?

Mr. BEALS. Is that the Brazilian?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Brazilian Communist.

Mr. BEALS. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know him?

Mr. BEALS. Never met him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a member of the National Committee for People's Rights in 1938?

Mr. BEALS. Don't recall it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a member of the National Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell?

Mr. BEALS. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your name, if used there, was used without your permission?

Mr. BEALS. That is right.

I might say with regard to Sobell, I got a number of letters from his wife which I didn't answer and then she sent me some material that was rather interesting and asked my opinion about it.

I said, "Well, I could not give an opinion unless I could see the whole transcript of the trial." Whereupon, I got that.

I wrote her my frank opinion and if that has been used anywhere, it has not been used with my knowledge or consent.

Mr. SOURWINE. Sir, I show you a mailing piece signed for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee by Marjorie More. It is a printed signature. I will ask you first if you have seen this or had a copy of it before.

Mr. BEALS. I have never seen it. I don't even know who Marjorie More is.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was the next question I was going to ask you. You had then nothing to do with the preparation of this article?

Mr. BEALS. Nothing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions of this witness. It may be that members of the committee will want to ask him about something I have overlooked.

Senator JOHNSTON. Any questions?

Senator KEATING. I have just one question, Mr. Beals.

Since this ad appeared in the New York Times or at any other time, has anything come to your attention to indicate that it was inspired or paid for in part, either by the Cuban Government or by any Communist sources?

Mr. BEALS. I have no knowledge.

Senator KEATING. You just don't know anything about it?

Mr. BEALS. I don't know anything about it. The only money I ever heard mentioned was this contractor in Brooklyn and Mr. Taber himself.

Senator KEATING. You don't know whether that contractor ever had done business with the Cuban Government or not?

Mr. BEALS. That I wouldn't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are going to furnish the committee with the correspondence that you have with Mr. Taber which will show that, the contractor's name and the other letter he wrote you.

Mr. BEALS. I will be delighted to.

Senator JOHNSTON. Do you know of anyone who paid for the ad?

Mr. BEALS. That is all I know.

Senator JOHNSTON. You don't know?

Mr. BEALS. I just don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may it be ordered that the material that is to be furnished by the witness may be inserted in the record at the appropriate place?

Senator JOHNSTON. All that you send in here we will be glad to make it a part of the record.

Mr. BEALS. I would like to have it back.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of course.

Senator JOHNSTON. Any that you desire to be made a part of the record, let's put it that way.

Mr. SOURWINE. And that this mailing piece may also go into the record?

Senator JOHNSTON. Yes; this will become a part of the record.

(The letter referred to was ordered marked "Exhibit No. 4" and because it was delayed in reaching the subcommittee, is printed as Appendix IV p. 122.)

Mr. BEALS. May I put a personal request in the record, that I had never seen it until you showed it to me?

Senator JOHNSTON. Oh, yes, your statement is in there.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean this?

Mr. BEALS. Yes.

Senator JOHNSTON. We will put that in right along with it.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is put in with what was shown to you.

Senator JOHNSTON. When you answered the question, we put that in the record right there, showing that you had never seen it.

Mr. BEALS. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. I simply want to tell the chairman that I have a small amount of additional material to offer for the record, but I would prefer to do it after this witness has been excused.

Senator JOHNSTON. We are certainly glad to have had you. We are going into another matter now.

Senator KEATING. Glad to have seen you, Mr. Beals.

(At this point in the proceedings the witness, Mr. Beals, left the hearing room.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, the committee subpoenaed, as the chairman knows, two other witnesses for this morning, Mr. Robert Taber and Mr. Kenneth Tynan.

Mr. Taber and Mr. Tynan apparently have employed the same attorney, Leonard Boudin of Boudin, Rabinowitz & Boudin of New York, and the committee has two practically identical telegrams.

With the chairman's permission, I should like to read one, one relates to Tynan and one refers to Taber.

The first telegram reads, it is addressed to the Internal Security Subcommittee, and I might state for the record, as the chairman knows, that Mr. Boudin made a request by telephone of Mr. Schroeder, who talked on this end, for an extension of time, a continuance.

This was taken up with the vice chairman of the subcommittee who decided there would be no continuance and Mr. Boudin was instructed over the telephone to have his clients here.

Subsequently, and apparently at 5:44 p.m. last night, these messages were filed. The first telegram reads:

INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE,  
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:*

Our client, Robert Taber, was served in New York City last night with a subpoena returnable tomorrow morning in Washington, D.C. This notice is too short to make it possible for him to consult with counsel to arrange his personal affairs and to fill his contractual obligations to the radio news service by which he is employed. Your attention is also called to the fact that the subpoena is blank in the part calling for a committee statement of the subject matter of the investigation and that neither subpoena fees or traveling expenses between Washington and New York have been paid to our client. Since under the circumstances it is impossible for him to appear tomorrow we request an adjournment until some time next week and an advance committee statement of the legislative purpose of the investigation. This statement of purpose is made particularly necessary by your Mr. Schroeder's telephonic advice today that he is not authorized to tell us the legislative purpose and that Senator Dodd would advise our client of it tomorrow, obviously too late to prepare himself for the hearing. We also request advance payment of our client's traveling expenses.

LEONARD BOUDIN.

Now the other telegram is similar, but it is enough different that it might be well to read it.

Senator JOHNSTON. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. It reads:

INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE,  
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:*

Our client, Kenneth Tynan, was served in New York City last night with a subpoena, returnable tomorrow morning in Washington, D.C. This notice is too short to make it possible for him to consult with counsel to arrange his personal affairs and to fulfill his contractual obligations to the weekly magazine by which he is employed. Your attention is also called to the fact that the subpoena is blank in the part calling for a committee statement in the subject matter of the investigation. Since in the first place it is impossible for Mr. Tynan to appear tomorrow, we request an adjournment until some time next week and a statement of the legislative purpose of the investigation. This statement of purpose is made particularly necessary by your Mr. Schroeder's telephonic advice today that he was not authorized to tell us the legislative purpose and that the committee would advise our client of it tomorrow, obviously too late to prepare himself for the hearing. Your attention is called specifically to the fact that Mr. Tynan is a British national and is here on a visitor's visa. While Mr. Tynan will, of course, appear on any adjourned date, I suggest you may wish to consider the fact that under international law, a foreign visitor, while obligated to obey the laws of this country, is under no legal obligation to advise the Congress of the necessity for legislation. This appears to be the first occasion on which a congressional committee has subpoenaed a visitor to this country. An adjournment will afford Mr. Tynan an opportunity to discuss the subpoena with his Embassy and secure the legal advice and instruction of its counselor.

That is signed by Leonard Boudin of Boudin, Rabinowitz & Boudin.

Senator KEATING. What is the weekly magazine Mr. Tynan is connected with?

Mr. MANDEL. The New Yorker, dramatic critic.

Senator KEATING. If he is here on a visitor's visa——

Mr. MANDEL. He lives here.

Senator KEATING. How long has he lived here?

Mr. MANDEL. I do not know.

Mr. SOURWINE. I don't know. I haven't personally checked it. On a visitor's visa, I don't believe he is allowed to work.

Senator JOHNSTON. A visitor is not.

Mr. SOURWINE. We received the following telegram which appears to have been filed at 7:48 p.m. New York last night.

INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE,  
*Senate Judiciary Committee:*

Further to our telegram in connection with the subpoena issued to our client Kenneth Tynan, having just seen a newspaper stating communism in Cuba is one of the subjects before the committee, Mr. Tynan asked me to state in his behalf that if it will be of any assistance to the committee in its deliberations, he is prepared to file an affidavit to the effect that he is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party or any affiliated organization.

It is signed by Leonard Boudin of Boudin, Rabinowitz & Boudin. I respectfully submit this is all we need for the record.

Do you have something for the record, Mr. Mandel?

Mr. MANDEL. I thought the Senators might want to know the legal firm, what its reputation is.

Mr. SOURWINE. Not for the record.

The committee might wish to discuss this.

I respectfully suggest that the record of the hearing be closed.

Senator DODD. I think so.

Senator JOHNSTON. Very well.

(Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.)



## FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1960

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:55 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, Senator Thomas J. Dodd presiding.  
Present: Senator Dodd.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; and Frank W. Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator DODD. The subcommittee will come to order.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, will you rise and be sworn?

Senator DODD. Raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TABER. I do.

Senator DODD. Go ahead, Counsel.

### TESTIMONY OF ROBERT TABER, NEW YORK, N.Y.; ACCOMPANIED BY LEONARD BOUDIN, ESQ., OF BOUDIN, RABINOWITZ & BOUDIN, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, would you give the reporter your full name?

Mr. TABER. Robert Taber.

Mr. SOURWINE. And your address, Mr. Taber?

Mr. TABER. 118 West 79th Street.

Mr. SOURWINE. New York City?

Mr. TABER. New York 25.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your business or profession, sir?

Mr. TABER. I am a journalist.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where are you employed?

Mr. TABER. Columbia Broadcasting System.

Senator DODD. How long have you been employed there?

Mr. TABER. About 10 years, off and on.

Senator DODD. Where were you employed previously?

Mr. TABER. I worked for several newspapers.

Senator DODD. Can you name them?

Mr. TABER. I worked for about 2 years for Newsday, Long Island, and prior to that for, oh, slightly less than 2 years, for the Newhouse newspapers in Queens, Long Island—Long Island Press and the Star Journal.

Senator DODD. Any others?

Mr. TABER. I don't believe so, Senator. I may have spent a week or two on this desk or that desk of some newspaper, but no permanent thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, I want to say to you that, as you may know, one of the duties imposed upon this committee in connection with its continuing investigation is to investigate propaganda, and the committee is interested in determining this morning whether a particular advertisement which appeared in the New York Times on Wednesday, April 6, 1960, is propaganda and whether this is in any way sponsored by or instigated by a foreign government or foreign national.

I show you the ad itself. I presume you have seen it before and ask you if you recognize this ad.

Mr. TABER. Before I answer your question I would like to raise several questions having to do with my appearance here.

With all respect, I would like to ask whether this subcommittee has a quorum present; whether it has jurisdiction in this particular matter, and if so, may I be shown whatever is required so that I may know that it does have jurisdiction and that my appearance here can be legally compelled by this subcommittee.

I would also like to request that my counsel be permitted to represent me and to make objections and to argue objections if any should arise in connection with my testimony here.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you wish me to make a statement?

Senator DODD. Go ahead.

Mr. SOURWINE. The committee's authority stems from two Senate resolutions which were named, I believe, in the subpoena. If you desire to see copies of these resolutions——

Senator DODD. I don't think that is necessary. You can tell him. Go on with your statement. You can look them up. We will give him the citations.

Mr. SOURWINE. The committee is authorized to conduct a continuing investigation into activities adversely affecting, or which might adversely affect, the internal security of the United States.

I am not attempting to quote this language verbatim, including, but not limited to the dissemination of propaganda, specifically Communist propaganda or propaganda on behalf of any other subversive interest and it is under that authority that you are called here.

The existence of the committee, of course, is well known and its right to issue subpoenas is well known, and I think it is self-evident that your counsel would not have produced you here if he didn't think the subpoena was valid.

Is there any contention that it is not?

(No response.)

Mr. SOURWINE. With regard to the question of quorum, under the rules of the Senate a committee is authorized to designate one member for the purpose of conducting hearings and investigations and administering oaths.

The Judiciary Committee has authorized this and has authorized its subcommittees to do it and there is a separate resolution of the internal subcommittee authorizing one member to sit for that purpose.

These resolutions also can be supplied to you within a few minutes if it is desired that you see them before you testify.

Senator DODD. I don't think that is necessary, and I said that earlier. I think we have told him what the authority is.

I don't think we have to get into an argument, legal argument here, about its validity.

Go on with the rest. That is all I am going to do, is tell him and go on with our hearing.

Mr. TABER. The question of whether my counsel may argue on my behalf, on legal questions, on the validity of this hearing and the questions which I previously cited.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is not a ruling of the chairman, of course. We will rule, as is customary—as your counsel, I am sure, is aware—if counsel does interpose objections, whenever he feels it is desirable to do so.

I am sure he will tell you he has never been treated otherwise than courteously by the committee.

Senator DODD. Your lawyer is here and has access to you and you have to him. No one has denied you this, but if your question has been answered, go on to something else.

Mr. BOUDIN. I may say, Mr. Sourwine, we do contest the validity of the subpoena and we do contest the authority of the subcommittee to sit, and we are not satisfied that we have been shown, nor do we think that there exists authority to conduct the investigation of the subject you have mentioned.

I am not going to argue the matter. I think it is sufficient.

Senator DODD. I don't think you should argue it. State your position.

Mr. BOUDIN. We stated our own position.

Mr. SOURWINE. The pending question is whether Mr. Taber recognizes this advertisement.

Mr. TABER. Yes; I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is this an advertisement which you placed in the New York Times or caused to be placed there?

Mr. TABER. Yes, that is true.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you tell us, sir, what part you played in the formation of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. I was one of a number of people, a group of friends who saw the need for or felt that we—that there was a pressing need to present a view of the Cuban situation which would do something to rectify the increasingly worsening relation between Cuba and the United States and something which we felt stemmed largely from misunderstanding on the part of the American public in this connection and as we state here, to combat the distortions, the discrepancies of the American press in this connection and we met—we formed a committee and this advertisement was the first public result of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who is the "we," Mr. Taber? Who met to form that committee? You and who else?

Mr. TABER. A number of private individuals of my acquaintance. I was named—I don't feel able to tell you at this time.

Senator DODD. Do you mean by that you don't remember them?

Mr. TABER. I remember, I believe I remember them, Senator. It is a question of whether—I would like to raise the question of whether again the committee has the authority to inquire into—

Senator DODD. Who else was with you other than that? I believe we do. I asked you. Answer the question.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid, with all respect, Senator, I will have to decline to answer the question on the grounds that to do so would be an infringement of my right to make a public statement on the public issue under the first amendment and that it would be an infringement of the rights of those people connected with me if I would give their names at this time.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I speak to this before the Chair rules?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. The contention that the name of these persons would be an infringement of their right to make a public statement must fail because there is here no interference with the making of the statement and it is well recognized in law that the right of freedom of the press and freedom of speech does not absolve an individual of responsibilities of what he has done after the statement has been made or the article has been published.

I ask that notwithstanding the objection, the Chair order or direct the witness to answer.

Mr. BOUDIN. May I be heard for a moment?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Mr. BOUDIN. The position taken by the witness is essentially that if those who had anything to do with the publication of an advertisement were to find themselves given publicity, possibly meet with committee subpoenas, and so forth, then this would, of course, discourage people making public statements on public issues.

Now I may say that very recently the Supreme Court of the United States, by the divided vote, upheld the right of anonymity of people issuing public statements. I can't remember the case at the moment, but that was a decision made by the Supreme Court and it was pointed out in the majority opinion that the important thing is not to discourage people from issuing statements in writing, or otherwise.

It is for that reason and only for that reason, that the witness feels that there is a basic first amendment problem involved here.

Senator DODD. Anything else?

(No response.)

Senator DODD. On this, I instruct you to answer the question.

Mr. BOUDIN. Excuse me a second while I consult the witness.

Senator DODD. I think it might be helpful and because you might want to think about it as you confer: Besides the jurisdictional grounds for this hearing which the Counsel Sourwine has stated, I would remind you that the Judiciary Committee is, of course, concerned about these foreign agents' registrations.

This is a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

This is just for your information as you confer.

I think the record should show that the witness and his counsel are having a conference. Show the time this started and the time it concluded.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel from 11:10 a.m. to 11:11 a.m.)

Mr. TABER. I think we can say, Senator, that since the names of a number of sponsors are mentioned in the ad itself that we can candidly say that some of these people themselves participated in the organization of the committee and others became sponsors as a result of the efforts of these.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is, of course, a natural assumption, but it is quite clear, I think, that the presence of a name on this ad was not

assurance that the person named was present for the formation of the committee.

Mr. TABER. A number of them were not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You stated some of them were. Will you tell us which ones were?

Mr. TABER. Those who were, Alan Sagner—the question—in certain cases we corresponded with the people and talked to them on the telephone. We didn't have meetings as meetings.

Mr. SOURWINE. We will get to the question of telephone in a moment. The question at the moment concerns those present at the meeting which you said was held for the formation of this committee.

You have told us that some of the people whose names are on this ad were present at that meeting, and you have named one, Alan Sagner.

Mr. TABER. The two basic organizers were myself and Mr. Sagner.

There happened to be some other people present who did not have and do not have any connection with this committee or with this ad, and I can't feel free to bring their names into this discussion because they don't have anything to do with the subject matter.

Mr. SOURWINE. First, were there any other persons present at the meetings whose names were on this ad?

Mr. TABER. Alan Sagner and myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. There were no others present at this organizational meeting whose names were on this ad?

Mr. TABER. Subsequently, I met with Waldo Frank.

Mr. SOURWINE. We are talking about this organization meeting at which you and Mr. Sagner were present.

Mr. TABER. There were a series of organization meetings, first it was one person and then with another.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, were there present at any of these organization meetings any of the individuals whose names are on this ad other than Mr. Sagner?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Frank.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Frank was present at one. Were he and Mr. Sagner both present at the same meeting at any time?

Mr. TABER. I honestly can't remember. I believe that Mr. Sagner conferred at some time with Mr. Frank, but I am not sure I was there at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. The first meeting was just you and Mr. Sagner, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, you have said that other persons were at this meeting. What other persons?

Mr. TABER. The first meeting occurred in a public restaurant, so the question of who else was there—it is something that I can't answer without mentioning any number of people who may or may not have known, but didn't have any particular connection with this matter.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where was this meeting held?

Mr. TABER. A restaurant on Eighth Avenue.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know the name?

Mr. TABER. The name of which I don't recall at the moment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where on Eighth Avenue?

Mr. TABER. About 51st or 52d.

Mr. SOURWINE. 51st or 52d Street on Eighth Avenue in New York City?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not recall the name of the restaurant?

Mr. TABER. I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you been back there since the meeting?

Mr. TABER. I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you at a table, you and Mr. Sagner?

Mr. TABER. I believe that we were.

Mr. SOURWINE. Or did you hold your meeting standing up in the restaurant?

Mr. TABER. I believe that we were at a group of tables in the center of the dining room.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean tables moved together?

Mr. TABER. Well, they were close enough together.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was there anyone other than you and Mr. Sagner sitting at your table?

Mr. TABER. No, I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was not. Now, when was this meeting held?

Mr. TABER. To the best of my recollection, it was held sometime toward the end of February, middle or end of February.

Mr. SOURWINE. How was this meeting arranged, by you or Mr. Sagner, or by some third person?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Sagner telephoned me and told me that he read my article on Cuba in the Nation; that he had read these statements of some other people who had written to the New York Times, and that had been very much disturbed by the whole tendency which the press had taken in representing Cuba; and that he had, although he had never been there himself, he felt there were obvious discrepancies, and he felt he would like to talk to me about it with the object of possibly taking some further action.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the placement of an advertisement discussed at this first meeting?

Mr. TABER. No, I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was not. When was the placement of an advertisement first discussed?

Mr. TABER. I believe that we had a subsequent meeting with Mr. Frank.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say "we", do you mean you and who else?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Sagner.

Mr. SOURWINE. At a subsequent meeting with Mr. Frank?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where was that meeting held?

Mr. TABER. My home.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was that?

Mr. TABER. Probably a week or two after the first.

Mr. SOURWINE. After the first meeting?

Mr. TABER. Correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. And was anyone else present at that meeting in your home?

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TABER. My wife was there. I believe that we had several friends present in the—not as a meeting—simply some of them happened to be there.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did any of those friends participate in the discussion of the affairs of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. We had a general, what I would describe as a social discussion, in which we ranged over a number of things and I dare say we discussed the political matter, Cuba, and of course, the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. And it was at this meeting that it was first discussed about the matter of placing an ad?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who were the other persons who were present?

Mr. TABER. My wife. I don't believe that I can give you the other names.

Senator DODD. Why not? You say you cannot give them.

Mr. TABER. I have to refer to my initial statement that bringing names into it which have not been made public in connection with the advertisement would be an intrusion into their right of privacy and their right to make a public statement of this nature without interference.

Senator DODD. Do you have anything more?

Mr. TABER. Under the first amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. I ask that notwithstanding the objection, the witness be ordered to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Mr. Witness, I instruct you to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry. The question was there a—

Mr. BOUDIN. I am sorry I interrupted by talking to the witness.

Senator DODD. My statement was, as chairman of this hearing, I instruct you to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. The question was?

Mr. SOURWINE. The question was—

Senator DODD. Let the reporter read it.

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

Mr. TABER. I must respectfully decline to answer the question under the protection of the first amendment on the grounds that the question is not pertinent and that this committee lacks authority to ask it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, were any of those persons present representatives directly or indirectly, to your knowledge, of any foreign government or a foreign national?

Mr. TABER. No, sir; they were not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were any of those persons present, to your knowledge, members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TABER. No, sir; they were not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, you placed this ad with the New York Times. Did you pay for it at the time?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you pay for it?

Mr. TABER. Again, I paid for it with—a couple of checks, drafts, money orders which I had collected for this purpose.

Mr. SOURWINE. There were checks and drafts and money orders, is that right?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many checks?

Mr. TABER. Excuse me a moment.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel.)

Senator DODD. What did you want?

Mr. TABER. I am trying to check the number of checks in my memory.

Senator DODD. You want to ask your lawyer how many checks you had? You want to consult him as to whether you want to answer the question?

Mr. TABER. I was not consulting him. I was looking at the paper.

Mr. BOUDIN. What happened I was looking over to see what he was doing.

Senator DODD. You just want time to recall, if you can, how many checks there were?

Mr. TABER. I believe that there were three checks and a draft. I was mistaken about the money order.

Mr. SOURWINE. The money order. Three checks and one draft?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Whose checks were they and whose draft was it?

Mr. TABER. I am very much afraid that again I will have to respectfully withhold that information on the grounds previously cited.

Mr. SOURWINE. I ask that the witness, notwithstanding his objection, be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Yes, I prefer also that you not say "on the grounds previously recited." I wish you would, in each instance, tell us why with reference to the question, Mr. Witness. I instruct you to answer the question.

Mr. BOUDIN. May I confer with the witness?

Senator DODD. Yes, of course.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TABER. The question was who signed——

Senator DODD. Would you like the question read back?

Mr. TABER. Thank you, Senator, I would—I was recalling the question was whether, was who paid, who signed the checks that were submitted to the New York Times.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who signed the draft.

Mr. TABER. I must respectfully decline to respond to the question on the grounds that it would be a violation of the first amendment in discouraging the free expression of political views and the freedom of the press; that the committee which makes the inquiry, lacks jurisdiction and authority in the matter under discussion.

Mr. SOURWINE. Notwithstanding this objection, Mr. Chairman, I ask the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Mr. Witness, I instruct you to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. I must again respectfully decline to answer on the grounds just stated, that to do so would be an infringement on the freedom of the press, the freedom of expression of public sentiments on public issues; that the committee lacks jurisdiction and authority; so that the question is not pertinent to the inquiry and again, on the question of whether or not a quorum is present.

Mr. BOUDIN. May I make one observation, Senator?

Senator DODD. Surely.

Mr. BOUDIN. You have noted that there was nothing secretive about this payment to the Times, the checks that were actually handed into the New York Times and so it was obviously no reason for concealment of the signatories of the checks.

A different situation arises where names may be set forth in the public hearing when people have contributed—as they have a right



to do under the Constitution—to a publication of an ad on a public issue may find names publicized. I have been watching the stories on this general subject and, in general, Americans resent it when they find names publicized and may find themselves subpoenaed also to answer such similar questions.

I think you do have then a very fundamental freedom of the press problem which doesn't exist to the same extent in many of the investigations that have been conducted by this committee, the subcommittee, and I think I will not argue the matter further and rest on that point.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, on the question of pertinency it should be stated that this committee, among other things, is attempting to determine if this ad was paid for in whole or in part with funds from a foreign country or foreign national.

The question asked is clearly pertinent to that purpose; notwithstanding the renewed and augmented objections of the witness and the statement of the counsel, I ask the witness be ordered directly to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Mr. Witness, I instruct you again to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. I think that I can assure the committee that, to my knowledge, none of the money which was paid into this ad came from any foreign government or agent of any foreign government. We made no secret of the matter at the time.

One of the checks written was signed by the people who signed them. They are a matter of record of the New York Times and I presume in banks from which they came.

I don't feel that it is my position or place to expose people in the glare of publicity and the various other intimidations which arise from being exposed to an inquiry of this nature.

Senator DODD. What do you suggest, that such a record, as I think you said, be located and be found?

Did you tell me the offices of the New York Times?

Mr. TABER. I presume the newspapers keep records of their transactions. Certainly, their banks do.

Senator DODD. Do you think the New York Times might enter this under your name as having paid for the ad and not have listed the names of those who drew the checks?

Mr. TABER. It is not a question. I don't know.

Senator DODD. I am sure you don't know, but it is quite possible this would be the situation and it might appear, therefore, that you are the only person who would know, and could help this committee to find out.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I respectfully say, Mr. Chairman, that, notwithstanding that, the committee is not required to go to an alternate source. We have a witness who is here and has the information and we have a right to the information.

Mr. BOUDIN. May I make one more point?

My client, on the fact that the New York Times was aware of the signatories to the checks, was not for the purpose indicated by Mr. Sourwine, namely, to indicate in alternative source and to suggest that the committee is limited to that source which is, of course, the point you were making but rather to indicate this was open and above-board in which there was not effort at concealment, and an ordinary

commercial transaction, the signatories to the checks, and therefore that the objective of the witness here is really what he says, namely, not to subject to the public glare with the effect on the first amendment, rights of other people as well as himself, people who were thus good enough to apparently risk something in taking a public position by placing an ad in the New York Times.

My remarks are merely intended to show that there was nothing secret about it and of course, the witness has already said that the money did not come from any foreign government or any foreign agent. He has already said that there was no issue of communism involved either in his own background or the background of the people he dealt with.

Anyhow, we have stated our position as well as we can.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that notwithstanding the additional statement of counsel and the additional objection of the witness, the witness be ordered to answer the question.

Senator DODD. I so instruct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. With all respect, I must decline again. I state my reasons for declining again if the Chair wishes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Witness, you have stated the checks did not come from a foreign source or a foreign national. You mean to state categorically that neither directly nor indirectly did the checks come from either a foreign nation or a foreign national?

Mr. TABER. I can't answer the question whether they came from a foreign national because I am not aware of the nationality of all of the people I deal with.

I don't check into their citizenship, but I can say that most certainly they did not come from a foreign government or an agent of a government—foreign government, to my knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know, do you, the individuals who gave you these checks?

Mr. TABER. The checks were—the ones paid to the New York Times?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TABER. Yes, I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. The people who signed the checks or the ones who gave them to you, respectively?

Mr. TABER. Yes, that is true.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, you know of your own knowledge that none of those persons was acting for or on behalf of a foreign government or a foreign national?

Mr. TABER. I have reason to believe that that was the case, and I have every reason to believe that they were not.

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked you if you know of your own knowledge that the persons that signed them or gave to you any one of these checks was acting directly or indirectly for a foreign government or a foreign national.

Mr. TABER. I don't understand what you mean by "my own knowledge." I have no way of proving this.

Mr. SOURWINE. The best evidence, it would seem, is to determine who the individuals were and then we can seek further, from those individuals, the source of the money.

Will you name one of the individuals who gave you one of the three checks?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I can give you the name since we have already mentioned it. I believe I can give the name of one of them if I may do so without jeopardizing my position and I would like to confer with counsel on that.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel from 11:32 to 11:33.)

Mr. TABER. I can say since one of—for several reasons—perhaps—I am sorry—I am out of order with my words—since one of the contributors has been very active in the organization of the committee and it is one of fairplay and since I don't wish to go out of my way to obstruct an investigation of this kind, certainly I think that I can tell you that one of the contributors was Allen Sagner whom you mentioned before.

I would like to say at the same time that if I were to go on to name the names that I would be compelled by law, to name the names of all of the several hundred contributors that we have had [of] small amounts, bearing various expenses of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and I don't feel that in revealing Mr. Sagner's name that I am permitted to any change in the position I have previously taken in regard to not exposing these peoples' names who have specifically asked anonymity in an investigation of this sort.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you telling us one of the three checks was a check signed by Mr. Sagner?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was the amount of that check?

Mr. TABER. I believe it was \$425.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was the total of the amount of the three checks and the draft, if you remember?

Mr. TABER. It was \$4,725.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall the amounts of the other two checks?

Mr. TABER. May I confer on this?

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel from 11:35 to 11:36.)

Mr. TABER. I am afraid that I can't answer your question without putting myself in a position of pointing in the direction of other people and leading them into a situation in which they would be subpoenaed and called before this committee and I can't do that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Without being argumentative, Mr. Taber, this question only calls for the amounts of the checks. It doesn't call for the names of the individuals.

You had three checks and a draft which totaled in excess of \$4,000 according to your testimony. You stated one of these checks was Mr. Sagner's for approximately \$400. We want to know the amounts of the other two checks and the amount of the draft.

Mr. TABER. I must respectfully decline to answer the question.

Mr. BOUDIN. Really, from purely a mathematical point of view, you know how many checks are needed and you know what a—how many checks there were and what an ad in the New York Times cost.

It is really quite important, whether the one check is \$1,000 or \$2,500. It has to amount eventually, you agree, mathematically to the price of an ad in the New York Times.

Mr. SOURWINE. I must resist the effort of the counsel to tell the committee what is or what is not important.

I asked that, notwithstanding the objection of the witness and the statement of counsel, the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Yes, Mr. Witness, I instruct you to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. I must respectfully decline to answer the question on the grounds that it lacks pertinency in this investigation; that the committee lacks authority to ask the question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Notwithstanding this new objection, I ask the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. I so instruct you, Mr. Witness. I instruct you to answer the question asked you by counsel.

Mr. TABER. I must again, with all due respect, decline to answer the question on the grounds stated—lack of pertinency.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us if one of these checks was in excess of the amount of \$3,000?

Mr. TABER. May I confer?

Senator DODD. Let the record show the witness conferring with counsel and I would like to have the record show the time involved. (Mr. Taber conferred with counsel less than one minute.)

Mr. TABER. With all due respect I must decline to answer the question on the grounds stated, the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SOURWINE. Explaining the pertinency, this question is an attempt to determine a substantial amount or a major amount of the total cost of the ad was paid by a single check.

I ask on the basis of this explanation, and notwithstanding the witness' objections in total, the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Mr. Witness, I instruct you to answer the question.

Mr. BOUDIN. The witness will decline, sir, and I take it we need not repeat the reasons stated before unless you want us to.

Mr. SOURWINE. The witness is competent to decline for himself.

Senator DODD. He can do that himself, sir.

Mr. TABER. I must respectfully decline to answer the question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, you told us earlier that there were other organizers of this committee besides those whose names appear on the ad. Will you tell us the names of those other organizers to whom you refer?

Mr. TABER. I am sorry, I am not sure that I did use the word "organizers."

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, the sense of your testimony as I understood it, the record, of course, will speak, was that other persons besides those whose names appear on the ad participated in the organization of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

It is the names of these other persons for which I am now asking.

Mr. TABER. If I said that I was quite mistaken because—and I have no intention of saying such a thing because I believe, in looking at this list, that people who are on it were, not all of them, of course, but some of them are people who helped in the organization of this ad.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you stating now that there was no person involved in the organization of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee whose name does not appear on this ad?

Mr. TABER. If there was, I don't recall it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, which of these individuals whose names appeared on the ad were at your home on the occasion of the meeting that you told us about which took place there at which Mr. Sagner and Mr. Frank were present?

MR. TABER. Mr. Sagner, Mr. Frank—offhand, I couldn't say, but I would like to say that, as I told you before, we have had a number of meetings and I don't recall all of these meetings.

It seems to me that I have been doing nothing but going to meetings. We have had assistance from people on this committee at various times, whether in one particular meeting or separately or in what situation, I honestly can't tell you.

MR. SOURWINE. Who are the officers of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

MR. TABER. We don't actually exist as a corporate entity or as a formal committee in any formal sense but, for practical purposes, I have been acting as secretary.

Mr. Frank has been chairman, Mr. Beals' position was actually purely nominal because he was not in New York and wasn't able to participate except by giving us the names of people whom we might contact and that sort of thing. But we haven't functioned as the kind of organization which requires officers. We are a very loose organization.

MR. SOURWINE. Had you secured the names of the persons listed on the ad?

MR. TABER. I wrote them letters. Mr. Frank wrote them letters. And in some cases, Mr. Sagner wrote letters or solicited them personally. In some cases I myself made telephone calls.

MR. SOURWINE. I think there is a misunderstanding. You are answering the question you thought I asked, which was how did you get authority to put the names on the ad?

My real question is how did you get the names of these individuals?

MR. BOUDIN. You mean what the criteria was?

MR. SOURWINE. No, I do not mean that. I mean how did you secure the names of these individuals you proceeded to contact by mail or telephone with respect to the formation of this committee and the publication of the ad?

MR. TABER. I see. In some cases they were known to Mr. Frank. He suggested a list of names we might get in contact with. I believe Mr. Sagner suggested some names. I myself have thought of some of them. We wrote—we contacted a number of people whose names did not appear on the ad because we got negative responses. We failed to get responses.

We chose a list of people whom we thought would have liberal information, who would understand what we were trying to do, the basic concept of fair play in this particular situation and we contacted as many of them as we could.

MR. SOURWINE. Did anyone other than yourself, Mr. Frank or Mr. Sagner suggest names to be contacted in that way?

MR. TABER. I believe that Mr. Beals gave me a list of names.

MR. SOURWINE. Anyone else?

MR. TABER. I believe that that's some—that names did come to us—occasionally we would write to such a person and he would suggest some other person.

MR. SOURWINE. You recall any other person who suggested names?

MR. TABER. Not offhand, no, sir.

Senator DODD. You said Mr. Beals did?

MR. TABER. Mr. Beals did give me a list of names.

Senator DODD. He did give you a list of names?

Mr. TABER. Yes, sir.

Senator DODD. Are you sure about that?

Mr. TABER. I think I have a letter in which he suggested that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, we will come down to the question which you thought I had asked earlier and I will phrase it this way.

Do you have authorization from each of the persons whose name is listed in the ad to include the name in the ad?

Mr. TABER. Yes; yes, I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did each of those persons have an opportunity to see the ad before they gave that permission?

Mr. TABER. Yes, they did.

Mr. BOUDIN. Just out of curiosity, would that be pertinent? You would not have a right, the committee to protect the people who—

Mr. SOURWINE. The question has been asked and answered. Why waste time?

Mr. Taber, does the Fair Play for Cuba Committee have an office or office space in New York City?

Mr. TABER. No, it does not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has it had an office or office space in New York City since its formation?

Mr. TABER. Not unless you count my home.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you rent office space from Mrs. Sammes at 60 East 46th Street in New York City in the name of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. That is not office space, simply a mailing address.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did arrange for a mailing address at 60 East 46th Street in New York City in the name of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. But you have no office space there?

Mr. TABER. It is not an office space. It is simply a mailing address.

Mr. SOURWINE. I say you have no office space.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. You simply have a mailing address. To your knowledge, Mr. Taber, and by that I mean so far as you know, are any members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee present or past members of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. TABER. To my knowledge, none of them are.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you make any inquiry about this in connection with the organization of the committee and the acceptance of the members?

Mr. TABER. I don't honestly believe that I went into the question at all of whether they were or weren't.

I would like to add that we, that in looking over the prospective list we scrupulously avoided names of people that we thought might be or who had some contacts with the Communist Party, that sort of thing.

The list that we ultimately came up with we felt no need to make the inquiry because we felt reasonably sure that they were not in any way connected.

Mr. SOURWINE. How long have you known Mr. Frank?

Mr. TABER. For a few months.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any knowledge that he is or ever was a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. TABER. I have nothing to indicate that except—no, I have nothing to indicate that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I show you a photostat of an article from the New Masses, September 1932, pages 6 and 7. The heading "How I Came to Communism," by Waldo Frank.

I ask if you ever saw that?

Mr. TABER. I never saw it. I can tell you without looking at it, but I would like to say that I read a reference to it in Mr. Sokolsky's column in the Hearst Headline Service in which he mentioned this matter and also pointed out that Mr. Frank had been denounced by the Communists themselves as a tool of Wall Street, in a number of publications and that the Daily Worker in New York was told by Mr. Frank himself, that the Daily Worker of New York had conducted a long campaign against him for his opposition to their views.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did Mr. Frank say anything to you with respect to the question of whether he ever was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TABER. Yes, he told me that he never was.

Senator DODD. That he never was?

Mr. TABER. Never was.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I ask that this article be inserted in the appendix of the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator DODD. Yes.

(The article referred to was marked, "Exhibit No. 5" and is printed as Appendix I at p. 93.)

Mr. BOUDIN. Excuse me one second. May I just look at it?

Senator DODD. Yes, it may be inserted.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, what is the present method of financing the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. We have been getting in a number, a great number of—

To begin with, following the publication of this ad we received a number of unsolicited donations, contributions, mostly in small amounts, \$5, \$10, \$20. I think the largest one was \$50 or \$100.

More recently, we have published a handbill stating our purpose, which contains an application blank in which we seek to enroll members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and, in any case, invite their donations and we have had some response to that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you telling us that all of the financing for the committee has come from voluntary contributions?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you, yourself, participated in those contributions?

Mr. TABER. Have I given any money to them?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. TABER. In a formal sense, I have not. But I have spent a great deal of money out of my pocket in the process of getting about town and going to the printer and that sort of thing, petty cash, sort of.

Mr. SOURWINE. None of the three checks that were given to the New York Times in payment for this ad was your check, was it?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the draft your draft?

Mr. TABER. Yes, it was.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was the amount of that draft?

Mr. TABER. The draft was \$400.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you procured that draft with your own money?

Mr. TABER. It wasn't entirely my own money. Some of it was donations from other people.

Mr. SOURWINE. Donations which had been given to you in cash?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. For the purpose of the ad?

Mr. TABER. For the purpose of the ad.

Mr. SOURWINE. We have now identified one check and the draft.

Do you still refuse to tell us who furnished the other two checks?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I am afraid that I must do that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you give us the names of the persons who gave you the cash which was included in your own draft?

Mr. TABER. I don't feel at liberty to do that either, for the reasons I have declined to give the names of those who gave the checks. I take the same position with regard to cash.

Senator DODD. That isn't sufficient for the record. I wish you would tell us exactly why you refuse to answer this question.

You have been asked by counsel to tell the names of the people who gave you cash toward this \$400 which you say was paid, partial payment to the New York Times for this advertisement.

We want to know who were the people that gave you cash.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel less than one minute.)

Mr. TABER. I respectfully decline to answer the question on the grounds that it would be a violation of the First Amendment, subject people who contributed to the same process which I am undergoing, thereby inhibiting the freedom of the press and freedom of free public expression; that the committee has not the authority to ask the question, and again refer to the matter pertinency of the question and the question of whether the quorum is present of this committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Notwithstanding these objections, I ask the witness be ordered, for the record, to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Mr. Witness, I instruct you to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. With all respect, Senator, I must decline again to answer the question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us whether any of the persons who gave you cash which you included in that \$400 draft were individuals whose names appear in the ad?

Mr. TABER. I must ask my counsel whether that would not imply some contradiction of the position.

Senator DODD. You may confer any time you want to confer. You are right at his side and you can't get much closer.

I want the record to show that you are under no restriction of any kind or character and you have had constant opportunity to confer.

You may again take time to confer before you answer.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel less than one minute.)

Mr. TABER. I must say, having conferred with counsel, that in order to preserve the consistency of the basic logic of the position I have taken in refusing to, declining to, answer questions as to the identity of people making such contributions, that I cannot tell you any further on the subject.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right.

Senator DODD. I think we should have the instruction again. If I am correct in my understanding of the status of the record, Mr.



Witness, I do instruct you to answer the question asked you by counsel.

Mr. TABER. With all respect, I must decline.

Mr. BOUDIN. Excuse me a second.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel less than one minute.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Taber, the next question—

Mr. BOUDIN. I hadn't finished—

Mr. SOURWINE. The witness finished his answer.

Senator DODD. Counsel wants an opportunity to confer with Mr. Taber. Go right ahead.

I am sure you don't object.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel from 11:58 to 11:59.)

Mr. TABER. I believe my counsel is quite right to say that.

Senator DODD. Never mind that. Let the counsel speak for himself and you speak for yourself, and let's keep the record straight.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry. I wish to point out that my reason for declining was not merely to maintain my consistency but for the other reason stated.

I believe the question of jurisdiction, the question of pertinency, the question of whether a quorum—in other words, the legal basis of this hearing, and, of course, the basic principle of freedom of the press and free expression, and public medium, without undue interference or pressure such as I believe this sort of investigation constitutes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Notwithstanding these renewed objections, Mr. Chairman, I ask the witness again be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Yes; I again instruct you to answer the question, Mr. Witness.

Mr. TABER. With all respect, Mr. Chairman, I must decline.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Taber, will you tell us whether the signer of either of the two checks, which signers have not yet been identified here, was one of the individuals whose name appears on this ad?

Senator DODD. Let the record show the witness is conferring with his counsel again and it is perfectly all right.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TABER. I respectfully decline to answer the question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can I ask the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question?

Senator DODD. Yes, Mr. Witness; I instruct you, order and direct you, to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. I must respectfully decline to answer the question on the grounds which I have stated, the authority, pertinency, quorum, and the basic position which I have taken with regard to the first amendment covering freedom of the press and free public expression.

Mr. SOURWINE. Notwithstanding these renewed objections, I ask the witness again be directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. I think the record is clear but again I will instruct him to answer.

Mr. TABER. With all respect, Senator, I must decline.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Taber, without conceding in any way, and we do not concede that there is any validity to your contention that you have a right to refuse to answer these questions in order to protect the first amendment rights, or the alleged first amendment

rights, of some other person or persons, I want to point out to you that those whose names appear on this ad are, by your own testimony, individuals who have granted you consent to have their name printed in connection with this ad.

They are, therefore, individuals who are not concealing, or attempting to conceal, in any way, their connection with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

If, therefore, one of those persons is one of the individuals who furnished one of these two checks about which we are talking, a refusal on your part to identify him as a signer of the check is not protecting him from disclosure as a person connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

With that explanation, I will ask you a new question of whether there is any individual whose name appears on this ad who provided you directly or indirectly with cash, or money in another form, to be used in paying for the ad?

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TABER. Precisely, I must decline to answer that question because, although I do, as you say, have their consent to publish their names in support of a position, I don't have their consent to give, to indicate, their contribution, or lack of contribution, their degree of interest—anything which would impinge their personal right of expression. That is a matter for them to state.

Mr. SOURWINE. I ask that, notwithstanding the objection, the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Yes, Mr. Witness, I do so instruct you and order you and direct you to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. With all respect, Mr. Chairman, I decline to answer the question.

Mr. SOURWINE. I now ask you this question—

Mr. BOUDIN. Excuse me. I think the witness ought to state why he is declining.

Senator DODD. I thought he had. The witness did, in his second answer. If not, I am perfectly happy to have him state it again.

Mr. BOUDIN. Thank you.

Mr. TABER. I respectfully decline to answer on the grounds of the first amendment, lack of jurisdiction, quorum, lack of authority to make this inquiry as to the contributions, lack of pertinency of questions.

Mr. SOURWINE. Notwithstanding these renewed and expanded objections, I ask the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. Yes, Mr. Witness, you are ordered and directed to answer the question. Our reason here is to make this record clear. I make it clear that I do again order you, after having heard your response or refusal. So you are instructed to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. I, myself, respectfully decline.

Mr. SOURWINE. I will now ask you this question, Mr. Taber, is it true that a substantial portion of the money with which you paid for this advertisement came from individuals whose names do not appear in the ad itself?

Mr. TABER. I think that I must take the basic position that I cannot discuss the matter of where funds for the publication of the ad came from, other than to say that they came from private indi-

viduals totally unconnected with any Government, any agency, and that they—I must respect their right to remain anonymous where they wish to remain anonymous.

Mr. SOURWINE. This does not, of course, answer the question, which is whether any individuals furnished any substantial part of it. I will rephrase the question.

Perhaps it would be better, instead of rephrasing it, to have the reporter read the precise question which remains unanswered.

Senator DODD. Read the question which was asked by Mr. Sourwine.

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

Mr. TABER. I must respectfully decline to answer the question on the grounds that it is not pertinent, a lack of pertinency, lack of authority, and again raise the question of the presence of a quorum, and jurisdiction.

Mr. SOURWINE. Notwithstanding these objections, I ask the witness to be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator Dodd. I instruct you to answer, and order and direct you to answer.

Mr. TABER. Respectfully decline, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, did you write the copy for this ad?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I laid out the first draft of the ad. I didn't write it entirely. I wrote a rough draft and it was submitted to Mr. Frank, and Mr. Sagner. I made some changes on their suggestions, basically the suggestions of Mr. Frank, who wrote a portion of it himself. We ultimately came to the finished product.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the copy for the ad submitted to any person other than Mr. Frank and Mr. Sagner for approval before it was sent in to be printed?

Mr. TABER. Yes; it was sent to Mr. Beals.

Mr. SOURWINE. Anyone else?

Mr. TABER. Well, I sent it to most of the prospective members on the list.

Mr. SOURWINE. Anyone who is not on the list?

Mr. TABER. No; definitely.

Senator DODD. Referring to the publication, you mean the list as published in the advertisement that was printed in the New York Times?

Mr. TABER. The list published in the New York Times.

Senator DODD. Any other list?

Mr. TABER. No; this is—well, excuse me. I will have to correct myself on that.

Before it was published in the New York Times, we had no names on it. We had a list of prospective sponsors and we mailed it to all of those prospective sponsors. I had forgotten that now.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, the exact amount you paid for the ad was \$4,725, was it not?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. You took a receipt—

Senator DODD. How much is that, Mr. Sourwine?

Mr. Sourwine. \$4,725.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. You took a receipt in the name of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you keep a membership list, a list of the members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. We keep a list of all the people that have shown an interest in this committee in order—a mailing list in order to mail them any information that we may have on the subject, and among those are some people who have expressed a desire to be members of the committee and others who have simply asked for information.

We haven't yet broken these two lists down and separated them and decided which are formal members and so on because we haven't had the formal corporate structure under which to have such a formal list.

Mr. SOURWINE. You plan to do that later?

Mr. TABER. We are in the process of doing that now. We are putting out applications and as we get the applications back they check it off—wish to be a member, and we mark on their card "Member."

Mr. SOURWINE. Your records then which are presently in the nature of a mailing list do include some marking or indication from which you can tell which are the members; is that right?

Mr. TABER. In most cases.

Mr. BOUDIN. Which he can tell? Which want to be members.

Mr. TABER. The members.

Senator DODD. Wait a minute. We can't have this disorder here.

Mr. BOUDIN. I didn't know I was creating disorder.

Senator DODD. Don't answer questions for the witness. Just hear me for a minute. This is entirely improper.

I think you are experienced enough to know it. When the witness is asked a question, he is to answer it himself. If he wants to confer with you, he has every opportunity to do so.

I instruct you not to answer again when the witness is asked a question.

Mr. BOUDIN. Senator, because we are keeping a record here let me indicate what I think I did.

The witness was asked a question and he answered it. The answer was then paraphrased by Mr. Sourwine, I thought inaccurately. I didn't think he was putting a question and I didn't want his statement which I felt was an improper paraphrase remaining in the record.

Of course, I don't want to answer for the witness and I am sorry that I seemed to be doing that.

Senator DODD. Very well, let's not have any more of it.

Go on, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, will you furnish the committee with the names of the persons who have assented to being members, or who have asked to be members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TABER. I am sorry, but I must respectfully decline to answer that question on the ground it would be an invasion of their right to publish such a statement, without their permission, in view of the first amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. I ask that, notwithstanding this objection, the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. I instruct you and order you and direct you, Mr. Witness, to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. I must decline, with all respect, to answer the question on the grounds it would be an invasion and a violation of their rights under the first amendment; that the committee lacks authority and jurisdiction; the question lacks pertinency and in the absence of a quorum, the question of whether there is a quorum.

Mr. SOURWINE. Notwithstanding this expanded objection, I ask the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Senator DODD. I don't know that it is expanded, but if it is he is so instructed and directed to answer the question.

I think it is sufficient for you to state your grounds and after the Chair instructs you to answer, you then decline, because it is perfectly clear that you have given your reason to so decline. It isn't much sense to repeat it over and over.

Mr. TABER. I respectfully decline.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, in whose name was the application made for Box T-249 at the Times, New York?

Mr. TABER. I believe it was made by myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. And in the name of Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us who is Mr. Sagner?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Sagner is a businessman who lives in South Orange, N.J.

Mr. SOURWINE. He is connected with a Sagner & Son?

Mr. TABER. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. 200 Fifth Avenue, New York City?

Mr. TABER. I don't know that. I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. What business is he in?

Mr. TABER. He is a builder, constructor, homebuilder.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you place this ad in the New York Times with the knowledge and approval of the Columbia Broadcasting System?

Mr. TABER. I don't believe that I am required to have any approval of the Columbia—

Mr. SOURWINE. Of course you are not. I didn't ask if you were required.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry. No, I didn't consult them.

Mr. SOURWINE. The CBS was not connected in any way with the financing of this advertisement, was it?

Mr. TABER. No, it was not, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us how much money was collected?

Senator DODD. Can I ask a question at this point, Mr. Counsel?

Exactly what is your position in CBS? I am sorry if I didn't understand you at the beginning.

Mr. TABER. I am a radio newswriter.

Senator DODD. A writer?

Mr. TABER. A writer.

Senator DODD. You do any voice broadcasting?

Mr. TABER. I have in the past, but haven't for several months.

Senator DODD. You just write the news for someone else to broadcast, is that it?

Mr. TABER. Ordinarily, that is the case.

Senator DODD. Who is your immediate supervisor in CBS?

Mr. TABER. It would be Mr. Driscoll.

Senator DODD. What is his first name?

Mr. TABER. David.

Senator DODD. David. That is all I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Taber, how much money was collected as a result of the April 6, 1960, ad in the New York Times?

Mr. TABER. Offhand, I should say \$500 to \$600. Following the publication of the ad; perhaps a little more than that. I am not sure.

Mr. SOURWINE. And how much had been contributed to the committee or to the work of the committee prior to the appearance of the ad?

Mr. TABER. The record of the committee, the work of the committee as separate from the publication of the ad you mean?

Mr. SOURWINE. No, including that.

Mr. TABER. Approximately \$600 or \$700 on top of the ad, in addition to the ad, and something roughly around that.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the total amount available at the present time for the expenses of the committee, for the future expenses of the committee?

Mr. TABER. What is on hand at the moment?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Approximately \$400 or \$500.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us who Marjorie More is?

Mr. TABER. Marjorie More is a code name which they find convenient, have found convenient for purposes of avoiding a great deal of personal correspondence with people.

In other words, it is much as though one would put a letter like, address box X or something of the sort. It is simply a formality.

Mr. SOURWINE. I will show you, Mr. Taber, a single sheet letter, it appears to have been printed, says, "New York City" and begins "Dear Friend." It is concluded, "Again many thanks for your interest and support. With all good wishes, from Marjorie More for the Committee." And I will ask you if this is a mailing piece which you caused to be printed and sent out?

Mr. TABER. Yes, it is.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you write the copy for it?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. In putting the signature "Marjorie More" at the end of that, did you intend to convey to the people who received it the idea that there was a person called Marjorie More who was signing correspondence for the committee?

Mr. TABER. No, I did not. I intended——

Mr. SOURWINE. What other——

Mr. TABER. May I answer?

Mr. SOURWINE. Please finish.

Mr. TABER. I intended to provide a means by which I could know, as mail came in, the difference between the mail which was in response to this particular piece of literature and personal mail or mail dealing with other matters. It was simply a code.

Mr. SOURWINE. There is no such person as Marjorie More?

Mr. TABER. There is not.

Mr. SOURWINE. May this go into the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator DODD. Yes, it may be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 6" and reads as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 5

NEW YORK CITY.

DEAR FRIEND: This is to thank you, very sincerely, for your expression of interest in the work of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and to inform you that you will receive the Committee's weekly news letter—as soon as it comes off the presses.

You will be interested to know that we have had a remarkable amount of mail, from all over the country, far more than we had anticipated. In consequence, unfortunately, we find it impossible immediately to answer, individually, the many specific inquiries that we have received, on matters related to Cuba. To meet the emergency, we are sending you a copy of a recent article in *The Nation*, which seems to us to cover most of these questions. The news letter will deal with more topical matters—for instance, President Eisenhower's letter to the Chilean students, and the position of the Roman Catholic Church in Cuba. And, of course, individual inquiries will be answered, as soon as we can muster the volunteer clerical help for this considerable task.

Please note: the Committee will hold its first public meeting on Sunday, April 24, at 4 p.m., in the Community Church of N.Y., 40 E. 35th St., New York City. The meeting will be jointly sponsored by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and the church's own Social Action Committee. The speaker will be Waldo Frank, noted author and lecturer. His topic will be "The Cuban Revolution: Crisis in the Americas."

If you live in the New York metropolitan area, or plan to be here April 24th, you are cordially invited to attend, and to bring as many friends as you wish.

Again, many thanks for your interest and support, with all good wishes from

MARJORIE MORE  
(For the Committee).

MR. SOURWINE. Will you tell us what the printing and distribution of this mailing piece cost?

MR. TABER. Offhand, let's see—possibly \$50.

MR. SOURWINE. I will now show you a four-page printed pamphlet or flier headed "Fair Play," volume I, No. 1, April 29, 1960.

I will ask you if this is the mailing piece which you caused to be printed and distributed?

MR. TABER. Yes, it is.

MR. SOURWINE. Did you write the copy for this?

MR. TABER. With the exception of the letter, which I see on page 3, exception of the portion of the letter from Mr. Beals—I don't see anything here—oh, yes—those are the exceptions, and of course, the quotations which are contained in several—

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may this be inserted in the record?

SENATOR DODD. Yes.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 7" and reads as follows:)

## EXHIBIT 7

*What is the Fair Play Committee? Page 4**Who is Conte Aguero? Page 2*

# Fair Play

Vol. 1 No. 1

April 29, 1960



New York

15 cents

## Hatchets Sharpened as Committee Opens Truth Campaign

The newly formed Fair Play for Cuba Committee made its public debut on April 6 (as most of our readers already know), with an advertisement in *The New York Times* setting forth some of the essential truths of revolutionary Cuba as we have been able to determine them.

Our basic appeal was to the spirit of fair mindedness on which most Americans seem to pride themselves. The spirit did not appear to be noticeably operative with regard to the Cuban Revolution. Had it been observed in the editorial columns of the newspapers and the reporting of the great wire services which wet nurse the newspapers and the radio and television newsrooms there would obviously have been no need for such a public appeal.

Questions on the order of "When will Fidel Castro stop shooting his political opponents?" (When will he stop beating his wife?) made it evident that people were not getting a clear picture of what was happening in Cuba. Nevertheless, we suspected that a surfeit of propaganda produces its own anti-toxin, and that a healthy scepticism would be found in the body politic if we were to scratch the surface.

The *Times* advertisement served that purpose. The results to date have been encouraging. The Committee has received some 1,500 letters. About a dozen of them suggest that we go back to Russia where we came from. A great many are strongly affirmative in support of the idea of Fair Play for Cuba, and many of these begin "My wife and I spent a few days in Cuba on vacation recently, and we were shocked to discover how misled we had been by what we had read about it in the newspapers. . . ."

The rest simply request information, and that seems fair enough. It is the Committee's function to try to provide it.

### Foreign Agents and Hearst Columnists

The press reaction has been about what had been anticipated. United Press International put out a long report on April 6th, summarizing the substance of the *Times'* ad. (Readers who have not seen it may obtain copies by writing to *Fair Play*, 60 E. 42nd St., New York 17, N. Y.)

The UPI report was perfectly straight, and had fairly

### Mystery of the Missing Brothers

Little is known in the U. S. about Ramon Castro Ruz, elder brother of the Cuban prime minister. He is a modest planter, not a public figure. One must exist in the public eye in order to vanish from it. Thus it fell short of sensational to be informed last week on the Columbia Broadcasting System airwaves that Brother Ramon had "disappeared."

Sinister significance was nevertheless attached to the alleged disappearance. CBS News correspondent Richard Bate, hustled out of Cuba, *persona non grata*, declared that he had been arrested only a few hours before he was to have interviewed Ramon Castro, whom he described as a man of known counter-revolutionary views. It was suggested that Ramon might have fled the country.

On Thursday Ramon Castro appeared in Havana to announce:

*"I am surprised by the news that I am outside of Cuba, since I have been during the past two days engaged in the tasks of the National Assembly of Colonos (independent cane planters), as a delegate from the Province of Oriente...."*

*"I wish to manifest publicly that I find myself in perfect harmony with my brothers . . . and I only ask God for the definitive triumph of the Revolution, which is the triumph of the people of Cuba."*

Why was Bate booted out? He said he suspected that it was because he had been "probing too deeply" into counter-revolution. As yet, no official Cuban comment on Bate's expulsion.

wide circulation, to judge by our mail, which comes from as far away as Texas and California. The following day, however, the wire service returned to something more like its usual form, quoting unidentified "diplomatic sources" and just plain "sources" in connection with a rumor (false) that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee had been established with the aid of Cuban consular officials.

*The New York Daily Mirror* ran an editorial April 7  
(Continued on Page 2)



Who is Luis Conte Aguero?*The Self-Styled 'Refugees' of the Cuban Revolution*

A prominent Cuban radio-television newscaster arrived in the United States on April 6th, and announced in New York the following day that he had come to stay permanently, to "write and speak the truth about Cuba."

So far, not much demonstrable truth has been heard. Nor does this come as a surprise to the Cubans who demonstrated outside of Havana Station CMQ shortly before the newscaster's departure, in protest against his broadcasts.

The self-styled refugee is Luis Conte Aguero. Wire service reports indicate that he left Havana after "seeking asylum" in the Argentine Embassy there, and describe him as "the exiled commentator."

Who is Conte Aguero? In answer to an inquiry from the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the Cuban Ministry of Foreign Relations this week sent a written report, containing the following:

"Luis Conte Aguero left Cuba after promoting a misleading campaign in which he reiterated the worn-out charge of enemies of Cuba that grave Communist infiltration was gaining control of the Government. His arguments repeated, word for word, the assertions of the Rosa Blanca organization (a counter-revolutionary group backed by Dominican dictator Rafael Trujillo and former supporters of Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista)

and other international interests conspiring against Cuba. He completed his maneuver by taking asylum in a foreign embassy, so as to create the impression that he was politically persecuted.

"Conte Aguero was never a revolutionary. He tried by all means within his reach to make the revolutionary movement fail, by spreading discouragement and fatalism among the rebels. He also participated in a maneuver designed to force the Orthodox Party to take part in the mock elections held by dictator Batista.

"In February, 1958, he sent an open letter to Fidel Castro asking him to surrender and "to come down from the hills," declaring that the insurrection would never be able to win.

"When his half-brother, Andres Rivero Aguero, was nominated for president by the dictatorship, Conte became the publicity manager of Batista's candidate, and organized an advertising agency under the name of "Arti," which arranged for the use of radio, press and television space for the campaign."

That is the Cuban version, the side of the story that has not been published in the United States. We don't give it blanket endorsement. We do say that if the U.S. press were as objective as it claims to be it would have made some effort to find out who Conte Aguero was, before lionizing him as a hero of truth and democracy.

(Continued from Page 1)

hinting that the Committee might turn out to be a Communist front, and warning that the sponsors of the Times' advertisement would be "checked for their prior records as political seers."

That task apparently fell to Hearst columnist George Sokolsky, who has been raking through the political backgrounds of such of the Committee members as may have any political background, and has raised the question of whether the sponsors may not be "unregistered foreign agents."

Coupled with this suggestion (April 9) was the warning that the Cuban government, being in a position to cut off the drinking water supply of the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay, "threatens the base that is vital to guarding the Panama Canal."

Perhaps there is a connection. It is difficult to follow such complicated mental processes. However, one gains some insight into Sokolskian method by citing his column on April 26, in which he quotes a portion of a letter from Carleton Beals. The quotation is used in such a way as to make it appear that Beals, a distinguished writer who had lent his name as co-chairman for the purposes of the Committee's appeal in the Times, had been kept in the dark as to the activities of the Committee, and had not, in fact, so much as seen the text of the Times' ad.

**Letter to a Hearstling**

We have since received a copy of a letter written to Sokolsky

by Beals, April 21, of which the following passages seem pertinent:

"Following your article about me and the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, I wrote you a letter indicating the unfairness and injustice of your hatchet attack. When you phoned me April 13, I presumed that you would correct the matter, as you certainly indicated to me that you would do. . . .

"I did not tell you over the phone that I had not seen the ad, merely that I did not see the final version in which a few changes were made. I want to say here and now that I fully approve of the ad as finally published in the N. Y. Times, and to say that I am in hearty accord with the proposal to attempt to counteract the falsehoods about Cuba appearing in the newspapers and magazines of this country. . . .

"Your letter today puts me in the embarrassing position of seeming to be opposed to The Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which I am not, though I may no longer be co-chairman; indeed I shall be overjoyed if the Committee manages to spread abroad any true information about the island and the revolution there. I shall continue to assist in that to the extent of my time, knowledge and ability."

One cannot call a clever journalist a liar without running afoul of the libel law, since most of the damage is done by innuendo, and not by plain statement. In future we shall refrain from wasting space in defending ourselves, having better work to do. However, for the reassurance of our readers, here it is, once for all: we have not received any shipments of Moscow gold or Cuban sugar. Our opinions are not for hire, but are our own.

Views of the American Press—From Adlai Stevenson to Clare Booth Luce

## Debris in the Bubbling Fountain Where Drink the Good and the Wise

All in all, it has been a bad month for the great, self-inflated grampus known to Americans as our free press.

Adlai Stevenson gave it a lusty kick. Robert Moses bruised the injury. CBS President Frank Stanton found that U. S. journalism had strayed into treacherous paths and was by way of becoming a mere agent of the Government. The nation's top official propaganda service, the U. S. Information Agency, complained that the press was, in fact, a *bad servant*. The Assistant Director of the USIA in Latin America said that U. S. newspapers "are certainly making our task harder."

Reporter magazine writer Marja Mannes saw tragedy in something which *Fair Play* is inclined to view as a healthy development: the decline of public confidence in the daily newspapers. She said the newspapers had two great advantages over television:

"They can be used by men as (breakfast) barriers against their wives."

"... You can't line a garbage pail with a television set. It's usually the other way around."

Clare Booth Luce, former U. S. ambassador to Italy and wife of the Time-Life-Fortune magnate, blamed the journalists themselves for being transmission belts for "high-level government and political cant, tripe, and public relations," and for being willing to "sell their birthright of candor and truth in order to become White House pets, party pets, corporation pets, Pentagon or State Department or trade union or governor's mansion pets."

### The Bubbling Fountain

Robert Moses was certainly smiling when he said he praised the press, "with some noisy exceptions," as "the bubbling fountain of pure water at which drink the good and wise." But it was the exceptions that he was concerned with:

"I have been on the outskirts, edges, and inside of public life for many years, and have never seen anything before equal in virulence and irresponsibility to the sensational yellow press of today, representing no doubt only a minority of all newspapers, but still an influential part of the whole.

"I regretfully include in this minority several highly respected conservative publications which today seek to boost circulation by means which would have horrified their founding fathers.

"Baseless allegations are blown up as facts, trivial incidents magnified to giant size, reputations years in building ruthlessly attacked, and the denouement, pay-off, exoneration and correction of the canard appears in small type on Page 36 or

40 opposite the stockyard prices or beside the obituaries."

But after all, why not lay a blasted reputation to rest on the obituary page? Where else?

Stevenson, commenting on his recent Latin-American tour:

"I took time out somewhere to read a collection of American newspapers of the week of February 15. Khrushchev was in India, Mikoyan was in Cuba. The French exploded their atomic bomb. The latest Chinese production figures were released. An antiquated school building in New York collapsed. The Geneva talks on bomb-testing were making some progress. If the generals testifying in Washington were right, our country was in second place militarily. Eisenhower said he was puzzled that some people were worried.

"All these events were important to us and to our children. Yet the big news in most of those American dailies that week was: when will Jack Paar make up his mind? And when that burning question was finally resolved, Dr. Finch's murder trial took over the front pages."

### Graveyards Where You Find Them

Why is FAIR PLAY so interested in all this? Obviously because it explains, even better than we can do it, our reason for publishing a news letter. If it were not true, there would probably be no need of a FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE. To quote one of our correspondents:

"A recent article . . . in the Miami press led me to the Miami library where I searched through back issues of THE NEW YORK TIMES until I came upon the April 6th ad. I cannot tell you how happy I was to see this ad and the statements in it.

"All thinking people know that the American press had done a miserable job of reporting the Cuban story and I often think, when I pick up a newspaper and see a reference to the 'hate America' campaign in Cuba, how really upside-down the whole thing is. For as anyone can see, something akin to a 'hate Cuba' campaign has been set afoot in the newspapers of our own country.

"Someone must get the truth to the American people—"

—Mrs. L.B.C., Miami, Fla.

After reviewing the opinions of Adlai Stevenson, Mrs. Luce, Robert Moses, et al., and reading a few hundred letters much in the vein of the one cited above, it comes as something of an anti-climax to pick up one of the New York City tabloids and see: "CUBA CALLED GRAVEYARD OF INDEPENDENT PRESS." How's that again?

**Q. What is The Fair Play for Cuba Committee?**

**A.** One of Vance Packard's "hidden persuaders," a Madison Avenue man engaged in motivational research, so called, was pretty sure that he knew the answer to that one. He wrote advising us to call ourselves *The Fair Play Committee for Cuba*. Maybe he's right, but it seems to us that the shift of emphasis would be misleading. It would imply that the *committee* was for Cuba, and fair play was for anyone who could get it. Our idea was to put first things first. We weren't much interested in being a committee. But we are very much interested in fair play, for everyone—north or south of the border. And in this instance, we're interested in fair play for *Cuba*. Why? Because we feel that six-and-a-half million people down there, still struggling to liberate themselves from the oppression and exploitation of centuries, have not been getting a square deal from our spokesmen, our opinion moulders, our press. Hence the Committee. Its members are journalists, creative writers, businessmen, ordinary working men and women. You can be one if you wish. In fact, we need you.

**Q. Who supports the Committee?**

**A.** YOU do—or at least, we hope that you will. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee has absolutely no connection with any other organization or agency. It has no paid employees. It depends on volunteer stamp-lickers and envelope addressers, and on the voluntary contributions of private persons who are, like us, interested in fair play, and honest reporting.

**Q. What is the purpose of the Committee?**

**A.** To disseminate truth, to combat untruth, to publish the factual information which the U. S. mass media suppress, which the American public has the right to know, and in the process to combat the ignorance, the inadequate leadership, the blatantly distorted reporting which we believe to constitute not merely a grave injustice to the Cuban people and a serious threat to their dream of a better life, but a serious threat, as well, to the free traditions of our own people, our nation, our Hemisphere.

Would you like to help? Fill out the form below.

To: The Fair Play for Cuba Committee  
60 East 42nd Street, New York 17, N.Y.

I wish to join the Committee. Enclosed is my check or money order for \$5.00, to cover enrollment fee, and mailing costs for the Committee's weekly fact sheet "Fair Play."

I cannot participate as an active member of the Committee, but enclose my contribution to support the cause of Fair Play for Cuba

Please send me more information about the Fair Play Committee and revolutionary Cuba as it is today

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us the approximate cost of this mailing piece, its printing and distribution?

Mr. TABER. Approximately \$175.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, did you pay for the printing and distribution of this mailing piece and the letter signed with the name Marjorie More out of funds contributed to the work of the Fair Play For Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. SOURWINE. I show you a reprint of an article from the Nation of January 23, 1960, "The Picture In Focus, Castro's Cuba by Robert Taber."

I will ask you if that is the article you referred to earlier which had been seen by one of the members of the committee and which led to the suggestion that you meet and consider the formation of the committee?

Mr. TABER. This is the article which he had referred to, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the text of this article be included in the appendix of the record of this hearing.

Senator DODD. Yes.

(The article referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 8" and appears as appendix II at p. 97.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the text of the letter signed by Marjorie More submitted to any person or persons for approval before it was printed, Mr. Taber?

Mr. TABER. I do not believe so. As a matter of fact, I had forgotten the contents of that particular letter but it seems to me it was just a thank you note.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the text or the proof of this four-page pamphlet or flier submitted to any person or persons for approval before it was printed and distributed?

Mr. TABER. I mailed it to the Community Church because they were cosponsoring the meeting which is referred to in that flier and of course, they are interested in the form in which we presented it.

Mr. SOURWINE. To whom did you mail it at the Community Church?

Mr. TABER. Either Reverend Harrington or Reverend Papandrew.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have approval of those gentlemen before you printed it or distributed it?

Mr. TABER. I felt I had tacit approval. I don't recall they mentioned it in subsequent correspondence or subsequent meetings.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, have you been in consultation with reference to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee or any of its activities with any persons known to you to be members of Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. TABER. I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever conferred on any subject with Joseph North?

Mr. TABER. Joseph North? I don't know the name.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever conferred on any subject with Benjamin Davis?

Mr. TABER. I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever conferred on any subject with Eugene Dennis?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever conferred on any subject with Jack Stachel?

Mr. TABER. No, I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you assure Mr. Carlton Beals that no Communists were members or were sponsors of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. Were Communists you say?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, did you assure him?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I did, to my knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you assure him that no funds for the committee came directly or indirectly from the Cuban Government?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. And this is true?

Mr. TABER. Yes, that is true.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you personally or in a representative capacity received payments of any kind either directly or indirectly from the Cuban Government?

Mr. TABER. No, I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you registered as an agent of the Cuban Government?

Mr. TABER. No, I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever had any dealings with the Cuban Embassy?

Mr. TABER. Cuban Embassy?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. TABER. No, I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever had any dealings with a person known to you to be on the staff of the Cuban Embassy?

Mr. TABER. I know several of the people on the staff in a personal capacity.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who?

Mr. TABER. Not the Cuban Embassy, but in New York.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Cuban legation, Cuban consulate?

Mr. TABER. The Cuban mission.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who on the Cuban mission in New York do you know?

Mr. TABER. Well, I know Raul Roa.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is Mr. Roa in the Cuban mission in New York?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And who else?

Mr. TABER. Well, at one time or another I have met, I suppose, the Ambassador to the United States from Cuba, various functionaries of the Cuban Government.

I have met them, but in a private capacity.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever discuss the affairs of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee with any of these individuals whom you know are connected with the Cuban consulate?

Mr. TABER. To the extent of having received expressions of pleasure or something of that sort, and naturally, in meeting these people, they say, "We saw your ad and we are happy about it," or something of that sort.

I have received a great deal of mail from Cubans in general, as well as Americans.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, prior to the publication of the ad in the New York Times on April 6, discuss the ad or the intention to publish such an ad with any of these individuals whom you knew are connected with the Cuban consulate?

Mr. TABER. The Cuban consulate, no, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were any of these individuals whom you know connected with the Cuban Embassy?

Mr. TABER. I may have in a conversational way, not with any purpose, certainly.

Mr. SOURWINE. With whom did you discuss it?

Mr. TABER. Offhand, I couldn't tell you. It is a matter which has come up with my conversations with Cubans and Americans a great many times.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you show or discuss the copy or text for the ad with any of the persons whom you know who are connected with the Cuban Embassy?

Mr. TABER. No, sir, I don't believe so. I believe not.

Senator DODD. What was your answer to that?

(The last answer of the witness was read by the reporter.)

Mr. SOURWINE. With what individuals connected with the Cuban Embassy are you acquainted?

Mr. TABER. I mentioned Mr. Roa. I have met a Mr. Primas. I have met the Ambassador to the United Nations. His name is Bisbé.

Mr. SOURWINE. With which of those individuals do you think you might have discussed the ad before it was published in the Times?

Mr. TABER. That I had discussed? You said I had discussed it? It's a question I can't answer because I don't know whether I actually discussed it or not discussed it.

Mr. SOURWINE. You said you might have discussed it.

Mr. TABER. It is a possibility.

Mr. SOURWINE. I said with which of these three individuals that you named might you have discussed it?

Mr. TABER. I might have discussed it with any or all of them had I discussed it. I can't confirm it.

Mr. SOURWINE. In order to have discussed it, it would have been necessary to have talked with them or one of them, would it not?

Mr. TABER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, did you talk with them or any one of them between the time of your first meeting with Mr. Sagner and the publication of the ad on April 6?

Mr. TABER. Let's see—my first meeting with Sagner was in February. I certainly saw some of them in the interim. Yes, I imagine I have. I have had several opportunities to meet them.

Mr. SOURWINE. What were the occasions on which you saw them? Did you see them at the Embassy or elsewhere?

Mr. TABER. I had a meeting. I had a lunch with several of them and some newspaper people at the United Nations, various telephone conversations in order to check on facts, factual questions having to do with Cuban affairs.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did they know that you were preparing an ad when you were checking these facts?

Mr. TABER. I believe that they knew we were preparing a committee—whether the question—the ad—had come up, I can't say as to that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, with whom did you have telephone conversations about that?

I will limit that question. With whom, I mean, whom in this area of persons associated with the Cuban Embassy——

Senator DODD. Let the record show the witness is conferring with his counsel before answering the question.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel from 12:25 p.m. to 12:26 p.m.)

Mr. TABER. The question again, please?

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

Mr. TABER. I can't honestly tell you. In a specific instance, dealing with an inquiry regarding factual matters having to do with Cuba, I can't tell you which of several persons might have responded to the telephone, to my call or my conversation. I don't have any recollection of it.

With regard to this ad, I haven't stated clearly that I ever had any conference of any kind with any of these people. I say only that it is a possibility that it might have been mentioned in casual conversation.

Mr. SOURWINE. You placed calls to some individuals to get information or to check information and you have stated that these people——

Senator DODD. I would make it clear that according to his testimony he called several people.

Mr. SOURWINE. The chairman is correct.

According to your testimony, you called several persons to check information. Now whom did you call?

Mr. TABER. Well, I called the mission office.

Mr. SOURWINE. In New York?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Not the Embassy here in Washington?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. You never called the Embassy to check information?

Mr. TABER. No, I never have.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you called the mission office, whom did you ask for?

Mr. TABER. I can only speculate. Probably Mr. Roa.

Mr. SOURWINE. Raul Roa?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that the same gentleman who is foreign minister of Cuba?

Mr. TABER. That is his son.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is the younger Roa that you are referring to?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is he the only one in the Cuban mission in New York who you would know well enough to ask for when you call up there for information?

Mr. TABER. I wouldn't say that, but I say that in all probability he would be the one since he is—speaks English best of the group and is the most familiar with economic developments and this sort of thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not concerned with probabilities. You made the phone calls. I am asking who did you ask for. Was it Raul Roa?

Mr. TABER. The question is we haven't established a specific occasion when I asked for anyone. Hence, I can't say who this person was. I normally say in my general recollection, I probably made several calls in which I have checked out points of information. I don't remember the specific occasions, nor do I remember the persons to whom I spoke.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, you told us that you had had a luncheon at the United Nations with some of these people connected with the Cuban mission and with certain newspapermen. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was this luncheon?

Mr. TABER. The luncheon was sometime during March?

Mr. SOURWINE. In March. Who was present?

Mr. TABER. The Ambassador and the Alternate Ambassador to the United Nations; the publisher of the Nation and his wife who covers affairs in the U.N.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who is he, the name?

Mr. TABER. George Kirstein.

Mr. SOURWINE. And his wife is Mrs. Kirstein?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Goes by that name?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who else was present?

Mr. TABER. I believe it was another member of that same delegation who was present; in fact, several members, but not of my acquaintance.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean by "that same delegation"?

Mr. TABER. I believe it was another member of that same delegation present: in fact, several members, but not of my acquaintance.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean by "that same delegation"?

Mr. TABER. The Cuban delegation to the U.N.

Mr. SOURWINE. They were persons not known to you?

Mr. TABER. Persons who I don't recall at the moment, not very well known to me, if known to me at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who arranged this luncheon?

Mr. TABER. I believe that the Cuban delegation arranged it.

Mr. SOURWINE. They invited you?

Mr. TABER. They invited me and they invited Mrs. Kirstein or Mr. Kirstein, one or the other of them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have any part in putting them in touch with the people from the Nation?

Mr. TABER. Not to my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't convey the invitation to Mr. and Mrs. Kirstein?

Mr. TABER. I believe not.

Mr. SOURWINE. And the invitation to that luncheon was conveyed to you by whom and how?

Mr. TABER. I don't recall at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was the purpose of the luncheon?

Mr. TABER. To the best of my recollection, Mrs. Kirstein, who covers the United Nations as a reporter for the Nation, had expressed



some interest in the Cuban question in general and the invitation came partly as a result of that and partly as a result of my article in the Nation.

Mr. SOURWINE. To whom did she express that interest?

Mr. TABER. To me.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you conveyed that expression of interest to Mr. Roa or to someone else connected with the Cuban mission?

Mr. TABER. It is possible that is the case. I am not sure.

Mr. SOURWINE. How else would they learn about it?

Mr. TABER. I may have mentioned it to them. In any case—or they may have—may have issued the invitation on the basis of their knowledge of my article in the Nation; the fact that we were mutually acquainted and then entirely on their own initiative. I can't recall the circumstances of the luncheon.

Mr. SOURWINE. But you do know that she had expressed to you this interest in Cuban affairs?

Mr. TABER. We had discussed Cuban affairs a number of times.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you do not know, is that your testimony, whether you conveyed her expression of interest or word of it to anyone connected with the Cuban mission?

Mr. TABER. As I say, it may have come up in casual conversation, but I don't recall. It is a possibility. That is all I recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Isn't this what happened: She told you she was interested. She would like to meet with them and on that basis they arranged it?

Mr. TABER. I can't confirm that. They—it may have been the other way around. They may have expressed a desire to meet with Mr. Kirstein or both of them, and I may have passed it along. I honestly don't recall the circumstances.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did anyone in the Cuban mission express to you such a desire?

Mr. TABER. I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. At that luncheon was the formation of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee discussed?

Mr. TABER. No, I believe not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the work of the committee discussed?

Mr. TABER. I don't think so. I don't think the committee came up at all at that luncheon.

In looking back, I am not sure that we had plans or that the committee had even started. As I say, I am vague on the date of that particular luncheon. It may have been before.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the ad, or copy for the ad, discussed at that luncheon?

Mr. TABER. No, I am certain it was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, on what occasions have you been in Cuba?

Mr. TABER. Well, I made my first visit to Cuba in February of 1957 as a reporter. Many times since then.

Mr. SOURWINE. You went as a reporter for CBS?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was the result of your trip? Did you have a program on the air?

Mr. TABER. The result of the trip was I made contact with some of the revolutionaries who were opposing Batista, the Batista dictatorship, and that actually is all that was accomplished at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. What revolutionaries did you make contact with?

Mr. TABER. You mean specific names?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Offhand I couldn't tell you. It has been quite a long time ago.

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't remember any of them?

Mr. TABER. Mario Llerama is one whose name stays in my mind.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you spell it?

Mr. TABER. L-L-E-R-A-M-A.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you at that time meet Fidel Castro?

Mr. TABER. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you meet "Che" Guevara?

Mr. TABER. I didn't meet any of the people who were fighting in the mountains at that time because I stayed in the cities.

Mr. SOURWINE. You remember no name among those contacts you made with the revolutionaries except those you have given us?

Mr. TABER. Another one was Filipino Tazos.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was he at that time connected with the Bank of Cuba?

Mr. TABER. He was connected with private banking institutions at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Anyone else whom you remember?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BOUDIN. May I give this [indicating an envelope] to Mr. Tynan?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Otulaski.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your counsel asked us to suspend.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, while your counsel was out—let the record show he has now returned to the room—you started to give us another name of a person among the revolutionaries in Cuba whom you had contacted in February of 1957.

Will you give us that name now?

Mr. TABER. Enrique Otulaski.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who else?

Mr. TABER. I don't recall any others at that time. I am sure there were some others. I don't remember the names.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did any news program result from that particular trip to Cuba in February of 1957?

Mr. TABER. Yes, as a result of that trip I subsequently had another contact in New York with one of the revolutionaries, Mario Llerana. I returned to Cuba in April and went into the Sierra Madres to do the first television-radio interview with Fidel Castro.

Mr. SOURWINE. April 1957?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. How long were you in the Sierra Madres with Castro?

Mr. TABER. Three weeks.

Mr. SOURWINE. During that time you met Fidel Castro?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Raul Castro?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. "Che" Guevara—Did you meet Camilo Cienfuegos?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Carlos Rafael Rodriguez?

Mr. TABER. No, he wasn't there.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall any other leaders you met in the Sierra Madres at that time?

Mr. TABER. Juan Almedia. Most of the original group. At that time there were about 80 of them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, the broadcast there was over CBS, was it not, was it filmed or taped?

Mr. TABER. Filmed and taped. We brought it out.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you thereafter return to Cuba?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I was there in April of 1958.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you again visit the revolutionary leaders?

Mr. TABER. Not in the Sierra Madres but only in the cities.

Mr. SOURWINE. In Oriente Province?

Mr. TABER. Oriente, also in Havana.

Mr. SOURWINE. What revolutionary leader did you see at that time?

Mr. TABER. One of them in Havana was Faustino Perez, and a lawyer by the name of Mendoza. I don't remember the rest of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. How long were you there at that time?

Mr. TABER. Several weeks.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have any program result from that visit?

Mr. TABER. I had a number of radio broadcasts from Santiago for Havana.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you thereafter again visit Cuba?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I was there in the summer of 1958.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you again see revolutionary leaders at that time?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where?

Mr. TABER. In northern Oriente.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who did you see again on that occasion?

Mr. TABER. Raul Castro. I don't remember very many of the names.

Mr. SOURWINE. And again broadcast resulted?

Mr. TABER. Yes, with some film, that is some film, the tape and so on.

Mr. SOURWINE. And thereafter, did you again visit Cuba?

Mr. TABER. Returned in early January, after the overthrow of Batista.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is January of 1959?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You went then to Havana?

Mr. TABER. Went to Havana.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you go elsewhere in Cuba in January 1959?

Mr. TABER. Went down to Santa Clara, I believe.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you went to Cuba on that occasion, did you go as a guest of the new government?

Mr. TABER. Well, I recall that at that time the airline, commercial airline had been suspended and the Cubans were flying refugees, exiles back, repatriates, and I flew on one of those planes which took ex-repatriated exiles back to Cuba.

Mr. SOURWINE. A Cuban Government airplane?

Mr. TABER. A Cuban airline. I don't know what the status of the airline was at that time but in many cases they arranged the flight and I went on one of them.

Mr. SOURWINE. The cost of the trip was not paid by you?

Mr. TABER. The cost of the trip down was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. While you were in Havana in January of 1959 and elsewhere in Cuba, were you treated as a guest of the Government?

Mr. TABER. No; I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You paid your own expenses?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Or did CBS pay them?

Mr. TABER. I paid them myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. This was not an official business trip for CBS?

Mr. TABER. No, it was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Subsequent to January 1959, did you again visit Cuba?

Mr. TABER. I made two trips in January of 1959. On the second occasion I paid my own way.

I made a subsequent trip. I guess it was in April. I went in April on my vacation.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of 1959?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. How long were you there at that time?

Mr. TABER. About 3 weeks.

Mr. SOURWINE. And on that occasion, were you treated as a guest of the Cuban Government?

Mr. TABER. No, I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Paid all your own expenses?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was a pleasure trip?

Mr. TABER. Actually, it was a business trip. As a matter of fact, I took one previous one before that in February or somewhere along the line when I took a week's leave of absence or so.

In both cases, I was working on a book, a history of the Cuban revolution. So I went down partly for pleasure and partly for research.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, after April of 1959, did you go again to Cuba?

Mr. TABER. I am trying to remember when. I have been down several times since then.

Senator DODD. Let the record show the witness is conferring with counsel.

(Mr. Taber conferred with his counsel from 12:25 to 12:26.)

Mr. TABER. I honestly don't recall the next time, but I believe—I am sorry. I have been down several times. I don't recall the precise dates.

Senator DODD. You mean several times since April 1959?

Mr. TABER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you been to Cuba during 1960?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I was there over the weekend, as a matter of fact.

Mr. SOURWINE. This past weekend?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you been there earlier this year?

Mr. TABER. There about 3 weeks ago.

Mr. SOURWINE. And had you been there earlier than that this year?

Mr. TABER. I think I have made 3 trips this year.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was the first one?

Mr. TABER. Along about March or so. I was there March or April.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that before or after the luncheon at the United Nations about which you testified?

Mr. TABER. Possibly after. I am not sure.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the occasion of that trip in March, whom did you see in Cuba?

Mr. TABER. I saw Fidel Castro, saw a number of members of the—you know, acquaintances from the revolutionary period. Any number of other people.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you discuss with anyone in Cuba on that occasion the formation of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee or the possibility of forming such a committee?

Mr. TABER. No; I believe not.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the second occasion this year when you visited Cuba, whom did you see?

Mr. TABER. Well, I went down there to get some information about my—with reference to the same book and the one I was trying to see was Fidel Castro. I didn't see him. I got tired of waiting and came back and that was true of the past trip.

Mr. SOURWINE. On that occasion, did you discuss with anyone in Cuba the activities of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. Are you referring to my last visit?

Mr. SOURWINE. The second visit which I think you said was about 3 weeks ago.

Mr. TABER. Something like that. Well, I, if it came after the ad was out—why, undoubtedly it was—had it mentioned to me by any number of people.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it after the ad was out?

Mr. TABER. I'd have to consult my records. Honestly, I am not sure. It wasn't my preoccupation. I had this book to do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, aside from any question of whether the ad was out, did you discuss any of the activities of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee with anyone in Cuba on the occasion of that visit about 3 weeks ago?

Mr. TABER. It is quite possible, but I don't recall the specific details of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you were down there again last week?

Mr. TABER. Down there again last week to attend a writers' conference and also to try to get some more—get this book situation cleared up.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you see any of the officials of the Government of Cuba on the occasion of that most recent trip?

Mr. TABER. I saw most of them, the President and at the wedding of Fidel Castro's sister——

Mr. SOURWINE. You were a guest at that wedding?

Mr. TABER. Beg pardon?

Mr. SOURWINE. You were a guest at that wedding?

Mr. TABER. A guest at that wedding. ——Fidel, Raul, most of them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, on that occasion, discuss with anyone in Cuba the activities of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. No, I did not.

To tell you the truth, the whole situation was extremely hectic and the opportunity didn't arise to discuss much of anything except, "How have you been?"

Mr. SOURWINE. Who is your usual liaison person with the Cuban Government in Havana?

Mr. TABER. Liaison in what sense?

Mr. SOURWINE. When you go to Havana you get in touch with somebody. Who do you get in touch with?

Mr. TABER. Usually with the secretary, secretary of Marcella Fernandez who works in the Ministry.

Mr. SOURWINE. The secretary of Marcella Fernandez? Do you recall the secretary's name?

Mr. TABER. No, I don't.

Senator DODD. How do you get in touch with her?

Mr. TABER. I go over there and stop in and talk. There is a girl there and I don't know the girl's name.

Senator DODD. How do you address her?

Mr. TABER. Beg your pardon?

Senator DODD. How do you speak to her?

Mr. TABER. My Spanish is not very good and her English is non-existent. I say, "Hello, how have you been" and things of that nature and I have never learned her name, but——

Senator DODD. Go ahead, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you finished, Mr. Taber?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the occasion of any of your trips to Cuba this year were you given money by any Cuban?

Mr. TABER. No, I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you paid your own expenses in connection with all of those trips?

Mr. TABER. With the exception of this last one, this last trip I went as a—to attend this writers' conference.

I was a guest on one of the previous occasions. I went as a guest in connection actually, in a business connection having to do with publication of my book.

Mr. SOURWINE. A guest of whom, sir?

Mr. TABER. Of the Government.

Mr. SOURWINE. Oh, yes, and on this last occasion were you also a guest of the Government?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Senator DODD. CBS ever pay your expenses for any of these trips down there and back?

Mr. TABER. Not this year. On a previous occasion, yes.

Senator DODD. Other years?

Mr. TABER. On all occasions when I was working as a reporter for CBS, a special correspondent for CBS, CBS paid my expenses. When I went on my own or as a guest of the Government——

Senator DODD. As a guest of the Cuban Government?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Senator DODD. The Castro government?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. During the summer of 1958 you spent about 2 months with Raul Castro watching the guerilla fighting in northern Oriente Province, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you live during that period of time?

Mr. TABER. Oh, in a number of small villages.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you bivouacked with the troops at all?

Mr. TABER. Part of the time, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you eat at the Army mess?

Mr. TABER. They didn't really have an Army mess. You see, they lived in homes of farmers, peasants and they ate what came along. They didn't have that kind of an organization.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you do the same thing?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you always pay for your quarters?

Mr. TABER. I never paid for them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who paid for them?

Mr. TABER. Occasionally, I gave one of them, some private family, something that I wanted. If there was a store—when it came to buying something, I bought it. But ordinarily—and all of the reporters with me for that matter—were fed by, from the same sources that the troops themselves were fed.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean the Army arranged it?

Mr. TABER. There wasn't an army at that time, but the guerillas living off the countryside were supplied by and lived on the population and were supplied by them and so was I.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Carlos Rafael Rodriguez?

Mr. TABER. No, I don't.

Mr. SOURWINE. You never met him while you were in Cuba?

Mr. TABER. If I did, I don't recall the name.

Senator DODD. You don't recall?

Mr. TABER. I don't recall the name at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber, have you, yourself, ever been a member of the Communist Party U.S.A.?

Mr. TABER. No, I never have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, we have here a letter addressed to the research director of this subcommittee from an official of the New York Times with regard to the placement and the cost of this ad.

It confirms what Mr. Taber has told us insofar as it pertains to us and I ask it go into the record at this time.

Senator DODD. Yes.

(The letter referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 9" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 9

THE NEW YORK TIMES,  
New York, N.Y., April 18, 1960.

Mr. BENJAMIN MANDEL,  
Research Director, Internal Security Subcommittee,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MANDEL: In accordance with the request in your letter dated April 6 concerning the advertisement of The Fair Play for Cuba Committee, we submit the following:

The advertisement was placed by Robert Taber, one of those whose names appear as sponsors. It was released to us on Tuesday, April 5, the day prior to publication. Mr. Taber delivered the advertisement in person and paid for it

at that time. The proof was okayed by the advertising acceptability department of the Times. The cost of the advertisement was \$4,725. Mr. Taber presented four checks to make up the amount. We do not have a record of those who signed the checks.

Sincerely yours,

VINCENT REDDING,  
*The New York Times.*

Mr. BOUDIN. May I see it?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questions of this witness, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. I have a couple of questions I would like to ask of the witness if I may.

Do you know Mr. Bates who works for CBS?

Mr. TABER. I met him several times.

Senator DODD. Is he a coworker there?

Mr. TABER. Not actually, Senator, because he is a correspondent and I am only a writer.

Senator DODD. I notice in your—hand me those exhibits—in this pamphlet—if it is a fair way to describe it—that you have identified, that you said you referred to him in this publication, don't you, "Fair Play"?

Mr. TABER. Yes, sir.

Senator DODD. Is it fair to say that your article about him—you say he was hustled out of Cuba as a persona non grata?

Mr. TABER. He said that.

Senator DODD. But he didn't write this article, did he?

Mr. TABER. No, he did not.

Senator DODD. Did you ask him why he left Cuba?

Mr. TABER. I didn't. I haven't seen him since he returned from Cuba.

I listened to him, listened to several broadcasts and what he had to say on them. I took what he said.

Senator DODD. But you haven't asked him.

Mr. TABER. I haven't seen him.

Senator DODD. But you wrote this article about him nevertheless, without ever asking him why he left Cuba.

Mr. TABER. He had explained himself quite fully on the air several times.

Senator DODD. But you hadn't seen him. You are a reporter yourself and work for the same company, is that right?

Mr. TABER. We don't work in the same place.

Senator DODD. I didn't say you worked in the same place. I said you worked for the same company.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have two more questions, if I may. They might fill small gaps.

Do you know the reason for Mr. Alan Sagner's interest in Cuban affairs?

Mr. TABER. I presume to know from what he has told me that he has a great interest in the cause of fairplay and that he feels that Cubans have not been getting it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know of any connection he has with Cuba?

Mr. TABER. I am not aware of any connection he has with Cuba.

Mr. SOURWINE. The final question, Are the funds of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee kept in a bank account?



Mr. TABER. Yes, they are.

Mr. SOURWINE. In what bank?

Mr. TABER. The Chase National Bank.

Mr. SOURWINE. In the name of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And subject to your order?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questions at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. Anything else, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. SOURWINE. I have nothing else.

There is something which need not be on the record but perhaps might just as well be. It is conceivable that the committee might want to ask Mr. Taber further questions.

Can we have an agreement with counsel that if we give counsel adequate time—

Senator DODD. Do you mean today?

Mr. SOURWINE. No, no, at another time we give counsel adequate notice and we will define that as at least 4 days' notice that he would produce Mr. Taber, or would you prefer to leave it on the basis of a new subpoena?

Senator DODD. I would prefer to leave it on the basis of a new subpoena.

Mr. BOUDIN. It is completely irrelevant, of course.

Senator DODD. I don't mean to cast any shadow on your client, Mr. Boudin. I think it is better for you and for us that we do it formally.

Mr. BOUDIN. I prefer formal proceedings. You are absolutely right.

Mr. SOURWINE. We have another witness, Mr. Chairman.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

### TESTIMONY OF KENNETH TYNAN, ACCOMPANIED BY LEONARD BOUDIN

Senator DODD. Raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you will give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TYNAN. I do swear.

Mr. SOURWINE. Give the reporter your full name, please.

Mr. TYNAN. Kenneth P. Tynan.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your address?

Mr. TYNAN. 56 East 89th Street, New York City.

Mr. SOURWINE. And your business or profession?

Mr. TYNAN. I am a drama critic and author.

Mr. SOURWINE. Presently employed as a drama critic for the New Yorker magazine?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you a subject of England?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were a native of England?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And what is your present immigration status here in the United States?

Mr. TYNAN. My present one, entirely due to an oversight on my part and my employer's is B-1 and 2. I have been employed on an H-1 visa that expired last October without even myself or my employers realizing it.

Senator DODD. I think it would be better instead of using code letters like B-1 and B-2 and H's that if you told us what arrangements you have here—

Mr. TYNAN. I am here on a visa for which my employers applied on the grounds that I was performing unique services for them. If that answers the question.

Senator DODD. Your employers are the New Yorker publishers?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Senator DODD. When did they apply for your unique services?

Mr. TYNAN. They applied in the autumn of 1958.

Senator DODD. And you have been performing unique services for them ever since, I suppose.

Mr. TYNAN. As unique as I can define.

Senator DODD. What is the rest of this B-2?

Mr. TYNAN. No, that is an ordinary—visitors and tourist visa that I have held for some years and which expires in April 1962.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it a fair assumption that you are in the process of straightening out your immigration status at the present time?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes, we have filed with the Immigration Office—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Tynan, have you ever used any name other than Kenneth Tynan?

Mr. TYNAN. Once when I wrote an article on Ingrid Bergman I used Roger Gorce.

Mr. SOURWINE. But you have never lived under another name?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party of Great Britain or the United States?

Mr. TYNAN. No, sir.

Senator DODD. Or the Communist Party of any other place.

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever been affiliated with any Communist-controlled organizations either in Great Britain or the United States?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your name appears in this advertisement which I will show you. I will ask you if you have seen that ad before?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. But you do not consider yourself a member of the committee?

Mr. TYNAN. No, I was asked to add my name to the ad but not to join the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see. Have you contributed to the committee?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who was it that asked you to lend your name to the ad?

Mr. TYNAN. Mr. Taber. I actually got a formal letter asking me if I would be willing to add my name to it and enclosing the content of the ad as it is printed there.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is Mr. Robert B. Taber who testified here before you today?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes, then a couple of days later I think he telephoned me and asked me if I was willing to add my name and I said I would.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you see the ad or a copy for the ad or a proof of the ad before it appeared in the New York Times?

Mr. TYNAN. I saw the content of it but not, I think, the list of the other signatories.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you approved of the content of the ad?

Mr. TYNAN. Well, let me say that my motive in adding my name was primarily as a journalist who has tremendous regard for complete and accurate reporting on any subject in any country.

I approved of the attempt to—let us say to expand the American press repertory on the Cuban situation.

Mr. SOURWINE. I wasn't asking for your motives but specifically whether you had approved the content of the ad before it was printed.

Mr. TYNAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now who showed that to you?

Mr. TYNAN. That was sent to me, together with the letter from the committee that I received.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber?

Mr. TYNAN. Now I can't remember if he signed it because he—it was quite certain he telephoned me but I can't remember whether his was the name.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you indicate your approval?

Mr. TYNAN. It was done over the telephone. I simply said "Yes."

Mr. SOURWINE. To Mr. Taber?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Tynan, in a statement issued on January 26, 1960, President Eisenhower charged the Prime Minister of Cuba with issuing statements which, to use the President's words, "contained unwarranted attacks on our Government and on our leading officials." That closes his quotation. How did it happen that you took the action of signing a statement in support of Castro in defiance of the views of President Eisenhower? Did this enter into your consideration at all?

Mr. TYNAN. I didn't know that President Eisenhower had expressed himself in that way. Whether or not it is my business in forming my opinions as an American—as an Englishman to take into account whether or not I am contradicting the opinions of the President of this country, I am not quite sure.

I am unaware of what Mr. Eisenhower said. I don't see that it arises.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your connection with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has had nothing to do at any time with your work for the New Yorker, has it?

Mr. TYNAN. Absolutely nothing.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is wholly a personal matter?

Mr. TYNAN. Completely.

Mr. SOURWINE. And your views in that regard don't pretend to reflect the views of the New Yorker magazine at all?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know of any of the individuals whose names appear with yours on this ad?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes, I do know Mr. Norman Mailer and Mr. Truman Capote, an associate. I have heard of Simone de Beauvoir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't know any of the others?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Tynan, did you produce a broadcast entitled "We Dissent," of the Associated Television, Ltd., the British Television Network, on January 27, 1960?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes, I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was this a broadcast which served to bring the United States into disrepute?

Mr. TYNAN. Certainly not.

Senator DODD. Just a minute. I suggest that you might rephrase that question. I think the matter of whether it did or not is an opinion and judgment, don't you think so?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Chair, of course, is correct. I will ask this question.

Was this broadcast intended to bring the United States into disrepute?

Mr. TYNAN. By no means. I should say rather the opposite.

Mr. SOURWINE. This was the broadcast produced as a platform for Americans who have doubts about the American way of life.

Mr. TYNAN. It was conceived and I think advertised, as a program expressing as much as we could in 90 minutes of the enormous—of the whole spectrum of nonconformity in this country in the arts and philosophy and politics and in any field.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are attempting to cover the entire spectrum?

Mr. TYNAN. That obviously one cannot do in 90 minutes.

I had hoped it would be a much longer program but I was overruled. Its aim, if I may continue, was to correct a distorted image of America that I had noticed to my horror in a great many countries in Europe.

The idea is that America is a country of conformists and organization men. I know this country well enough to say it is untrue.

I was extremely pleased to be asked by the TV company concerned to undertake the organization of the program.

Senator DODD. This is the private TV in Great Britain was it not?

Mr. TYNAN. It is one of the independents.

Senator DODD. Independent?

Mr. TYNAN. Independent producing companies.

Mr. SOURWINE. I can understand that you could not in a 90-minute program put on every body that you might wish to reach, but is it fair to say that you put on as many as you could get of the persons you wanted?

Mr. TYNAN. Well, originally this was enormous. It was compiled in England. A couple of hundred of people were on it and we had an extremely limited schedule, extremely limited amount of money at our disposal which restricted our filming entirely to San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York.

Obviously, we could only interview those who were available and accessible and interested at that time in those cities.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you include in this broadcast Alger Hiss?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You knew that he had been cited in sworn testimony as a member of an underground ring of the Communist Party?

Mr. TYNAN. I had heard that, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You knew that he had operated in the espionage field within the U.S. Government?

Mr. TYNAN. I had heard that too.

Mr. SOURWINE. You knew he was a convicted perjurer?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you also include in this broadcast Arnold Johnson, the legislative director of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you get in touch with Mr. Hiss?

Mr. TYNAN. It was discussed, as I say, in England and agreed that he should be contacted if available.

Senator DODD. When you say it was discussed, tell us who you discussed it with.

Mr. TYNAN. Well, employees of ATV which is the name of the company.

Senator DODD. Don't make them quite so anonymous. Who?

Mr. TYNAN. Well, now, since this intramural affair has come to me and I am perfectly willing to tell you, but I think I would have to ask the manager of the company, Mr. Val Parnell—I don't know if my contract allows me to discuss their intramural affairs here.

Mr. SOURWINE. I respectfully suggest that you consult with counsel whether any contract you have in England has any bearing on your obligation to answer proper questions here.

Mr. TYNAN. I will answer them, certainly. The director of the program in England was a Mr. Michael Redington, the associate editor was a man called Fred P. Ullham, something like that, and the program consultant, attached to Associated Television was Mr. Robert Heller.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, the question which still remains a little bit unanswered was how did you get in touch with Mr. Hiss?

Mr. TYNAN. I was answering that when the—somebody, I can't remember which of these gentlemen, read an item in an English newspaper some years ago saying he was working with a firm called Feathercombs, I believe, in New York.

So when I got back to this country in August of last year, after these discussions in England, I called up that company and asked to speak to Mr. Hiss.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see. Was Mr. Hiss' name suggested by you for this broadcast or by someone else?

Mr. TYNAN. I can't remember because there were so many names discussed.

I would say upward of 200 names were discussed and I was in favor of including Mr. Hiss for the principal reason that he was the only person on our list whose name was known in England and this being a commercial television company, we had to provide some excitement to the audience and that was the principal reason.

Senator DODD. The only one whose name was known in England?

Mr. TYNAN. I would say so, yes.

Senator DODD. Ever heard of Norman Thomas over there?

Mr. TYNAN. No, only people who are intimately connected with the other social parties.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Tynan, how did you get in touch with Arnold Johnson?

Mr. TYNAN. His name came up because we recalled that he had been jailed, I believe, under the Smith Act, was that it? It was in violation of the Smith Act.

Mr. BOUDIN. That is it.

Mr. TYNAN. And when I got here I instructed my secretary to contact the Communist Party here, find out if he was still attached to it and to get his telephone number, which was done.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did anyone connected with the Communist Party, U.S.A., make any suggestions respecting individuals to be used or interviewed on this broadcast?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you include in this broadcast the Reverend Stephen Fritchman?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know at the time he had refused under oath to state whether he was a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you get in touch with Reverend Fritchman?

Mr. TYNAN. I got in touch with him during my—in the course of discussing with Mr. Dalton Trumbo who was also on the other program, I was explaining to Mr. Trumbo the nature of the program and our desire to have on it somebody who stood for religious non-conformity, religious dissent, and he said, well, there is a Unitarian minister here. You might talk to him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you tell us that no person connected with the Communist Party, U.S.A., made any suggestions respecting who should be interviewed on this program?

Mr. TYNAN. Oh, I thought you meant other Communists. I mean one Communist suggesting other Communists. Well, I don't know that Mr. Trumbo is a Communist.

Is there any evidence on that point?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Tynan, I will ask you this. Don't you know he has been identified under oath as a Communist Party member by a number of witnesses?

Mr. TYNAN. I did not know that.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not know that Mr. Trumbo himself had refused to affirm or deny Communist membership under oath?

Mr. TYNAN. I knew that he had been cited in contempt and imprisoned for that reason, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you include in this broadcast Clinton Jencks?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you get in touch with Mr. Jencks?

Mr. TYNAN. His name came up because we were anxious to include a representative of strong, nonconformist opinions in the union movement and again his name was familiar to us from the *Jencks* case and I got his telephone number from the San Francisco telephone directory.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you get in touch with Dalton Trumbo?

Mr. TYNAN. I got in touch with him by—I obtained his address from someone in England. I can't recall who, and I wrote him on behalf of Associated TV explaining what the affair was about.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that Clinton Jencks was a leader of the Communist-controlled International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, expelled from our CIO in 1950?

Mr. TYNAN. I knew he was in the union that you mentioned. I did not know it was Communist controlled.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know he had been identified under oath as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know he had under oath, refused to answer respecting his membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. TYNAN. He told me that, yes, but at the time of contacting him I didn't know it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he tell you anything about whether he was or was not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ask him?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. He told you that he had refused under oath to answer the question and you didn't ask him whether he was or was not?

Mr. TYNAN. He didn't tell me so much as he told the camera that was operating, that was part of the statement that he made.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see. Now you included in this broadcast Norman Cousins?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now when Norman Cousins expressed his criticism of this show and demanded the right to organize another program entitled, "What's Right With America" what effort was made to grant his request?

Mr. TYNAN. Well, none by me certainly, because I did not think that the contents of the program justified such an elaborate reply.

(Mr. Tynan conferred with his counsel from 1:15 to 1:16 p.m.)

Senator DODD. I suppose you know what I have had to say about the program.

Mr. TYNAN. Yes, somebody sent me a copy of your speech.

Senator DODD. You know about my telegram suggesting that there be another program?

Mr. TYNAN. I didn't quite hear that.

Senator DODD. I said I assume you know that I sent a telegram suggesting that another program be organized?

Mr. TYNAN. I didn't know that; no.

Senator DODD. That is all.

Mr. BOUDIN. May I just interrupt for a moment?

We moved so quickly into the examination and you notice that I prefer to let Mr. Tynan say whatever he wishes and not obstruct the hearing.

He did have a statement he wanted to make.

May I, at some point suggest that you let him make it?

Mr. SOURWINE. I have one more suggestion, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask that the chairman's speech on this subject be inserted in the record at this point.

Senator DODD. I almost feel that I should object to that myself.

Mr. BOUDIN. I raise no objection.

Senator DODD. I don't think it adds anything, really.

Mr. SOURWINE. It covers the whole background of the broadcast and will show what we are talking about.

Senator DODD. All right.

(The speech referred to reads as follows:)

#### HOW NOT TO PROMOTE ANGLO-AMERICAN UNDERSTANDING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, within any alliance of free nations there are bound to be differences of opinion and tensions. Indeed, within very broad limits, the existence of differing viewpoints may be considered a proof of vitality.

It would be naive to assume, however, that the Communists do not exploit our differences. The Kremlin has at its disposition the most highly organized, most subtle propaganda apparatus in human history. Although black and white proof may be difficult to obtain, I am convinced that the Kremlin is using this apparatus to foment tensions within the Western alliance, and to aggravate those that already exist. I am convinced that they do their utmost to encourage anti-British feeling in America, anti-American feeling in Britain, anti-German feeling in Britain, anti-British feeling in Germany—and so on, through every permutation of possible hostilities.

Legitimate differences of opinion cannot be muted. A free press must be free to criticize not only its own government, but also governments that happen to be allied with it. But when familiar criticism within the Western alliance becomes malicious, irresponsible, or even thoughtless, it plays into the hands of the Communist enemy. In the present crisis through which NATO is now passing, such criticism becomes particularly dangerous.

On January 27, the Associated Television, Ltd.—the independent TV network in Britain—broadcast a filmed program entitled "We Dissent." I consider this program to be a prime example of the kind of irresponsible criticism that undermines the Western alliance by weakening the fabric of mutual respect.

I cannot say whether the person or persons responsible for the production of the program acted out of tendentiousness or out of ignorance, whether the selection of participants was calculated or fortuitous.

Fortuitous or not, in effect a fraud has been perpetrated on the Associated Television, Ltd., on the British public, through this network, and on a number of Americans who participated in the panel discussion, through their separately filmed interviews.

In the interest of decency, fairness, and the public health of the Western alliance, I think it might be useful to examine some of the details of that fraud.

The ostensible purpose of "We Dissent," was to present a spectrum of non-conformist views in America. These were the opening words of the commentator: "Yet there is another tradition in America: a proud tradition of dissent. The Pilgrim Fathers sailed across the Atlantic because they were religious dissenters. The Founding Fathers—Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton—created the United States because they dissented politically from George III. Have wealth and conformity, gray flannel suits, and ranch homes killed that revolutionary urge, and smothered dissent?"

My answer is, "Of course not—as every honest man knows."

The commentator went on to explain that the program was intended as "a platform for Americans who have doubts about the American way of life." He said:

"We think it important for these varied minority views to be seen in Britain as a reminder that the America of the so-called American century is not just what it appears on the surface—in fact, it is still a dynamic society with new ideas wise and foolish, halfbaked and profound, bubbling up inside it."

So far, so good. But how did the program go about presenting these "varied minority views?" First of all, let us see whom it selected to make this presentation.

The first group of participants—and qualitatively the dominant group—consisted of Communists and party liners—of people, that is, who are sworn enemies of Britain, America, and the cause of freedom.

First of all, there was Arnold Johnson, former legislative director of the Communist Party, one of the 28 Communists sentenced to prison, under the Smith Act, for conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by force.

There was Clinton Jencks, head of the United Mine, Mill, & Smelter Workers Union, which was expelled from the CIO in 1950 because of its Communist control. Jencks has been identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, and he has invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer any questions concerning his association with the party.



There was the Reverend Stephen Fritchman, of Los Angeles, who has been as consistent and as notorious a party liner in this country as the Reverend Hewlitt Johnson has been in Britain. Dr. Fritchman has been associated with many Communist-front organizations and has played a prominent role in Communist peace congresses. He invoked the fifth amendment when he was asked by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1951: "Are you a member of the Communist Party?"

There was Dalton Trumbo, one of the famous "Hollywood Ten" who were sentenced to prison for contempt of Congress because they refused to answer questions concerning their membership or activities in the Communist Party.

Finally, there was Alger Hiss, who, as everyone knows, is a convicted perjurer. It is sometimes forgotten, however, that part of the charge on which he was convicted was that he lied when he said that he had not handed over secret State Department documents to Soviet representatives.

These so-called dissenters were not merely simple members of the panel. Clinton Jencks was presented as the spokesman for nonconformist trade unionism in America, the Reverend Stephen Fritchman as the spokesman for nonconformist religion in America, Dalton Trumbo as the spokesman for nonconformist Hollywood writers.

Only one of this group, Arnold Johnson, was formally identified as a Communist or Communist sympathizer.

The second group of participants in "We Dissent" consisted of serious-minded liberals like Norman Cousins; Trevor Thomas, of the American Friends Service Committee; Norman Thomas; Prof. Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard; Prof. Wright Mills, of Columbia University; and Dr. Robert M. Hutchins. They belong to the legitimate spectrum of dissent in our country today, and they speak for points of view that are significant. But they would, I believe, be the first to admit that by themselves they do not constitute the spectrum of dissent, that the views they advocate belong almost exclusively to that segment of the spectrum which lies between liberalism and left-liberalism.

Professor Galbraith and Professor Mills have distinguished themselves as critics of the affluent society; Norman Cousins, Norman Thomas, and Trevor Thomas have been ardent advocates of total disarmament and the abolition of nuclear testing; Dr. Hutchins enjoys a reputation as one of the most eminent critics of congressional investigations, as a fundamentalist champion of the fifth amendment.

I happen to agree in part with Professor Galbraith's books. I believe that Norman Cousins, Norman Thomas, and Trevor Thomas are great humanitarians, but unrealistic in their approach to disarmament and nuclear testing. I have great respect for Dr. Hutchins, although I believe that he has been unrealistic in failing to recognize the Communist Party as an alien conspiracy.

But this is "by the way." Much as I may disagree with some of their views, I believe, of course, that there can be no objection to their airing them abroad. But I do object to "We Dissent," first, because of the completely one-sided nature of the presentation; second, by combining the views of these legitimate dissenters on certain limited issues with the views expressed by the members of group 1, the program created the false impression that the views of group 1 and group 2 are in mutual harmony. Through this invidious association, in my opinion, the legitimate dissenters were maligned, while the pro-Communists were endowed with a respectability to which they are not entitled.

I am happy to report that Mr. Norman Cousins and Mr. Norman Thomas have issued statements questioning the manner in which their interviews were combined with those in group 1.

Mr. Cousins, in a cabled protest to the Associated Television Network, said that he had not been informed his interview would be used in the context of "What's Wrong With America," and he vigorously protested the misrepresentations that had been made to him at the time he did the recording. He requested permission to organize a 90-minute television program on the subject "What's Right With America," with the Associated Television Network paying the costs.

Mr. Norman Thomas said in a letter to me that he does not consider Communists and beatniks to be part of "the proud tradition of dissent" in our country, and he endorsed my proposal for a counterprogram.

The third group of participants consisted of miscellaneous eccentrics, extremists, and faddists. There was the writer, Alex King, who told his British audience that he is "absolutely surrounded by whores." There were the beatnik writers, Bob Kaufman, Alan Ginsberg, and Laurence Ferlinghetti. There was the beatnik drug addict, Philip Lamantia, who defended the right to take dope.

There was the Reverend Maurice McCrackin, of Cincinnati, who had been imprisoned after persistent refusal to pay that portion of his income tax which, in his opinion, was intended for military purposes.

There was Norman Mailer, high priest of the "hipsters." What is a "hipster"? In Mailer's words, a "hipster" is "a man who has divorced himself from history; in a kind of way, a psychopath" who is "first concerned with his own needs" and "turns morality inside out."

Another of group 3 was Harold Call, director of the Mattachine Society, an organization "which is endeavoring to educate the general public and the sexuality in our culture today as well as a number of other problems concerning sex deviation and the adjustments thereto." He was on the British television program telling about the terrible condition in America.

With 22 personal interviews, "We Dissent" might indeed have presented to the British public a panorama of the "varied minority views" in our country. "The proud tradition of dissent" in America was represented on the program, although in a limited and completely one-sided manner, by people like Hutchins, Galbraith, Cousins, and Thomas. But I challenge the program's contention that "our proud tradition of dissent" is in any way represented by most of the other members of this tendentious amalgam—by Communists, party liners, and a convicted perjuror, by beatniks, eccentrics, a dope addict, and an expert on sex deviation.

Not very surprisingly, the picture of America painted by this strange assortment of dissenters ranged from dark gray to black—with a few insane splotches of color added by the beatniks and eccentrics. America was portrayed as a land where conformism and fear of nonconformism prevail; where dissenters are persecuted, deprived of passports, incarcerated, blacklisted; where freedom of speech exists only as a formality; where the press and radio are controlled by the capitalists and run by prostitutes; where people are afraid to talk about freedom or justice or better housing for fear of being suspected of communism. The general impression conveyed by the program was that it is a materialistic land, a frightened land, in which idealism and higher values are virtually nonexistent.

To be fair, the picture presented was not all dark gray to black. The legitimate dissenters did their painting in gentler hues. But theirs were not the predominant colors; it was the gray-to-black that prevailed. And their gentler hues were used in a manner which seemed to make them blend with and lend support to the darker hues with which the party liners filled most of the canvas.

Let us examine some of the details of this canvas.

Prof. Wright Mills said:

"Freedom of speech exists, of course, in the United States. Nobody locks you up. But on the other hand, nobody has to lock you up, because many intellectuals are locking themselves up."

Alger Hiss said that there has been a tendency to conform over the past 10 years because of "a sort of nameless fear, a fear of the unknown."

Arnold Johnson assailed the political persecution of conscientious objectors, Puerto Rican nationalists, and Communists, and the curbs on academic freedom and civil liberties.

Dalton Trumbo said that unorthodox opinions are forbidden in Hollywood, that if Americans now wish to make a statement favoring better housing, they must preface their statement with a declaration of hatred for communism.

Clinton Jencks described the widespread hunger and the long unemployed lines which, he said, still characterize our economy.

The beatnik writer, Laurence Ferlinghetti, said:

"And after it became obvious that the Voice of America was really the deaf ear of America, and the President was unable to hear the underprivileged natives of the world shouting, 'No contamination without representation'—then it was that the natives of the Republic began assembling in a driving rain from which there was no escape except peace."

This was how "We Dissent" combined the opinions of legitimate dissenters with those of beatniks and pro-Communists to present a completely distorted view of America and of the status of dissent in America.

I am frank to say I do not understand that, but that is what he said.

No one can tell me that a nationally telecast program like this does not have some effect. Such a presentation could only dispose those who feel negative about America to feel more negative, and those who are neutral or friendly to feel uneasy.

And who gains from all this?

I do not mean to suggest that our British friends should be told only good things about America or that Americans who appear on British television programs should avoid frank criticism of their country. I object to the program in

question because of its outrageously one-sided nature, and because it made Communists and partyliners the chief spokesmen for "the proud tradition of dissent" in America.

I should like to suggest to the Associated Television network of Britain that an effort be made to redress the wrong that has been done by presenting another program of equivalent length. Mr. Norman Cousins has urged that the theme of such a program should be, "What Is Right With America?" There is a danger, however, that a program so completely one-sided in the opposite direction might be considered suspect.

Why not, instead, present our British friends with a sort of townhall discussion of America today—a discussion in which the pros and cons, the assenters and the dissenters, are equally and fairly represented? I would be prepared to endorse the widest latitude in the selection of legitimate dissenters. But in the name of sanity let us not have beatniks as representatives of the American tradition and let us not have Moscow conformists masquerading as American dissenters.

Such a 90-minute program, soundly conceived, could present an effective panorama of America to the British public—and it would certainly give them a much more accurate insight into the vitality of the democratic process in our country today.

In fairness to the British people and the American people, both, I hope that such a program can be arranged. I have today sent a letter to the Associated Television network formally proposing such a program.

But above all, I hope that the press and radio of all the NATO countries will utilize their great influence to promote mutual understanding and respect; that, where they consider it their duty to criticize, their criticisms will be tempered and carefully weighed; that they will look upon it as a sacred duty to combat divisive influences within the Western alliance and to promote its spiritual unity.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no further questions of this witness except one which can be deferred for the statement or I can ask it now and then let him make the statement.

Mr. TYNAN, have you ever written for Mainstream?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know this to be a Communist publication?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say it is not?

Mr. TYNAN. I have no means of knowing that. My contact with it was entirely limited to this article which, I should like it to be recorded, was reprinted from the Observer newspaper in London to which I have contributed.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say this article; you are referring to article "Culture in Trouble" which appeared in the March 1960 issue?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you say this article was first printed in the Observer?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it correct to assume that Mainstream then sought the rights to reprint?

Mr. TYNAN. I myself happened to be speaking the very day that I was contacted by the magazine. I happened to be speaking over the telephone to England, to the assistant editor of the Observer, and I said I heard it from a little magazine here, the articles, the Broadway Season, and I was much too lazy to turn out anything new and would it be OK if I allowed them to have this one. They said yes, of course.

Mr. SOURWINE. I will ask you, sir, do you know Herbert Aptheker?

Mr. TYNAN. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. He appears on the front cover of this magazine. It's called Sociology, U.S.A. Do you know Mr. Aptheker is a spokesman for the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. TYNAN. I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOUDIN. Mr. Chairman, could Mr. Tynan make his statement?

Mr. TYNAN. I apologize for the delivery.

Senator DODD. You want to read it or want us to put it in?

Mr. TYNAN. If it could just be inserted I would much rather have it.

Senator DODD. We will just take a quick look at it and insert it.

Mr. BOUDIN. I just want the chairman to read it.

Senator DODD. You have seen it?

Mr. BOUDIN. I wanted you to read it and let him make one request further.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one more question?

Senator DODD. Of course.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Tynan, do you have any knowledge respecting the source of any of the funds used to pay the expenses or any of them of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. TYNAN. Absolutely none.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you personally compensated by Mainstream for this article?

Mr. TYNAN. No, sir.

(Mr. Tynan's prepared statement was later ordered into the record at this point and reads as follows:)

As an English journalist, I have paid regular annual visits to the United States for the past 9 years. I have spent the past two winters here as guest drama critic of the New Yorker; during this period I have also been employed by the Observer, a London weekly newspaper. I am a visitor to the United States, not an immigrant or a resident alien; nor have I done anything during my stay to belie the statement I made when my visa was first granted—namely, that I am not and never have been a member of the Communist Party or of any affiliated organization. (These may not have been the precise terms of the declaration I was asked to make, but that, as I recall, was their import.) It may be worth adding that the only organizations to which I pay dues are, I believe, the Royal Society of Literature, the Critics' Circle, and the Diners' Club. In answering the questions that the committee may put to me, I am perfectly willing to reply to any queries about my activities in the United States, and I have no intention of invoking any of the amendments to the Constitution. I should like, however, to express my regret that the committee should have seen fit to employ its authority to subpoena a visiting journalist. It has not done so before, to the best of my knowledge; and I respectfully suggest that there may be better ways of demonstrating to the world this country's traditional and splendid regard for freedom of speech. Constitutionally, of course, it is within the committee's power to subpoena whom it chooses; I merely submit that governmental interrogation of foreign newspapermen is not a practice that one instinctively associates with the workings of Western democracy. It is true that the Soviet Union has frequently censured—and sometimes expelled—visiting journalists with whose opinions it disagreed; I can think of several American correspondents to whom this has happened. I leave it to the committee to decide whether this is a wholly desirable precedent.

As I understand it, the function of a congressional committee is to gather information on the basis of which new legislation may be recommended. I cannot help finding it anomalous that a foreign visitor should be compelled to contribute to the legislative processes of a country not his own. I am profoundly interested in the making of English law; but I am modest enough to feel that the making of American Federal law is none of my business.

Senator DODD. Mr. Sourwine, I think you should read the statement.

Mr. SOURWINE (after reading prepared statement of Mr. Tynan). Does the Chair desire any comment on this statement?

Senator DODD. Well, if you have any to make, Mr. Sourwine, I shall be happy to hear it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I would simply make this comment. The statement appears to make the point that a foreign visitor should not be asked to testify before the committee or any committee of the Congress.

I am sure it is not intended to single out this committee so the point must be that a congressional committee must not subpoena a foreign visitor.

When the committee is seeking information which is in the possession of a foreign visitor, I can see no reason why the committee shouldn't seek that information from the visitor if he is here and many aliens have been questioned by congressional committees and I don't think that an alien's rights or privileges in that regard are any different because he is a journalist than if he was a banker or philanthropist or any other line of living.

Mr. BOUDIN. I think the two positions now are very well stated on the record and I will not reply to Mr. Sourwine, however great the temptation may be.

Mr. Tynan does want, Senator, to make a brief statement with respect to the radio program or television program concerning which you inquired.

Senator DODD. All right, I think we ought to insert this in the record, of course, before Mr. Sourwine's comments.

Mr. SOURWINE. I thought it had already been in the record.

Senator DODD. Let's make it clear and orderly.

Mr. TYNAN. Well, in view of what I have learned from you in this hearing, it still seems to me worth pointing out that I can't remember how many people appeared on the program—some 26 or so—and if my count is correct there are 5 who have been alleged or proved to have had Communist connections or extremely leftwing connections anyway—5 out of more than 25, 26, in a show expressly intended to cover every kind of extreme unorthodoxy. That isn't a dangerous proportion nor did it seem so to Prof. Eugene Rostow, of Yale University, who is in England, was in England at the time of the program and I had the TV company contact the American Embassy and ask them if they would suggest some American then in England who could be in the studio at the time of the program and comment on it afterward.

It was at their suggestion that we contacted Professor Rostow.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Embassy suggested Professor Rostow?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall who at the Embassy?

Mr. TYNAN. No, I didn't do the contacting.

Senator DODD. I know Gene Rostow very well, to put you at ease if you have any fears about that.

Mr. BOUDIN. Very fine dean and a very fine law school.

Senator DODD. I think so.

Mr. TYNAN. He said immediately when we asked about it, the commentator of the program at the end of it, if he thought America needed a right to reply to the program and his answer was, and I quote from the transcript of the program:

Oh, not at all, not at all. I don't think this program is unfavorable to America. Of course, it doesn't present the whole story, but it didn't purport to do that. It presented a very interesting and very significant part of the story of American life.

Senator DODD. You are quoting him directly I take it?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes; it is in the transcript that has been entered into the record.

Senator DODD. Did he say this?

Mr. TYNAN. Yes, this was broadcast immediately after the program which was on film. He was in the studio and when the program, the statements in the program, had been screened, he was instantly asked this and his answer was—

Senator DODD. I understand this.

Mr. BOUDIN. Only one final suggestion.

Mr. Tynan has suggested, in view of the fact that he has been interrogated concerning a program, that the contents of the program which I think are available to the committee, be made a part of this record so that we may see the basis for criticism or noncriticism.

Senator DODD. I think we have put in so much of what I had to say and what Gene Rostow had to say maybe we better get the program in.

Mr. SOURWINE. We will include the entire statement.

Mr. TYNAN. Which, if I may answer, includes Mr. Rostow's reply to it.

Senator DODD. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you furnish the committee with that script?

Mr. TYNAN. I thought we had.

Senator DODD. I think we have it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, it is being put in at the request of the witness. If it is being put in—what he furnishes—we know we have the right material.

Mr. BOUDIN. I shall authenticate it.

Senator DODD. Very well.

(The recording referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 10" and is printed as app. III, at p. 104.)

Mr. SOURWINE. That concludes this hearing. I think we have a matter to discuss with Mr. Boudin, off the record.

(Whereupon, at 1:25 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

## FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

---

MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1960

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2 p.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, Senator Thomas J. Dodd presiding.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, Chief Counsel, Benjamin Mandel, research director, and Frank Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator DODD. We shall take the testimony of Miss Grant.

### TESTIMONY OF JOANNE ALILEEN GRANT, NEW YORK, N.Y.; ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK J. DONNER, ATTORNEY

Senator DODD. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give to the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss GRANT. I do.

Senator DODD. Sit down and give your name and address to the reporter.

What is your name?

Miss GRANT. Joanne Grant.

Senator DODD. G-r-a-n-t?

Miss GRANT. Right.

Senator DODD. Where do you live—is it Miss Grant?

Miss GRANT. Miss, yes.

Senator DODD. Where do you live?

Miss GRANT. 410 Central Park West.

Senator DODD. New York City?

Miss GRANT. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are accompanied by counsel?

Miss GRANT. Yes.

Senator DODD. Would counsel give his name, please?

Mr. DONNER. Frank J. Donner. My office is at 342 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Miss Grant, there seems to be a tendency on the part of some persons to misspell your middle name. Is it Alileen or Aileen?

Miss GRANT. It is Alileen on my birth certificate, but that is really incorrect; so it is spelled two ways by various people.

Mr. SOURWINE. A-l-i-l-e-e-n or A-i-l-e-e-n?

Miss GRANT. It doesn't matter to me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever live in an apartment—apartment 13, at 27 West 84th Street?

Mr. DONNER. May we have a statement as to the purpose of the hearing?

Mr. SOURWINE. The committee is investigating Communist infiltration of pressure groups and specifically in connection with the hearing here today, Communist infiltration of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, and more specifically, the Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and its branches.

The committee is also investigating, in connection with its hearings today, and this is the reason for calling Miss Grant, the Committee for Fair Play for Cuba, or the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Senator DODD. I think the record should show that now the committee is only concerned, so far as Miss Grant is concerned, with the—

Mr. SOURWINE. That is correct. We have other witnesses here today in connection with the broader aspect of Communist infiltration of pressure groups, but the particular pressure group we shall ask Miss Grant about is the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Is this a sufficient statement?

Mr. DONNER. Fine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Miss Grant, did you ever live in apartment 13, 27 West 84th Street, New York City?

Miss GRANT. Yes, I did. Actually, I am not sure of the apartment number. I do not think that that was it, but it was 27 West 84th Street.

Mr. SOURWINE. I was trying to clear this up. We have an indication that this is an alternate address for you.

Miss GRANT. No, it is not an alternate address.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is not?

Miss GRANT. I used to live there.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is a former address?

Miss GRANT. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are a native-born American?

Miss GRANT. Yes, I am.

Mr. SOURWINE. And a U.S. citizen?

Miss GRANT. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you were born where?

Miss GRANT. I was born in Utica, N.Y.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are a graduate of Syracuse University?

Miss GRANT. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. 1951?

Miss GRANT. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have taken graduate studies at New York University.?

Miss GRANT. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have been a member of the India delegation to the United Nations?

Miss GRANT. I would like to decline to answer that question on the following grounds: Lack of legislative purpose, lack of committee jurisdiction, lack of pertinency, and on the basis of my rights under the first amendment and on the basis of my rights and privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator DODD. Well, now, I would order you to answer except that you have claimed rights under the fifth amendment and the first



amendment. Do you actually feel that if you answered this question yes or no, you might incriminate yourself or degrade yourself?

Miss GRANT. I have the same answer.

Senator DODD. Well, what is the answer, please? I want it specifically to my question.

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on all the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I shall state that the primary purpose of this question was one of identification, since there is some question in the mind of counsel as to how a U.S. citizen could be a member of the India Delegation to the United Nations.

However, I shall state that the committee's information was received from responsible and reputable sources, and that it is that Miss Grant is a member of the India delegation to the United Nations and became such in December 1960.

Do you want to correct that statement in any way, Miss Grant?

Senator DODD. If it is not true, we would like to know it. Of course, you can do as you want to. But for the life of me, I do not see how this is going to incriminate you or degrade you or in any way cause you any trouble. If you are a member of that delegation, I should think you would consider it a matter of honor.

Miss GRANT. I would like to decline for the reasons stated heretofore.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you, Miss Grant, presently the secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, as stated in the New York Times for July 22, 1960, and in the magazine, Fair Play, published by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Miss GRANT. I would like to decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Senator DODD. I would like to ask a question. I am sorry I did not ask it back a minute ago.

Have you ever been in India?

Miss GRANT. I would like to decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Miss Grant, are you presently a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it not true that you are a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and have been a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., during the entire time you have been connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for the reasons given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Robert Taber, national executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Richard Gibson, the president of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Lyle Stuart, treasurer of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Waldo Frank, national honorary chairman of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know any of the individuals I have just asked you about as fellow members of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it not true that you were elected as secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, New York chapter, at its meeting held at Steinway Hall, 111 West 57th Street, at New York City, as announced in the New York Times, July 22, 1960?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you a member of the Communist Party faction of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you had contacts with the Cuban Embassy?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it not true, Miss Grant, that you have had such contacts with the Embassy, or with members of the Embassy staff in your capacity as an official of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for reasons previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Miss Grant, were you a member of the Communist Party when you attended Syracuse University?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., or the Communist Youth Organization, when you attended New York University?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever registered with the Department of Justice as a foreign agent?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever had any contacts since the first of January this year with members of the Communist Party of Cuba?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever had any contacts with members of the Communist Party of India?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you the executive secretary of the U.S. Festival Committee located at 246 Fifth Avenue, New York, as stated in its letterhead of May 6, 1959?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously given.

Senator DODD. Do we have a copy of that letterhead?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Senator DODD. Show it to the witness.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I ask that a copy of that letterhead be inserted into the record at this point.

Senator DODD. Yes, and I think the witness should be shown a copy of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have that, Mr. Mandel?

Mr. MANDEL. I do not think I have it right here. I have a reference to it.

Senator DODD. I do not want a reference to it. If we do not have the letterhead, obviously the witness cannot see it, and I do not think it should be put into the record unless she does.

We had better go on with the questioning. I thought that if we had it, she might like to look at it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Miss Grant, did you ever have any connection with the U.S. Festival Committee, which was making arrangements for the Communist Youth Festival held in Vienna during the summer of 1959?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you aware that you have been referred to in the New York Times of March 17, 1959, on pages 1 and 3, as the executive secretary of the New York group preparing for the Communist-dominated World Youth Festival at Vienna?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Waldo Frank, who is honorary chairman of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, as also a sponsor of the U.S. Festival Committee as mentioned in the Communist magazine, New World Review, for March 9, 1959, on page 25?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Miss Grant, do you know Nicolai Burov, secretary of the Soviet United Nations mission?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever have anything to do in getting the Beryozka dancers, the Soviet Beryozka dancers to attend a fund-raising event sponsored by the U.S. Festival Committee?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it not true that you did make arrangements for that attendance by the dancers, and that you made contact with Nicolai Burov?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you attend the Moscow festival in 1957?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it not a fact that you did attend that festival, and you went from there to Red China?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Senator DODD. What year was that?

Mr. SOURWINE. 1957.

Did you ever pose for a picture with Chou En-lai, Premier of Communist China?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer, for reasons previously stated.

Senator DODD. Do we have such a picture?

Mr. MANDEL. We have the organ in which it appears.

Senator DODD. Let me see it.

Mr. MANDEL. We do not have the actual magazine; we have a date.

Senator DODD. Do we have the picture?

Mr. MANDEL. Do we have the magazine?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Mr. MANDEL. It is a Moscow magazine, and very difficult to obtain. We do not have the magazine. We have the date and the reference.

Senator DODD. They do not take pictures in Russian. I cannot see how it could be any more difficult to obtain.

Mr. SOURWINE. The committee has a report that this magazine contains such a picture. We have been endeavoring to get the magazine. We do not have it. I do not offer it as evidence. I asked the witness if it were true. This is the best secondary evidence, in the absence of the picture itself, which we are trying to get.

Senator DODD. The question to ask was that we have been informed that such a picture did appear. We have not seen the picture.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is correct.

Senator DODD. I think it is better to make it clear.

Mr. SOURWINE. May we have an order that if we are able to secure this picture from a source through which we can identify it, we may enter it into the record?

Senator DODD. Yes, it is so ordered.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 11" and is reproduced below:)

EXHIBIT No. 11



This picture, taken in 1957, shows Joanne Grant (extreme left) serenading Chou En-lai, the Red Chinese Premier (third from left, front row), during an unauthorized visit of American students to Communist China (picture and identification by Associated Press).

Mr. SOURWINE. Miss Grant, did you ever have any trouble about your passport?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. I show you, Miss Grant, what purports to be a true statement respecting your passport record, compiled on the basis of access to the records of the Passport Division, and I ask you if there is anything in this which you desire to correct or comment upon?

Senator DODD. Do I understand, Mr. Sourwine, that this is from an official record of the Passport Division?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir, it is a summary statement, prepared from the official records of the Passport Division.

Senator DODD. This is what the witness is now examining with her lawyer?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DONNER. I wonder, Mr. Sourwine, whether you would read the last question?

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked the witness if there was anything in this statement which she wished to correct or state was wrong, or concerning which she wished to comment.

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the statement as shown to the witness be ordered in the record at this point.

Senator DODD. Yes. I think it should be made clear that this is a summary of the record, is it not?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator DODD. Who prepared the summary?

Mr. SOURWINE. This was prepared by the committee.

Senator DODD. By a member of the committee staff?

Mr. SOURWINE. No, sir, by an employee of the Passport Division of the State Department.

Senator DODD. Very well, it may be admitted for the record.

(The statement referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 12" and reads as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 12

#### JOANNE ALILEEN GRANT

Joanne Alileen Grant executed a passport application at the New York Passport Agency on April 16, 1957, in which she gave the following information:

She was born on March 30, 1930, at Utica, N.Y., and was living at 27 West 84th Street, New York 24, N.Y. Her father, John Grant, was born about 1901, probably in the United States, but neither the exact place of his birth nor his address in 1957 were known to applicant. Her mother, Minnie Randall Hubbard, was born on May 9, 1910, at Norwich, N.Y., and was then residing at 24 Delaware Square, Norwich, N.Y. Miss Grant stated she was 5 feet 4 inches tall, and had brown hair and brown eyes; she stated she was employed as a writer. She indicated that she did not plan to travel by organized tour; that she would depart from New York by ship in June 1957 for a 3 month vacation and visit the following countries: England, France, Italy, Spain, Israel, Poland, U.S.S.R., Germany, and Denmark.

On April 24, 1957, Miss Grant was issued passport No. 473761. During the summer of 1957 she traveled to Paris, and from there to Moscow where she attended the Sixth World Youth Festival. At the close of the festival she, along with 41 other American citizens, accepted an invitation by the All China Federation of Democratic Youth to tour Communist China in violation of the restrictive endorsement contained in her passport and in contravention of U.S. foreign policy. She admitted that she had surrendered her passport to the Chinese authorities for examination in compliance with the Chinese law.

While in Communist China, Miss Grant participated with other members of the group in an interview of Richard George Fecteau, an American citizen who is held prisoner in Communist China, and in issuing a report of this interview to the

press. She also participated in an interview of Chou En-lai, Premier of Communist China, and Janos Kadar, Premier of Hungary. In addition, she wrote articles concerning the tour for the Nation magazine and participated in a radio broadcast from Peking.

Miss Grant departed Communist China via Rangoon, Burma. Upon arrival in Rangoon her passport was endorsed by an American consular official as valid only for return to the United States. In spite of the endorsement in her passport, Miss Grant traveled to India where she attended the annual convention of the Youth Section of the Congress Party at Lucknow, India, and toured a number of Near Eastern and European countries before returning to the United States. Upon arrival in New York, she was requested to surrender her passport to the Immigration and Naturalization authorities but refused to do so.

Miss Grant was notified that passport facilities had been tentatively withdrawn and that, pursuant to section 51.137 of the passport regulations, she would be accorded an informal hearing before the issuance of a final refusal. A hearing was held on March 5, 1958, at which Miss Grant appeared with Leonard B. Boudin, a New York attorney who represented her. When Miss Grant was asked whether she would again travel in violation of the restrictions contained in her passport she stated that she would do the same thing again.

Based on the information of record and Miss Grant's testimony at the hearing, the Department concluded that further passport facilities should be refused under the provisions of section 51.136(b) of the passport regulations, and so advised Miss Grant on December 24, 1958. This decision was affirmed by the Board of Passport Appeals and a copy of the decision and findings was sent to Miss Grant's attorney on June 15, 1959.

Since that date Miss Grant has not applied for passport facilities.

Mr. SOURWINE. Miss Grant, is it true that when you visited Moscow in 1957, you marched in the Lenin Stadium with the American Youth delegation, led by Jacob Rosen, who dipped the American flag to Khrushchev?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you been a member of the Harlem Youth section of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you aware that you have been so identified—that is, as a member of the Harlem Youth section of the Communist Party—in sworn testimony by Albert Gaillard, the former president of that section?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. For the record, Mr. Chairman, the testimony of Mr. Gaillard was before the House Un-American Activities Committee on February 3, 1960.

Miss Grant, did you attend meetings of the Communist Party at Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue, New York City?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Mr. Gaillard had testified on the same occasion I have already mentioned respecting your attendance at such meetings?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Stephen Tyler?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is not Stephen Tyler a man who visited China with you as part of the American Youth delegation?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that Stephen Tyler had testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee on March 2, on which occasion he declared, "The only person in the group who met Mao Tse-tung, who is normally inaccessible, was Joanne Grant"?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. According to the New York Times of June 19, 1960, at pages 1 and 16, Dr. Berta Louisa Pla y Badia, cultural attaché at the Cuban consulate in New York City, was expelled on the grounds that "She has been active in seeking to undermine the United Nations, and has been known to make arrangements for a representative of the Cuban Government to speak before a Communist front group." Do you know this Dr. Berta Louisa Pla y Badia?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you had any dealings with her?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Senator DODD. What was she expelled for?

Mr. SOURWINE. She was expelled from the United States for misusing her position with the Cuban consulate.

Senator DODD. I see.

Expelled? Is that what you call it? I thought they determined such persons to be *persona non grata*.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is the way it is handled, I think.

Mr. DONNER. I assume this was on the diplomatic level?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Joseph Reap, a press officer in the U.S. State Department, is quoted in the New York Times of June 19, 1960, as justifying the expulsion of Carlos Manuel Lazaro Felix Sanchez y Basquet, assistant to the Cuban consul of Miami, on the grounds that he was—

the principal Cuban intelligence agent in the Miami area, known to be operating a network of agents in the United States, to whom he has been paying money for information to be used against residents of this country.

I ask you, Miss Grant, are you acquainted with the Carlos Manuel Lazaro Felix Sanchez y Basquet who is referred to in that article?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you been in contact with that Senor Sanchez?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever receive money from that Senor Sanchez?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer for reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever receive money from sources known to you to be Cuban for the work or the expenses of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questions of this witness, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. Do you know Kenneth Tynan?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Senator DODD. Do we have a copy of the advertisement that appeared in the New York Times?

Mr. DONNER. Do you mean the one that appeared today?

Senator DODD. Appeared where today?

Mr. DONNER. In the New York Times.

Senator DODD. I have not seen the Times today. I did not mean today's, no. I meant whenever this appeared. I think it was back in—

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean the ad of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Senator DODD. Yes. I meant the ad that appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, April 6, 1960.

Mr. SOURWINE. I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that that was before the date on which Miss Grant was elected secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Senator DODD. I just wanted to ask her if she had seen it.

I show you this page taken from the New York Times of that date, and ask you, Miss Grant, if you are familiar with this ad, if you have seen it before?

Miss GRANT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Senator DODD. That is, you are refusing to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, the first amendment, and whatever else it was you previously stated?

Miss GRANT. Yes.

Senator DODD. I do not think there is any need to insert this ad in the record, except as long as it is perfectly clear, as I think it is, from the way I have described the ad, just what the witness was shown.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not sure that ad is not already in the record.

Senator DODD. It may be in.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does the Chair wish to order, if it is not already in the record, that it be placed in at this time?

Senator DODD. I think it may be more orderly to place it in at some other point.

Mr. SOURWINE. Since Miss Grant cannot identify it, and it pre-dates the time when she was secretary.

Senator DODD. She did not say she could not identify it, she declined to answer. So I think there is no point in inserting it here.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questions of this witness.

Senator DODD. All right.

Mr. DONNER. Is the witness excused?

Senator DODD. Yes.

(Whereupon, at 2:15 p.m., the committee proceeded to consideration of other business.)



## FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

---

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1961

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11:15 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, Senator James O. Eastland, (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Eastland, Dodd, Johnston, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; and Benjamin Mandel, research director.

Chairman EASTLAND. The committee will come to order.

Mr. SOURWINE. Dr. Santos-Buch.

Chairman EASTLAND. Doctor, will you hold your hand up?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF CHARLES A. SANTOS-BUCH, M.D., ACCOMPANIED BY PAUL R. CONNOLLY, JR., COUNSEL

Mr. SOURWINE. Your full name, please.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I am Dr. Charles A. Santos-Buch.

Mr. SOURWINE. And your address.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. 1315 York Avenue, New York City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your place of business.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I am assistant pathologist at the New York Hospital, Cornell Medical Center.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are a doctor of medicine?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. With a degree from Cornell University?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. And where did you have your arts and sciences degree?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Harvard College.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are a national of Cuba?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I am a Cuban national.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are admitted to the United States for permanent residence?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes; I have been.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are accompanied by counsel?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes; I am.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will counsel identify himself, please?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Paul R. Connolly, Jr., Washington, D.C.

Mr. SOURWINE. Dr. Santos-Buch, are you a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, I am, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you join that committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Early in 1959.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you one of the organizers or founders of that committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir; I was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who were the other organizers of the committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Mr. Alan Sagner, Mr. Robert Taber, myself, Mr. Waldo Frank, Mr. Carleton Beals, and Mr. Richard Gibson.

Mr. SOURWINE. How long have you known Robert Taber?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I have known Robert Taber since the insurrection against Batista.

Mr. SOURWINE. When and where did you first meet him?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I met him at New York in 1957.

Mr. SOURWINE. And did you see him in Cuba?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No, sir; I was not in Cuba at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you or your family have anything to do with him in Cuba?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us about that?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Mr. Taber was a CBS newsman, and he was interested in interviewing Fidel Castro when he was in the Sierra Maestra. And my family befriended him and used their facilities to get him to Castro.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were then associated with the Castro revolutionary movement?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir; I was.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have testified in executive session before this committee, have you not?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir; I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. On two different occasions?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have covered in detail the organization of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember discussing a meeting which occurred in a particular restaurant?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. An organizational meeting?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. In a restaurant on Eighth Avenue, at about 51st or 52d Street?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you identify that restaurant?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. It is a Cuban restaurant. I don't remember whether it is the Liborio or El Prado, but it is one or the other.

Mr. SOURWINE. Liborio or El Prado?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. And that meeting at the restaurant, was that the first organizational meeting of the committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. At that organizational meeting of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, who was present?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Alan Sagner, Robert Taber, and myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. The three of you?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was it first planned to start the publicity of the campaign of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee with a full-page ad in the New York Times.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. From the time of the first meeting at that restaurant.

Mr. SOURWINE. You had discussed this at the meeting at the restaurant?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We discussed the possibility of placing an ad.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now what were your plans at that time about paying for the ad?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We had planned at that time on obtaining signatures and donations from prominent Americans to pay for the ad.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with the drafting—

Chairman EASTLAND. Wait just a minute until he finishes conferring with his counsel.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I would like to make a statement.

From the very beginning we didn't really plan to have a full-page ad. The committee grew, and then it was thought later to make it a full-page ad.

Chairman EASTLAND. I want to ask you a question.

You are not now and you have never been a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Senator DODD. You mean "No, sir"?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, I have not been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with the preparation of this ad—that is, the ad which appeared in the New York Times on April 6, 1960?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I did not draft the ad, but I was consulted with respect to it, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. After the ad had been prepared did you find out from the New York Times the cost to have it printed?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Mr. Taber found out the cost.

Mr. SOURWINE. How much was it going to cost, \$4,700?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did you do about meeting that cost?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We drew up letters and copies of the ad, which were sent to prominent New York intellectuals with the hope of obtaining enough money and signatures to pay for the ad.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you get enough money in that way?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We got about \$1,100.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you get the rest of the money?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We obtained it from Raulito Roa.

Mr. SOURWINE. Raulito Roa?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Identify him. Who is he?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. He is one of the permanent delegates of the Cuban mission in the United Nations.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is he the son of the Foreign Minister of Cuba?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you say you obtained the money from him. Do you mean his own money, or you obtained the money through him from the Cuban Government?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We obtained it through him from the Cuban Government.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. Now who made arrangements with Mr. Roa to supply this money, the financing that was needed to kick off this propaganda campaign?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Taber and myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you together when you saw Mr. Roa to make these arrangements?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. The first time Taber went to see Roa, and subsequently—

Chairman EASTLAND. Just tell the story in your own words, please, sir.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I was busy with my duties in the hospital, and Mr. Taber had a little more free time, and he was able to see Raulito Roa about the money. And it was not until later that I met with Raulito Roa and obtained the money from him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now you and Mr. Taber had discussed getting the money from Roa, Jr., or, as you say, Raulito Roa; is that correct?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you planned that you would go together to ask him for it?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you were tied up at the hospital?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. And Mr. Taber went by himself?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he then report to you that he had seen Mr. Roa?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And that Mr. Roa was going to provide the money?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you thereafter go with Mr. Taber to get the money?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Tell us in detail where you met Mr. Taber, where you went from there, where you met Mr. Roa, and what happened.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Well, I received a phone call on a Tuesday from Mr. Taber, and he said we were to meet in the street, which I did; I met him in the street near his place of work. There he informed me that the money had arrived, and asked me to accompany him to get the money from Raulito Roa. And I agreed to do this.

The next day, by prearrangement, we met again in the street near his place of work, and we drove to Raulito Roa's apartment. There

I stayed in the street, in the car, and Taber went up and saw Roa, who later came down and got in the car. He said he had the money in a check and it had to be cashed.

Mr. SOURWINE. In a check. What kind of a check?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I never saw the check, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know to whom the check was made payable?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I later found out that it was made payable to Prof. Manuel Bisbé, the chief permanent delegate of the Cuban mission to the United Nations.

Mr. SOURWINE. This was a check drafted on a Cuban fund or a Cuban bank?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I never saw the check, but I presume it was.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was done about getting that check cashed? You obviously needed Professor Bisbé's signature, didn't you?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead. What was done?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We then drove from Raulito's place to Professor Bisbé's house.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say "we." Raulito Roa, Mr. Taber, and yourself?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Raulito Roa went into Bisbé's house and there he had it endorsed. And then he came back down.

Chairman EASTLAND. Wait a minute. What did he say when he came back down?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. He said that Professor Bisbé was reluctant to sign the check, but he was able to convince him to sign the check.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then where did you go?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We went from Professor Bisbé's home south on Second Avenue, looking for a bank to cash the check. And we stopped at one of these banks, and Raulito Roa agreed to cash a check but was not able to cash a check.

Mr. SOURWINE. You weren't looking for any particular bank? Just for a bank?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Just for a bank.

Mr. SOURWINE. You had a check for \$3,500 and you were going to cash it at the first bank you came to?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. Did you cash it?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No; we were not able to cash it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then what did you do? Who took it in to cash it?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Raulito Roa.

Mr. SOURWINE. He came out and said he couldn't cash it?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then what did you do?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Raulito Roa suggested that I drive him to the United Nations Building because there he could cash the check.

Mr. SOURWINE. He was known there?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I guess so.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. Did you do that?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes; I did that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did Mr. Taber go along?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you got to the United Nations Building what happened?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Raulito Roa got off the car and went into the United Nations Building, and after a few moments he came out with an envelope containing the cash.

Mr. SOURWINE. He got back in the car?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. He got back in the car.

Mr. SOURWINE. And then what did you do?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We drove out of the United Nations grounds, and Raulito Roa asked to be driven near his place, near his office. And we let him off. He gave the envelope with the cash to Taber.

Mr. SOURWINE. To Mr. Taber, not to you but to Mr. Taber?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. After he got out what happened to the money? You and Taber were then alone in the car, and Taber had the money?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then what happened?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Taber counted the money.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you see him count it?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I heard him counting. He was sitting in the back seat.

Mr. SOURWINE. In what form was it, \$100 bills?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, it was in \$100 bills.

Mr. SOURWINE. He counted the money, and then what did he do?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. He said, "That is right, \$3,500." And he gave it to me.

Mr. SOURWINE. He gave you the money?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Doctor, was that in accordance with the pre-arranged plan that you and he had in regard to what was to be done with the money?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was that plan?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. The plan was to—the New York Times required a certified check to pay for the ad, and I was to obtain the certified check through my bank.

Mr. SOURWINE. Through your bank?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Why was that?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Well, Mr. Taber was executive secretary, or was to be executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Then we wanted suspicion diverted from him as to where the money came from.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you then go to your bank?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. You made a deposit of \$3,500?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. I show you a photostat of a deposit slip, April 5, 1960, and ask you if that is the deposit slip with which you made that deposit.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I show you next a photostat of a certification charge to your account, a certified check for \$3,500, and ask you if the same was paid to the New York Times. Do you recognize that as the slip that was OK'd when you got that certified check?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You took that certified check. What did you do with it?

Senator DODD. Why don't you put those in the record?

Mr. SOURWINE. I intend to offer them for the record, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. They are admitted.

(The photostats were marked "Exhibits No. 13 and No. 13-A" and are reproduced on the following pages.)

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. By prearrangement again we met with Taber near his place of work, then I gave him the certified check.

Mr. SOURWINE. You had gone alone to your bank?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And then you met Taber and gave him the check?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know what he did with it after that?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. He told me that he had given it to the New York Times.

Mr. SOURWINE. In payment for the ad?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. In payment for the ad.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Dr. Santos-Buch, was your name ever used in the ad or in connection with any other publicity material for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No, sir; it was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know why not? You were one of the organizers of the committee.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. It was the feeling of the committee members that no Cubans should be signatory of the ad.

Mr. SOURWINE. And your name was kept out of the publicity and off the ad in order to conceal the fact that a Cuban, to wit, you, was connected with the committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, did you and Mr. Taber have any understanding about a story you would tell as to where this \$3,500 came from if you were forced to explain it?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. Wait a minute now.

What Taber was to tell and what he was to tell.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what I intended. "You" was meant to be plural.

By a story that you would both tell, did you ever agree on a story that either of you would tell if you had to explain this?

Chairman EASTLAND. Either one of you, either you or Taber, if either one of you was interrogated and had to explain that, state whether or not you had an agreement as to what you each would say.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir; we had reached an agreement.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was it?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. The agreement was to—if I was to be questioned, I was to say that I had obtained the money from eight of my friends in the United States.

EXHIBIT No. 1

83 CHEMICAL B.K. TRUST COMPANY  
 N.Y. TR. CO. 3500

APR 5 '60

ACCOUNT NUMBER  
 FOR ACCOUNT TITLE  
 CAROL M. SANTOSBUCH

IF YOUR ACCOUNT IS MAINTAINED AT ANOTHER OFFICE,  
 PLEASE INDICATE THE OFFICE BELOW.

PLEASE ENDORSE ALL CHECKS	DATE	DOLLARS	CENTS
CASH	4/5/60	3500	00
ENCLOSE ONLY ONE ITEM AND MAXIMUM 10 CHECKS ENVELOPE			
COUPONS			
CHECKS	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
TOTAL		3500	00

NOTE  
 IF THIS DEPOSIT IS FOR AN ACCOUNT CARRIED AT ANOTHER OFFICE IT IS RECEIVED UPON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT CREDIT MAY NOT BE MADE TO THE DEPOSITOR'S ACCOUNT UNTIL THE BUSINESS DAY FOLLOWING THE DATE OF DEPOSIT.

The Provisions for Bank Collections of the New York Regulations of the Instruments of Law shall be deemed to apply with respect to all items, whether or not negotiable, received by the Bank and all items, to the contrary, be deemed to have been received for collection only.



EXHIBIT No. 1-A

P. O. R. 10 (4-56)

CHEMICAL CORN EXCHANGE BANK  
NEW YORK

83

CERTIFICATION  
AUDITOR'S COPY 2

CHARGE

65 St. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave

N<sup>o</sup>. 184<sup>m</sup>

Charles A. Santos Buch

DATE

4/5/60

POST	TELLER
UNITS	5

THE ITEM DESCRIBED BELOW HAS BEEN CERTIFIED TODAY AND CHARGED TO THE ABOVE ACCOUNT.

CHECK NO.	NOTE	ACCEPTANCE	DATED
85			4/5/60
PAYABLE TO	The New York Times		
PRESENTED BY	M. A. Santos		
		3500.-	

Mr. SOURWINE. And if Mr. Taber was questioned, he was to say that you had obtained the money from eight of your friends?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was he to say that he did not know who the eight were?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you were to say that you had not told him who the eight were?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, in fact, go so far as to make arrangements with eight of your friends for the use of their names if you had to use that to cover the story?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you given to proper authorities the names of the friends of yours who authorized you to use their names in that way?

Mr. CONNOLLY. May we have that question again?

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you given to proper authorities the names of friends of yours who authorized you to use their names in that way?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Some of them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that it is germane to this hearing to go into the question of those names.

Chairman EASTLAND. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now Mr. Taber was asked to testify before this committee in executive session. You know this, do you not?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. He told me he had to.

Mr. SOURWINE. You talked with him after he testified?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. And, naturally, you were interested in what he said, weren't you?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ask him about whether he had stuck by his agreement?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did he tell you?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. He said he didn't have to testify because he took the first amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what he told you?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he and you then and there discuss what might happen if you were called to testify?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And what did you say about that?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I said that it was a good idea to use the first amendment.

Senator DODD. Do you know what the first amendment is?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I was told by Mr. Taber.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you and he then and there agree that if your first amendment plea didn't work you were to stick to your original story about the eight people?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. As a last resort; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you appeared before this committee and were questioned last Friday, did you, in fact, stick to that story about the eight people?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes; I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did in part, didn't you, and in part you didn't?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. You admitted that you had received the money from Raulito Roa?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. But you told us at that time that the explanation you had given Taber was that you had received it from eight friends of yours?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. In doing that you were attempting to protect Mr. Taber of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee from having to register as a foreign agent, weren't you?

I will withdraw the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. He doesn't mind answering it.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I can answer it.

It was partly so, but for the most part I was fearful of—I am out of sympathy with the Castro regime now, and I was fearful that I was going to be identified as an anti-Castro sympathizer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Doctor, after you testified on Friday, you then consulted with your attorney; isn't that correct?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. And is it true that he persuaded you to come back and tell the committee the whole truth about this matter?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you did so, and you have told us the whole truth now again this morning; is that true?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Senator DODD. Since he appeared twice, I think it ought to go on the record that he testified in an executive session last night.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct a statement that I didn't realize I made. I said that I received a phone call on a Tuesday. It was really on a Monday. And I got the money on a Tuesday, which was the day before the ad appeared.

Mr. SOURWINE. You got the money—well, the date shows here. You got the money on the same day you made the deposit in the bank and drew the certified check, which was April 5, 1960, whatever day of the week it was.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is right.

Chairman EASTLAND. Isn't it true that at all times Mr. Taber desired to use these names in the ad as sponsors, who had desired to finance the thing, but it was financed largely by the Castro government in Cuba, and that he was an agent for an alien government?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Senator DODD. He said he advised you, or he said that he himself would have recourse to the first amendment? Did he tell you why he was selecting the first amendment?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Well, I understand that it was an infringement upon the freedom of expression.

Senator DODD. Freedom of speech.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Freedom of speech. And since we both felt that the ad was expressing an opinion, we thought it was a good idea.

Senator DODD. You thought it was a good idea to use the first amendment?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. To use the first amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. It wasn't your own idea, was it?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber had been advised by his counsel to do this, had he not?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who his counsel was?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Mr. Boudin.

Mr. SOURWINE. Leonard Boudin?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Leonard Boudin.

Senator DODD. I think this should be made clear.

Do you actually know whether it was Mr. Taber's idea or Mr. Boudin's idea?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No, I do not.

Senator DODD. I don't see how you could. Did Mr. Taber tell you that he had resorted to the first amendment when he appeared before this committee in executive session?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes.

Senator DODD. For your information, he did. But he also made some direct statements and denied the facts under oath.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he tell you whether or not his counsel had advised him to take the first amendment?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I do not recall.

Senator HRUSKA. Dr. Buch, I will read a portion of the testimony of Mr. Taber taken on the occasion, when he discussed the source of the money and denied that it was taken from any foreign country or any agent for a foreign country. Mr. Taber is answering the question of Mr. Sourwine, and he stated:

I think that I can assure the committee that, to my knowledge, none of the money which was paid into this ad came from any foreign government or agent of any foreign government. We made no secret of the matter at the time.

Then in another portion of the testimony Mr. Sourwine asks this question:

Mr. Witness, you have stated the checks did not come from a foreign source or a foreign national. You mean to state categorically that neither directly or indirectly did the checks come from either a foreign nation or a foreign national?

And Mr. Taber's answer was:

I can't answer the question whether they came from a foreign national because I am not aware of the nationality of all of the people I deal with. I don't check into their citizenship. But I can say that most certainly they did not come from a foreign government or an agent of a government, foreign government, to my knowledge.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. SOURWINE. Now you know of your own knowledge that none of these persons was acting for or on behalf of a foreign government or a foreign national?

Mr. Taber's answer:

I have reason to believe that that was the case, and I have every reason to believe that they were not.

Now, Dr. Buch, did Mr. Taber know Mr. Roa to be a foreign national?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. Would you say, in the light of your knowledge of the facts, that these statements which I have read as answers from Mr. Taber were correct?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No, sir.

Senator DODD. They were something more than incorrect; they were lies. Isn't that so?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. It wasn't true.

Senator DODD. You say it wasn't true; I will say it was a lie.

Senator HRUSKA. Dr. Buch, Mr. Taber knew Mr. Roa was a delegate to the United Nations representing the Cuban Government, did he not?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. And you knew he was?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Senator COTTON. May I ask one question.

Dr. Buch, you testified that there was an agreement made that the check should go through your bank and your account. Who first suggested that arrangement, you or Mr. Taber?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. This was mutually agreed about the same time, sir.

Senator COTTON. And how about this story that was concocted, that would be told if either or both of you were compelled to answer about the donors of this money? Who suggested that story?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. We both discussed the idea of how to cover this story. But my idea prevailed of obtaining eight of my friends to back me up.

Senator COTTON. And Mr. Taber discussed it with you, and in the discussion it was perfectly clear that he understood completely where the money was coming from, and participated in thinking of some story to divert suspicion, as you have expressed it?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. There is no doubt about that.

Senator COTTON. Well, were any other expedients suggested by either of you before you agreed on this story of the eight donors?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Senator KEATING. May I ask—

Senator DODD. Dr. Buch, did you and Taber have a talk—you say you did discuss the first amendment. Let me ask you this: Do you know that there were several attacks made on this committee for inquiring into this matter, on the grounds that this was an attempt to invade the right of freedom of speech?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No, sir. I have tried to disassociate myself from this committee since early fall, and I am not aware of that—I was not aware of that.

Chairman EASTLAND. You mean the Fair Play for Cuba Committee when you say "this committee"?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Senator DODD. There were no conversations about any of these complaints—if I may put it that way—about this committee, between you and Taber?

Senator KEATING. Meaning this Internal Security Subcommittee?

Senator DODD. This Internal Security Subcommittee.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Other than that conversation after his testimony, I haven't had any complaints or references.

Senator KEATING. Dr. Santos-Buch, were you subpoenaed to appear here before this committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to read two other statements that Mr. Taber made in this testimony, and ask Dr. Buch about them.

First, Mr. Taber, in discussing this meeting in the restaurant, El Prado or Liborio Restaurant on Eighth Avenue, said his recollection was that it was held toward the end of February, the middle or end of February. Does that meet with your recollection as to when it was?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now Mr. Taber told us—I asked him: "Was there anyone other than you and Mr. Sagner sitting at your table?" And he said, "No, I don't believe so."

Your testimony is that you also were at that table; isn't that the case? You told us you and Mr. Taber and Mr. Sagner were at the table.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. There were three of us; that is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Taber says he doesn't believe there was anyone but he and Mr. Sagner. Do you think it is possible that he has forgotten you?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I was there.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was not a facetious question. Do you think it is possible that Mr. Taber forgot you?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have one more matter that I want to inquire about. I asked Mr. Taber, "Are you stating now that there was no person involved in the organization of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee whose name does not appear on this ad?" referring to the ad in the New York Times. And Mr. Taber said, "If there was, I don't recall." Do you think it possible that Mr. Taber forgot you at that time?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questions.

Senator JOHNSTON. I will ask one question.

What was the main object in forming this committee known as the Fair Play Committee? Why did you organize this committee?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I had felt that certain segments of the American press were not reporting the news from Cuba truthfully. And I personally felt that this was a means of getting the truth to the American people. This is the reason.

Chairman EASTLAND. Mr. Taber made the suggestion; he came to you, did he not? Or did you go to him?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Mr. Alan Sagner came to Taber, and Taber came to me.

Senator DODD. You don't now believe, do you, that the truth was told in the Fair Play for Cuba ad about the conditions in Cuba?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. As it subsequently turned out; no.

Chairman EASTLAND. And you have been to Cuba since that ad was published?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Chairman EASTLAND. And you know that the conditions there, as described in the ad, were untrue?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Senator JOHNSTON. In other words, you were misled then in your belief, at the time that you published the ad, in the information that you put in that ad?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. At the time that the ad was placed I had hopes of the success of the original ideals of the revolution.

Senator JOHNSTON. But you didn't know really the facts that were in there; you published something that you didn't know; isn't that true?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. To my best knowledge at that time, I thought those facts and quotations were true.

Senator JOHNSTON. You thought they were true, but you only had arrived at those conclusions because of talking to some people that had misinformed you; isn't that right?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes. There were also opinions which were my own at that time, which are now changed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, maybe it would be helpful at this point if we put the ad in the record, or a photostat of the ad, page 33, the New York Times, Wednesday, April 6, 1960.

Chairman EASTLAND. It is admitted.

(The advertisement was marked "Exhibit No. 3" and is reproduced at p. 6.)

Mr. SOURWINE. I won't read you much of it, but it starts off:

What is really happening in Cuba?

From Havana come charges of sabotage, economic aggression, counterrevolutionary intrigue, air raids on Cuban cane fields, sugar mills, homes. Against this background, the great news agencies and a powerful section of the U.S. press raise a barrage of equally grave accusations. What can we believe in the welter of conflicting reports?

It then quotes:

A pro-Communist state has been established in Cuba with the clear objective of bargaining with Soviet Russia for the munitions of war—

quoting Sokolsky in the New York Journal-American.

True or false?

And it then says:

False. Not a shred of evidence has been produced to support such allegations \* \* \*

Cuba's recent trade pact with the Soviet Union represents an effort to find new markets for Cuban sugar, and to obtain not arms but agricultural implements and industrial machinery for which credit has been denied in the United States.

We now know that to be false.

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. The ad says:

Efforts to drive a wedge between the Roman Catholic Church and the revolutionary government on the issue of communism have been forcefully repulsed by the church itself \* \* \*

There is perfect harmony between the church and the state.

We now know that to be false; isn't it?

Mr. SANTOS-BUCH. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. I won't continue.

Chairman EASTLAND. Mr. Taber thought up the ad, didn't he?

Mr. SANTOS-BUCH. He drafted the answers.

Chairman EASTLAND. He drafted the ad.

Senator DODD. Do you know whether Taber is a Communist Party member or not?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I do not know that.

Senator DODD. You know Taber made frequent trips to Cuba at this time when you were talking to him, did he not?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I think so, yes, sir; at least two.

Senator DODD. At least two?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. That I know about.

Chairman EASTLAND. Any further questions?

Senator HRUSKA. Dr. Buch, in an article in Harper's, Kenneth Tynan, a witness before this committee on a previous occasion, undertook to describe some of the things which he underwent, allegedly, in the process of that hearing. I am reading a part of the article from Harper's magazine:

We then moved on to the Cuba advertisement. Hilarity, hereabouts, began to displace dread; such was the caliber of the inquisition that astonished amusement became the only possible response. Had I received money for signing the ad? No. Was it paid for by Cuban gold? No.

Now do you agree with that statement of Mr. Tynan as made in this article, that the ad was not paid for at least in part by Cuban gold?

Dr. SANTOS-BUCH. I don't find it amusing when \$3,500 came from the Cuban Government.

Senator DODD. I might say that the record shows that Mr. Tynan was never asked any such question. So he not only told an untruth in that article, but he told an untruth about the question he was asked. That was published in Harper's magazine.

Senator HRUSKA. The record so shows, and a scrutiny of the transcript so indicates.

Chairman EASTLAND. Any further questions?

If not, we will retire.

Doctor, we want to thank you for your fine service to this country.

And I certainly want to thank counsel for the outstanding legal services rendered in this case.

I think it is obvious to everyone that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is a Communist operation.

We will now recess.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)



# APPENDIXES

[From *New Masses*, September 1932, pp. 6 and 7]

## APPENDIX I

### *Exhibit No. 4*

#### HOW I CAME TO COMMUNISM: SYMPOSIUM

By Waldo Frank

##### WHERE I STAND AND HOW I GOT HERE

The editors of *New Masses* write to me of "the marked movement among the intellectuals toward the left"; and they ask me for an "intellectual autobiography" of how I got that way. What they want to know, of course, is in my books. And what they are really asking, is a 2,000 word digest of my books for readers who, presumably, are too busy preparing the Revolution to find time to read them. Personally, I feel that if a necessarily superficial digest of a man's books is worth while it would repay the effort to read the books, themselves. Moreover, although there may be some critic smart enough to get into so brief a space the essence of what I have labored to put into fifteen volumes, I am sure I can not do it.

My "movement toward the left" is a steady, logical evolution in my published works. It is not really a "movement" at all in the sense of a *displacement*—like that of a man, for instance, who moves from Brooklyn to the Bronx. It is really a clarifying and solidifying and organizing of convictions present in my work from its beginning: it is a sharpening and shifting of the focus of my work, due to the economic and psychologic shifts of the America I live in.

I have never been an economist or sociologist. I have always been, first of all, an artist—the kind of artist, however, who is interested not only in individuals but also in peoples, in cultures, in ideas. Those of my creations that deal with imaginary persons or groups of persons are "fiction": those that deal with actual historic peoples are harder to classify, but they are as essentially works of art as my novels. I am, moreover, a product of the New York upper middle class. But by the time I was finished with college, I knew that I did not belong with my class, and that I could not go into the money-making racket which went by such names as "business" or "the law." A couple of years of newspaper work were sufficient to convince me that the capitalistic order was rotten from top to bottom: rotten in its churches, in its politics, in its business, in its arts, in its intellectual life. But this conviction brought with it no clear idea as to the way out. The trouble, it seemed to me, was with human nature. And of course, it was—and it is. Men and women, I thought, might individually achieve, against great odds, some truth and beauty. It was a desperately slow process; but at the time I knew no other. The Marxian idea of a class, potentially representative of mankind, and potentially destined to destroy the stratified greed and violence that had become Society, was still far beyond me.

Nonetheless, social emotions and social ideas were, from the beginning, conscious factors in my books. And it would be possible, if I had the time, to isolate and trace their evolution from one book to the next; although in so doing I should necessarily distort the true nature of my works, if I disregarded other vital and integral elements.

My first published novel (written before we entered the War) was *The Unwelcome Man*. It is the story of a sensitive youth, without unusual talents, in petty bourgeois American society. The story arraigns this society for its sordidness, its cruelty, its sterility; it depicts the fate of a lad who rebels against it, yet who rebels hopelessly, since he is equipped with but ordinary powers, since he is alone, and since—above all—he possesses no ideology except that of his own class.

Then the War came to America and it forced me, who had always been most at home in the arts and in philosophy, to think for the first time in political terms.

I saw soon enough that the War was not what the Nations said it was: that it was the result of imperialistic capitalism and, more deeply, of the state of mind symbolized by the capitalistic order. Before this, I had condemned capitalism's *culture*, I had also condemned its economic system. But I had gone no further than a vague utopian socialism. I had read Kropotkin, but not Marx. Which meant, that I had faith only in individual action. Now, I read Marx. But I was still extremely far from applying his laws to American conditions.

At the time, I was editing "The Seven Arts" with James Oppenheim and Van Wyck Brooks. All three of us called ourselves socialists; but our magazine had begun as a purely literary organ for national expression. Our "master" was Walt Whitman. Now, however, with the War upon us, we were faced with the necessity of action. We opposed America's entry into the War. We supported Eugene Debs (although we did not think much of his mind). We published John Reed, and the magnificent revolutionary articles of Randolph Bourne. Secret service men began to infest our offices; the papers listed us among "enemies from within." We went down with flying colors.

When the draft came, I registered as an objector "not for religious reasons but against imperialist war." And while I waited for the military police to send me to Leavenworth (they never got to me), I began a novel which only now I am really writing; and of which I published a part under the title *The Dark Mother*.

My rebellion and my hopes at this time, were expressed in my first critical volume *Our America*, which appeared in 1919. Let me quote from the first paragraph:

"No American can hope to run a journal, win public office, successfully advertise a soap or write a popular novel who does not insist upon the idealistic basis of his country. A peculiar sort of ethical rapture has earned the term American. Woodrow Wilson is only its latest adept: George Washington was by no means its first. And the reason is probably at least in part that no land has ever sprung so nakedly as ours from a direct and conscious material impulse. The history of the colonization of America is the reflex result of economic movements in the Mother countries . . ."

And the book's last sentence:

"\* \* \* In a dying world, creation is revolution."

*Our America*, although essentially a poet's portrait of his world, was an attack on our capitalistic system, *viewed as a culture*. It also was an appeal to the future—to "revolution." But it did not envisage the way to this future in Marxian terms—i.e., in terms of the class war. The masses, whom it called "the multitudes in Whitman," must take over and make over America; but the book stressed as the dynamic force making for revolution, the spiritual and cultural values in America: the Indian, the immigrant, the message of men like Whitman, Lincoln, Spinoza, Marx. And its direct appeal was not to a proletarian class (with whom I had little contact), but to a small band of gallant writers who were to lead the "multitude"—and who, of course, failed to materialize.

I returned to fiction; and wrote in the next four years my three most important novels: *Rahab*, *City Block*, *Holiday*. These were pure forms of experimental art; lyrical and dionysian. But even in them, there is a strong line of social implication—which perhaps is one reason why all three of these novels are translated into Russian. *Holiday* is a novel of the South. It really has but two collective characters: "white town" and "nigger town" of a Gulf state. It depicts the encounter of these two characters—the economic subjugation of the Negro to the white, and the emotional subjugation of the white to the Negro. It draws the clash to its tragic passionate conclusion: the lynching. Perhaps I can best suggest the social quality of the book by saying that the Negro press hailed it, and called it the "modern Uncle Tom's Cabin"—a compliment which, I fear, did not flatter the artist in me.

*Rahab* is, in its bare social lines, the story of a Southern girl of the middle class, ruined by her evangelical Christian husband, driven to New York where, in contact with the underworld, she finds what must be the essence of true religion: the facing of the reality of life. And *City Block* is a kind of collective novel about a New York proletarian street. These books are not "proletarian literature" in the sense that their characters consciously call for a Marxian revolution. Neither is *Winesburg* or *Marching Men*, although Sherwood Anderson is deeply a proletarian novelist. But let me point out, that to have made the characters of my "city block" call for revolution in 1922 would have been bad art. It would have been contrary to the nature of these characters. Only when the proletariat itself becomes consciously revolutionary, can a *good* proletarian novelist so depict it. That consciousness is just beginning in the U.S. To demand it of novels faithful to the truth as it existed a decade ago, is absurd.

Now again, the great American problem claimed me: the problem of creating a true *new world* in our hemisphere. *Our America* had been but a prelude of this theme, which I intended to treat symphonically in a group of books. My purpose was not mainly critical: it was to create portraits of the American worlds—of the human sources of our energy—which would constructively lead forth into the future. One of the results of *Our America* had been to put me in touch with the radical students and writers of South America. And they made me see that America did not stop at the Rio Grande: it went all the way down to Argentina. Now, you cannot understand the U.S. without knowing England and Europe. And similarly you cannot understand America Hispana, without knowing Spain, Portugal, North Africa. So I went there. And later on, I went to Mexico and South America.

I wrote *Virgin Spain* and *America Hispana*—cultural portraits of these peoples. I cannot, here, possibly go into even the simplest exposition of what these books contain; their ideological content is too complex, and besides, they are primarily *portraits*—works of art. Here, all I can say is, that I felt very strongly the relevance of both the Catholic and Semitic traditions in Spain, and of the American Indian cultures, to the problem of creating a world in which the person, knowing his true place in the collective group, should be a *true* person. The Spaniard has a sense of the whole which needs only to be transposed from its false Christian symbols to prepare him for a true communism. (I point out the analogy of the Russians, who also had a Catholic background, in my recent *Dawn in Russia*). And the great Indian cultures have always had communistic roots; have always preserved that sense of the individual as a *social integer*, which we must achieve in North America, before we can think of overcoming the false individualism that is the essence of our capitalistic order.

I wrote these two books primarily for the United States, since I was convinced of the usefulness *for ourselves* of understanding these peoples. But oddly enough, the books have been understood chiefly in the Hispanic countries. Here, they were shallowly regarded as "travel books." (They are no more travel books, than *Don Quixote* is a travel book). In Spain, in Mexico, in Argentina, they are understood as revolutionary analyses of the genius of races—attempts to lift up, into consciousness and therefore into force, the potential promise of the American peoples.

Well allotted space is running short, and I haven't done much more than mention a few of my books. They may be said to represent, socially, an evolution from personal revolt against bourgeois society (*The Unwelcome Man, Our America*) to the discovery of dynamic forces and values in our modern epoch, potential for the creating of a new revolutionary world (*The Rediscovery of America, America Hispana*). In all my books, however, the stress is on the *primary material* that must be recreated—i.e., mankind; and not on the economic and political method that must be the first outward step in the re-creative task. The reason for this is, that I am not an economist, not a professional revolutionist; but an artist, a psychologist, and cultural historian.

Where, then, is my "movement to the left?" For it exists. In my books, it is not a movement, it is a steady evolution. But in my active life, it has recently been something of a "movement."

I will put down briefly why this is, and why it will continue to be \* \* \*.

1. I have lost my last vestige of faith in the middle classes, in all middle class action, and in the efficacy of intellectual groups who are identified, either openly or indirectly, with middle class values.

2. I do not romanticize or idealize the workers and peasants. I am no follower of Rousseau, vaguely dreaming of the perfection of "the natural man." But to have faith in human life at all, in this epoch of bourgeois decadence, must mean henceforth to have faith in the proletarians and farmers who *alone* as a class have not been hopelessly corrupted by the sources and methods of the capitalistic order. The artist and thinker, from now on, must choose: either to hope and fight with the masses, or to despair and surrender alone. At bottom, Marxism is a methodology for creating a *human* culture—in place of the *slave* cultures which history reveals. In this sense, which underlies his great economic discoveries, I am better equipped to understand Marx; and I accept him wholly. However, Marx did not complete the task of providing a methodology for the new culture. He began, but he did not conclude the work. And he knew this. To be a good Marxian is to be creative enough to go beyond Marx.

3. I accept wholly the Marxian law, that a revolutionary proletarian class is the *chief instrument* for creating the communist society. And I agree with Marx, wholly, that only this communist society can go forward to the creating of a real *human* culture.

4. I believe that the intellectuals of all kinds must definitely and actively join hands with the revolutionary proletarian class; that they must take a militant part, *as intellectuals*, henceforth, in the class war, and that it is their duty to make their position unequivocally clear to all the workers.

5. The world is in crisis. Men and women are starving; they are being demoralized by unemployment; when they attempt even to protest they are being bludgeoned back to slavery by the armed mobs of Business fascism. At such a time, I cannot forever remain in my library, although my essential work lies there. I must from time to time make clear, in language simpler than the language of my books—in the language of physical comradeship—my solidarity with the people.

6. The world is in crisis, *and there is no time to lose*. The revolutionary tomorrow must be prepared today. Otherwise, it may come too late—too late to save mankind from the destruction of capitalistic war, and (still worse) from the moral siphilis of capitalistic Peace.

7. However, I shall not lose sight of what has been, and continues to be, my share in the work of world-creation. Nor shall I let my emotions in the daily crisis swerve me. That would be a deadly sentimentalism. The task of the creative artist, the task of the creator of revolutionary cultural values, is important today as it has never been before.

August 14, 1932.

## APPENDIX II

## EXHIBIT 7

## THE

## NATION

JANUARY 23, 1960 .

THE PICTURE IN FOCUS:

## CASTRO'S CUBA . . by Robert Taber

*As a CBS newsmen, Robert Taber was an eyewitness to the Cuban Revolution during four critical periods: in April, 1957, he spent three weeks with Castro in the Sierra Maestra, and was the first newsmen to do a radio-TV interview with the revolutionary leader; he was again in Oriente Province during the "total war" phase of the fighting in the spring of 1958; in the summer of that year, he spent two months with Fidel's brother, Raúl, watching the guerrilla fighting in northern Oriente; and a year ago he witnessed Fidel's triumphant entry into Havana. He has since returned to Cuba several times doing research for a forthcoming book, M-26: Biography of a Revolution. The following article is based on material from the book.—Editors.*

IN *Our Man in Havana*, novelist Graham Greene wrote a farce about a debt-ridden British vacuum-cleaner dealer in Havana, who was recruited as an intelligence agent for his country. Lacking information of the sort required by his employers, the dealer began to invent it. In due course, he filed a report about a mysterious concrete platform being constructed, he asserted, in the remote, rebel-controlled mountains of eastern Cuba. Then, when pressed by his superiors for more details, he was reduced, in desperation, to drawing plans of a gigantic "secret weapon," which he said was being installed on the mysterious platform in the mountains. His model and source of inspiration: a streamlined vacuum-cleaner attachment among his wares.

Greene presented this, of course, as gentle satire, spoofing the puerile but deadly serious and occasionally

frightening preoccupation of the great powers with the cloak-and-dagger fantasies of their "cold war." What the novelist did not consider, perhaps, was that such fantasies can be made credible once they are put in the frame of reference of propaganda to which people have already been conditioned.

Thus, David Sentner, in the Hearst Headline Service newspaper column "Washington Window," of November 12, 1959:

Are Red Russian military technicians helping the anti-American Castro Cuban government to build a missile base?

There is a gigantic concrete "emplacement" in Camaguey Province in Cuba, nearing completion. It is marked "Off Limits" by the Cuban authorities and it is heavily guarded by Castro soldiery.

This much our intelligence agents know, but no more.

The Hearst columnist goes on to say that there is "evidence" that small arms were smuggled ashore from Russian submarines during the struggle against Batista, adding that there is, however, "no corroboration to date of the new Cuban regime having received any missiles," i.e., from the Soviet Union.

The plain inference is that the Cubans have received Soviet missiles, smuggled ashore from Russian submarines, and that this will soon be "corroborated."

Presumably, no one has yet plagiarized *Our Man in Havana* to the extent of sending drawings of vacuum-cleaner attachments to our Central Intelligence Agency in Washington. However, much of the reportage on the Cuban scene during the past year supports the suspicion that even this might not be too much to anticipate.

THE FACT is that the "gigantic concrete emplacement" mystery of the Hearst newspapers differs only in degree, certainly not in kind, from the great bulk of what has been reported in the press and on radio and TV in the United States concerning the Cuban Revolution since Dictator Fulgencio Batista's

precipitate flight from Havana on New Year's Day, 1959. We have witnessed a virulent press campaign, concocted of ignorance, half-truths, name calling, connotative misdirection and outright fabrication, all tending to erode the first bright image of the revolution and to discredit its leadership.

One must concede at once that the Cuban revolutionaries themselves have provided, gratis, a great deal of the ammunition which has been hurled against them. Fidel Castro's off-the-cuff remark that in the event of United States military intervention in Cuba "... twenty thousand *gringos* would die!" was scarcely calculated to endear him to the North American press or people. He has added a great many provocations to this initial one since last January. Oratorical intemperance, a Cuban flair for exaggeration, and a failure to take account of other people's prejudices, have all contributed to damaging misunderstandings.

It is barely possible that a more adroit public-relations effort vis-à-vis the United States might have eased some of the strain. But one must instantly add that no amount of oil spread on troubled waters could have ameliorated the underlying conflict of interests of which the surface storm of propaganda is merely symptomatic. Nor could clever press relations long have concealed this paramount fact: *The Cuban Revolution was and is, above all, a Cuban declaration of independence from the United States.*

This is what made it certain that Fidel Castro's U.S. press notices would be mostly unfavorable. They could not have been otherwise.

IN ORDER to understand the nature of the conflict, one must consider briefly the status of the island before the revolution, and then proceed to review the developments of the past year.

From Cuba's founding as a republic in 1903 until December 31, 1958, when the Batista regime abruptly collapsed, the country was for every practical purpose a United States colony, captive both economically and politically. Its first constitution

gave the United States the privilege of intervening in Cuban affairs, both internal and external — a privilege invoked more than once under the detested Platt Amendment, which was not abrogated until 1934. Cuba's trade treaties were written in Washington and Wall Street. The greater part of its resources—sugar, mineral rights, public-utility concessions, cattle lands — were controlled by U.S. capital. In such circumstances, it can scarcely be doubted that the succession of rapacious professional politicians who ruled Cuba during most of the half-century or so of its republican existence were necessarily the caretakers of a vast amount of American, rather than Cuban, wealth. And whatever else may have been, the dictator who fled to Santo Domingo on the first day of 1959 was one of these — a discredited, dispossessed custodian of the Yankee dollar.

A SIZABLE part of the Cuban business community — the small merchants and the economic nationalists of finance and industry — had opposed Batista and made common cause with Fidel Castro's bearded revolutionaries for reasons of their own. But to the extent that these Cuban businessmen understood the radical *fidelist* program, set forth in all its essential details as early as 1953, they were wary of him. At best, they wished him only a limited success — that is, they hoped that he would serve as a cat's-paw to destroy the Batista regime, but that he would subsequently be forced to accept a "liberal" coalition government representing their interests. If worst came to worst, they felt, it would probably be possible to "do business" with Castro, very much as business had been done with other nominally popular governments in the past.

*Fortune* magazine, discussing the question of agrarian reform under the Castro government in its September, 1959, issue, put the matter very well:

If the rich, powerful and normally cynical Cubans began to be disquieted by the realization that giving land to somebody involved taking it from somebody else (i.e., themselves), they didn't raise the point. Some promi-

nent citizens thought that the new hero was merely making appropriate noble noises, and that when the excitement subsided, he would give them the cordial and cooperative government they liked.

That impression certainly prevailed among the rich, powerful and normally cynical Americans with a stake in Cuba, and no doubt was shared by Washington as well.

These cynics were soon disappointed. Even before Fidel had reached Havana, the "noble noises" of the *fidelistas* were echoed by the crash of revolutionary rifles as the first and worst of some 550 war criminals, notorious torturers and mass murderers of the Batista regime died before firing squads.

At the outset, Castro installed a politically "equidistant" government in the Presidential palace in Havana. Only a few of its members were actual revolutionaries. However, any hope that the conservatives of the new Cabinet would soon restore "business as usual" was speedily dashed by the realization that the provisional government was not, in fact, governing. The administration of state affairs, like the trial and execution of the war criminals and the reorganization of the armed forces, remained in the hands of Fidel Castro and his supporters.

A month after Batista's overthrow, Fidel accepted nominal as well as actual authority by becoming Prime Minister. The Cabinet was reorganized, and the long-promised social revolution got under way.

A HORRENDOUS outcry had already arisen in the United States press in reaction to the war-crimes trials, which were seen as a portent of the intransigent radicalism of the Castro movement.

The island of Cuba, of slight interest to the newspaper-reading public during seven years of struggle against the Batista dictatorship, was suddenly rediscovered only "ninety miles off our shores, site of the American naval base that guards our southern defenses, anchor of our defense of the Panama Canal, and key to the future of Latin America . . ." An army of American journalists flocked to Havana, and tor-

rents of sensational, adjective-packed prose — more than had been written during the two preceding years of civil war — began to flow back. Members of Congress took up the cry. Republican Senator Capehart of Indiana perceived "the spectacle of a bearded monster stalking through Cuba." Representative Wayne Hays, possibly better informed about the sugar-beet industry of his own Ohio than about Cuban affairs, demanded to know what the State Department intended to do to "calm Castro down, before he depopulates Cuba." *Time* magazine informed its readers that the *fidelistas* were taking revenge on a conquered foe, and listed among "typical victims" the name of Alejandro Garcia Olayon, a naval officer accused of having roasted six persons alive, and of having supervised the slaughter of some three hundred persons, after an abortive uprising in Cienfuegos in 1957.

The campaign abated somewhat as understanding dawned that the



Bohemia, Havana  
Fidel Castro

revolutionary tribunals, although following a code of Cuban rather than Anglo-Saxon juridical procedure, were administering strict justice, that there was no slightest question as to the guilt of those condemned, and that all sectors of the Cuban population, as well as the Catholic clergy itself, stood amazed at the furore of foreign criticism. Perhaps it was perceived, too, that the revolutionary government did not seem to be doing anything so revolutionary in its first month in of-

fice that it would seriously jeopardize the \$850,000,000 of private U.S. investment capital in Cuba.

Fidel's accession to the Premiership in February signaled an important consolidation of power by the *fidelista* movement. To quote *The New York Times* of February 22:

The action of Fidel Castro in personally taking over the office of the Premier of the Republic of Cuba reflects his recognition of the fact that the people accept him as their supreme leader. The truth is that they regard him as not only Premier in the Government of Dr. Manuel Urrutia, whom he proclaimed President, but as the very Government itself.

Precisely so. It does not follow, however, that opposition to the revolutionary process had ended, as we shall see.

In mid-April, the Cuban Premier made a visit to the United States that seemed, briefly, to promise improved relations with Washington. But friendly gestures were no substitute for deeds; basic conflicts of interest, both economic and political, proved irreconcilable, and the *rapprochement* failed to "take." Cuba had embarked on a revolutionary course from which there has been, to date, no turning.

On the political plane, Castro made it clear that his government had no intention of following, in blind submission, Washington's lead in the cold war. He said that although his revolutionary movement was "not Red, but olive green" (a reference to the color of the revolutionary uniform), it did not intend to persecute the Cuban Communists of the *Partido Socialista Popular*. With regard to the island's foreign policy, he said that Cuba would choose its own path, both politically and in its commercial relations with other countries. United States interference in matters related to Cuban defense — specifically the question of some British aircraft which Cuba sought to buy and the State Department persuaded Britain not to sell — subsequently produced the statement that if the island could not satisfy its needs in the West, it would do so "elsewhere," i.e., in the Communist countries, if need be.

In the United Nations, where Batista's representative, Nuñez Por-

tuondo, had been considered the bellwether of the United States' "solid Latin American bloc," Cuba broke the united front for the first time by abstaining from voting on a U.S. proposal to postpone debate for another year on the question of seating Communist China.

A mere glance at the bare bones of the *fidelista* economic program is sufficient to disclose the reasons for the attraction that it originally exerted on the economic nationalists in Cuban business and banking circles. The same facts and figures reveal as well, however, the basis of future opposition to the movement on the part of other, larger and more powerful, economic interests in Cuba and in the United States.

The promised diversification of agriculture meant that Cuba could hope to stop spending \$20 million annually on Texas and Louisiana rice, and even greater sums on U.S. canned food products and bottled beverages, and produce its own. Protective tariffs and government aid to fledgling native industries promised to create both higher employment and an expansion of domestic markets, based on the increased purchasing power of a more productive labor force. Agrarian reform, to turn half a million squatters and itinerant agricultural workers into prosperous small farmers, held out the same hope of greater general prosperity and a better distribution of the nation's wealth.

And all of these measures, as well as others in prospect, signified something else of great importance: an end to the flight of capital, principally in the form of sugar profits, that had been flowing from Cuba by the hundreds of millions of dollars over the years, never to return.

IF IT seems paradoxical to say that sugar was the island's principal source of income and at the same time an incubus on the Cuban people, it is because a simple fact has not been considered: fully 40 per cent of the nation's sugar production, with an annual value of more than \$600 million, was firmly in the hands of U.S. corporations in 1958. (In the past, the percentage had risen as high as 70.) An additional

10 to 20 per cent was controlled by Canadian, Spanish and other foreign interests. Thus less than half of a product accounting for nearly two-thirds of Cuba's national income, and fully 80 per cent of her export, was actually controlled by Cubans. And even the profits accruing to the Cuban sugar barons did not remain in Cuba; most of the return was banked or invested abroad.

The same conditions applied with respect to the great cattle ranches, to the nation's mineral wealth (90 per cent in American hands), to its oil (owned entirely by British and American corporations), to its public utilities (80 per cent American-owned).

The importance of such facts cannot be exaggerated. They are the essence of economic colonialism, which requires neither a Colonial Office nor a colonial army to maintain itself when native politicians gladly serve as overseers at lower wages.

At bottom, economic colonialism has its basis in the same circumstance as feudalism: the monopoly control of a nation's wealth, in the one instance by foreigners, in the other by an oligarchy of one's own wealthy and powerful countrymen.

CUBA suffered from the two afflictions at once. Until the agrarian reform, fewer than 8 per cent of the property holdings in Cuba accounted for nearly 75 per cent of all cultivated land. That is to say, three-quarters of the agricultural resources of an agricultural country the size of England, and with a population half again that of Ireland, was in the hands of a few dozen wealthy Cuban families and giant U.S.-owned sugar and cattle corporations.

The social consequences of such a maldistribution of wealth are obvious enough. Cuba's illiteracy rate was one of the highest in the hemisphere, 33.5 per cent. A million Cuban women and children had never worn shoes. Half a million *campesinos* had never tasted milk, or meat. More than a million had never had even the most rudimentary medical care. Thousands of *guajiros* in the Sierra Maestra were as isolated from the rest of the nation as though they lived on an island in the Pacific, without roads, communications, or

any contact with the outside world.

Where was the sound economy, the prosperous nation, of which Batista's American public-relations agents used to boast? The sugar corporations were prosperous. The great cattle ranchers were prosperous. But who was paying the bill?

Felipe Pazos, one of the prominent bankers of the anti-Batista movement, has said that graft on public works alone during seven years of the Batista administration came close to \$500 million on a total public-works budget of less than \$800 million. Cost estimates were customarily doubled, and the rake-off apportioned among the thieves. Such practices extended into every aspect of the nation's economic life. A report written by Robert Alden in *The New York Times* of January 5, 1958, described "the agent of the government, the man with the outstretched palm who is the key figure in the large-scale corruption in Cuba":

The owner of a small food store says: "I pay \$2 to the 'collector' every time I pull the shutter of my shop in the morning. I pay \$2 when I pull it down at night."

The taxicab driver pays the "collector" \$1 for the right to stay at his taxi stand for three hours, and, depending on their volume of business, a precise scale of payment is exacted from each of thousands of street vendors.

In February, 1958, it was estimated that nearly 27,000 Cubans lived on the proceeds of gambling; 11,500 lived by or on prostitution; 5,000 lived by begging (Report of the Cuban National Council of Economy, 1958). The "collector" extracted tribute from them all.

The money lost on the Havana gaming tables by American tourists lined Batista's pockets and those of American gangsters in Las Vegas, Cleveland and New York. Corporation taxes were low, for the benefit of foreign investors, and the Cuban *latifundistas* paid more in bribes than in taxes. The tax on an annual income of \$1,000,000 never exceeded 40 per cent, and even this was seldom paid. But the middle classes groaned under taxation, and the working classes sweated to pay for imported rice, beans and tinned

goods; the United States enjoyed a trade with Cuba which ran to more than \$10 million a month in its own favor.

Of the total Cuban labor force of 2,204,000, some 361,000 persons were wholly unemployed throughout 1957; 150,000 were employed only part of the time; 154,000 were engaged in unremunerated labor — e.g., as domestic servants, working for their meals and lodgings. Of 1,539,000 Cubans gainfully employed, 954,000 earned less than \$75 a month in a nation where the peso was on a par with the dollar and had even less purchasing power in Havana than in New York.

The nation's free gold and dollar reserves, depleted by assaults on the Treasury and an unfavorable trade balance with the United States, were down to \$110,000 by the end of December, 1958. The incoming govern-



Revolucion, Havana



ment was faced with a current deficit of more than \$50 million and a national indebtedness of close to \$1.5 billion.

The revolutionary Provisional Government, coming to power in January, abolished the worst of the abuses of the Batista regime at a single stroke:

¶Thousands of government sinecures were eliminated, along with the subsidies which had been paid, for political reasons, to most Cuban newspapers and to many Cuban journalists.

¶A ministry for the recovery of stolen property set to work to recover millions of dollars in cash and more millions in property illegally acquired under past regimes. Scores of contractors who had accepted "kickbacks" on public-works contracts were forced to disgorge their illicit gains, and the estates of former government officials, acquired dishonestly, were confiscated by the state.

¶Home and apartment rentals were reduced 30 to 50 per cent, bringing dwelling rentals to what were considered more reasonable levels and at the same time injecting a considerable amount of fresh capital into the economy at the consumer level. The effect was much the same for Cuban wage earners as though they had received a sizable increase in pay, and the benefits were immediately felt, also, by thousands of retail merchants.

¶Mortgage rates were reduced in order to provide relief for the smaller landlords.

¶Under a Cabinet decree, owners of idle property in urban areas were compelled to build on their vacant lots, or to put them up for sale to builders, in an effort to create employment, to end real estate speculation and to provide desperately needed urban space for industrial development.

¶Tax laws were revised to reduce the number of different taxes by about two-thirds and to provide a more equitable distribution of the tax load. Collections were rigorously enforced, and thousands of tax-dodgers now found themselves paying not only current but past taxes, which they had thought to evade.

(Of 30,000 members of Havana's twelve most exclusive clubs, it was found that only 6,000 had ever even filed tax returns.)

Although there was some grumbling, principally among landlords whose rentals were reduced, the reaction to the first reforms of the new government was generally favorable. The business classes had asked for honest government, and they discovered that they were getting it "for almost the first time," said *The New York Times* correspondent Herbert Matthews, "since Columbus discovered the island."

It quickly became evident, however, that the provisional government had no intention of stopping at this point.

The big U.S.-owned utility companies were next to feel the effects of reform. Government interventors were installed to oversee the affairs of the *Compañía Cubana de Electricidad*, a \$300,000,000 subsidiary of the American & Foreign Power Corporation, supplying 90 per cent of Cuba's electrical power. After an inspection of the books, the company was ordered to extend its rural service and to reduce its rates by 30 per cent.

The books of the Cuban Telephone Company, a subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph, representing a \$115,000,000 investment, were also examined. Rate increases which had been granted by the Batista government were abolished, and the company was ordered to improve its notoriously inadequate and inefficient service.

The government had already armed itself with authority to impose controls on currency and imports, to halt the flight of Cuban capital and to restore a lopsided balance of payments. Within the first few months of the new administration, imports were reduced by more than 30 per cent, the curbs being applied primarily to non-essential goods—e.g., bottled alcoholic beverages and television sets. Since Cuba had been the world's sixth greatest market for U.S. manufactured and agricultural products, it is not surprising that there should have been repercussions. The worst fears of U.S. investors were confirmed in

June, with the promulgation of the Agrarian Reform Law.

THE distribution of idle government land holdings to landless *campesinos* had already begun. *Guajiros* in the Sierra Maestra who had lived for generations on land nominally owned by absentee landlords under ancient Spanish grants had also been assured of title to their plots. The next step—under the Agrarian Reform Law—was to invoke the provisions of the Cuban Constitution of 1940 which, although never enforced, had strictly forbidden the holding of *latifundios*, i.e., more than a thousand acres in a single property.

Exceptions were permitted in the new law to allow maximum holdings of 3,316 acres in rice and cattle lands—where it could be demonstrated that such holdings would be in the interest of more efficient production.

Holdings beyond the legal maximums were subject to expropriation, the land so acquired by the state to be distributed among Cuba's 700,000 landless peasants, with preference to be given to the sharecroppers or squatters actually living on the expropriated property. Each family was assured of two *caballerías* (66½ acres) gratis, and the privilege of purchasing three additional *caballerías*.

The law forbade the ownership of sugar-cane holdings by mill owners, the purpose being to break up the large monopolies in the interest of the peasants and small cane-growers. Ownership of Cuban land by foreigners, whether acquired by purchase or inheritance, was forbidden, and likewise the ownership of land by stock companies in which foreigners might hold shares.

THE owners were shocked by the compensation offered for the property to be expropriated: twenty-year government bonds bearing 4½ per cent interest. Although they had for many years enjoyed extremely low taxation as the result of minimal assessments, they were now dismayed to learn that expropriation payments would be based on these same evaluations.

The American press was prompt to denounce the agrarian reform as confiscatory. The complaints of the sugar cartel were translated into the language most familiar to the American newspaper-reading public: the land-reform program was a Kremlin-inspired plot to destroy free enterprise. In Washington, there was talk of reducing the Cuban sugar quota, an idea particularly appealing to the sugar Senators of Louisiana and to those legislators with an interest in Hawaiian and Puerto Rican cane sugar or U.S. beet sugar. (The question comes up for action in the current session of Congress.)

Altogether, nearly two million acres of cane-land owned or controlled by United States interests was marked for expropriation, final action being deferred until after the 1959-1960 *zafra*, or winter harvest, so as not to interfere with sugar production. The first of the big American-owned cattle ranches to be expropriated, the 33,500-acre King ranch in Camaguey, was formally seized by the Agrarian Reform Institute on November 15. The total extent of other American-owned ranches and other holdings marked for expropriation is thought to be about a million acres.

In Havana, the government launched what was viewed as another "shaft" aimed at U.S. business interests: a 5 per cent tax on the value of minerals extracted by mining companies, and a 25 per cent tax on the value of minerals or ores exported from Cuba. A subsequent measure brought the oil deposits of the island under the control of the industrial division of the Agrarian Reform Institute.

When, in November, the Havana government suddenly and without explanation replaced Dr. Felipe Pazos as president of the Cuban National Bank with one of the most radical of the Cuban revolutionary leaders, Dr. Ernesto "Che" Guevara, it was felt that the worst had indeed come to the worst.

IT IS easily possible to trace a rough correspondence between the policy decisions and actions of the revolutionary government and the rise and fall of the decible level of the anti-Castro propaganda cam-

paign in the United States and elsewhere.

The journalistic image of Fidel Castro varied, even during the struggle against Batista, in ratio to the assessment made of his intentions and capabilities in financial and diplomatic quarters. One saw, in succession, the romantic bourgeois hero (supported by the "best elements" of Cuban society), the potentially dangerous fanatic ("Burn the cane! After Batista we will have a *zafra* of liberty!"), the bearded leader of what Senator Ellender called "a bunch of handits, burning sugar plantations."

By the end of the first month of *fielista* control, the international wire services and their clients in the United States were in full cry against the new government, and it was difficult to distinguish the "liberal" journals—which had hitherto viewed Castro with cautious sympathy—from the most reactionary. The burden of the wave of criticism was humanitarian concern for the "victims" of the revolutionary tribunals, but the underlying preoccupation was apparent in speculation as to the probable economic orientation of the new regime.

As early as January — Fidel's first month in power — *U.S. News and World Report*, among other conservative journals, was inquiring as to the possibility of a dictatorship taking shape in Cuba, and it may be significant that, during the same period, Associated Press analyst William Ryan, for one, perceived the clear possibility of U.S. intervention to save Cuba from "chaos."

IN MAY, with the beginning of the "Communist beach head" scare, initiated on television and echoed by the Hearst press, there was renewed talk of intervention, this time to save Cuba not from chaos but from communism. United Press International's vice president, Lyle C. Wilson, speculated that Communists probably would "take over" the Cuban government, and predicted that in such a circumstance "the United States would promptly apply force to prevent the Reds from getting a foothold in the island Republic," adding: "The United States wouldn't

tolerate communism in our backyard."

The attempts of the Havana government to cope with the increasingly disruptive conspiracies of counter-revolutionary elements both inside and outside of Cuba during the summer and fall of 1959 simply provided more fuel for the anti-Castro press campaign. The technique employed to discredit the revolutionary leadership is illustrated in the following excerpt from *Newsweek* magazine's edition of November 9:

The revolutionary tribunals are coming back, and so are the firing squads. The mob has shouted its approval of Premier Fidel Castro's plan to arm the peasants and the workers. . . . They are not a bloodthirsty people, these Habaneros who keep crying "To the firing squad!" The trouble is that they've been so brainwashed that whatever Castro says they automatically believe.

Who is trying to brainwash whom — and with what object? To be evaluated properly, the above quotation should be compared with another, published about the same time, from Hearst columnist David Sentner:

*Washington:* The United States must immediately lead a movement by the Organization of American States and the U.N. for the replacement of the Communist-dominated Castro regime in Cuba. Otherwise within six to eight months, many other Latin American nations will follow the Castro pattern and confiscate all American property.

So predicts Dr. Emilio Nuñez Portuondo, former U.N. Security Council President and distinguished Cuban diplomat. . . .

Sentner does not trouble to identify the "distinguished Cuban diplomat" as Batista's former United Nations representative or as the so-called "intellectual leader" of the anti-Castro *batistianos-in-exile* with headquarters in Ciudad-Trujillo. However, he does say that the Castro regime has placed "a big death-price" on Nuñez Portuondo's head, and goes on to quote him at length concerning an alleged plot, instigated by Moscow and Peking, to "communize" Cuba.

It is not too difficult to see the

relationship between the *Newsweek* article and the Hearst columnist's interview with Nuñez Portuondo. The one, painting a lurid picture of an evil, tyrannical, menacing regime, prepares U.S. public opinion for what the other bluntly proposes: an overt military attack on that same regime in the name of humanity, or self-defense, or something equally moral.

Thus it would seem that Fidel Castro's apprehensions with regard to the possibility of foreign intervention, dismissed in the American press as mere ranting or evidence of paranoia, could have some basis. And hence the preoccupation in Havana with counter-revolutionary conspiracies, both at home and abroad. The possibility of a successful counter-revolution in Cuba at the present time is so remote as to be non-existent. On the other hand, the existence of a counter-revolutionary force, small but well financed, with a firm base in Santo Domingo, powerful backing in the United States and a manpower pool of former Batista soldiers, policemen and displaced petty officials in Cuba itself, does pose a serious threat to the revolution.

It was, after all, the *fidelistas* themselves who demonstrated how much confusion could be sown, and how much damage done to an economy, by a handful of fanatics.

But this is to discuss the lesser evil. The real danger lies in the use to which the *appearance* of a counter-revolution could be put — if the United States were inclined to in-

tervene in Cuba. A widespread, lasting campaign of terrorism, endangering American lives and property, would most certainly produce a ringing appeal for outside aid, in which Cuban conservatives would join. And although Washington—recalling the world-wide political repercussions of its thinly disguised intervention in Guatemala in 1954—would not be anxious to follow the same course again, it is easy to see how Nuñez Portuondo's plan might be adopted, i.e., United States military intervention under the aegis of the Organization of American States.

HOW MUCH of the sound and fury of the U.S. press campaign, with its incessant theme of Communist "infiltration" in the Caribbean, has been justified by the actual developments of the first year of revolutionary government in Cuba?

From the point of view of the great Cuban landowners, the import-export bankers, the sugar cartel, the immediate dollar interests threatened, no doubt *all* of it is justified. From a more liberal, not to say more humane, position, very little indeed.

The picture of a Cuba dominated by Moscow or Peking is not supported by a nose-count of Communists in its government or in the armed forces. Their number is negligible, their influence minimal. Nor do the results of last year's union elections vindicate the notion of significant Communist influence in the ranks of organized labor. In the 500,000-member Sugar Workers Federation, to cite an instance, Communist candidates were elected in only eight of 243 locals. Not a single Communist was elected to the executive board of the Confederation of Cuban Workers.

The revival of the revolutionary tribunals in October was the Castro government's answer to a series of counter-revolutionary threats dating back to August, when an invasion from Santo Domingo was aborted with the capture of a planeload of arms sent by Dominican dictator Rafael Trujillo. The civil courts, rubber stamps for the Batista regime, had not yet been sufficiently reorganized to cope with any large number of trials or to dispense the speedy justice which would serve as

a deterrent to further insurrection.

Further conflicts of ideology and interest are inevitable. It would be remarkable if a far-reaching social and economic revolution could be achieved in any country without such conflicts.

Fidel Castro is by no means above criticism. He has leaned far too heavily on his own political gifts, his personal influence, his oratorical skill, to solve the pressing problems with which he has been confronted. The result has been an appearance of demagoguery which has alienated many of his erstwhile supporters and awakened deep concern even in the most liberal quarters.

The question remains whether it would have been possible to implement the program which has given the Cuban masses their first glimpse of hope, and the island the first honest government in its history, by less arbitrary, more conventional methods. One concludes, however reluctantly: no.

THE history of half a century of parliamentary procedure and ballot-box representation provides almost overwhelming evidence of the simple fact that political democracy is meaningless without a generous measure of economic democracy. The introduction of the ballot box in Cuba heralded nothing more than an exchange of absentee landlords, Spanish for American, and the rise of a class of scavenging professional politicians whose hire was the loot of a rampant spoils system and whose ultimate effect was to pave the way for the ultimate disaster: Batista. It is certainly not surprising that Fidel Castro considers a public-opinion poll or a show of hands in the park in front of the Presidential palace a relatively satisfactory substitute for national elections. Nor is it surprising that the great mass of the people in Cuba today show little interest in the subject.

The Cuban conservatives who are presently calling for elections are precisely those individuals who have had the most experience at manipulating the electoral process for their own private ends. It is most improbable that any candidate opposed to the *fidelistas* program, or not en-

### A Chilean View



Uncle Sam: "Each Day That Rumba Looks More Curious."

dorsed by the revolutionary movement, could win an election in Cuba at this time. But there is no doubt, either, that an election campaign would serve as a sounding board for the spokesmen of powerful reactionary interests, would sow confusion and help to revive a counter-revolutionary effort not yet fully under control. It would profoundly dishearten the Cuban man in the street who has learned through half a century to equate the ballot box with the pistol, the dishonest peso, and the privileged few who have been the exponents, practitioners and principal beneficiaries of Cuban elections.

CERTAINLY a great deal is at stake for the Cuban people. The organization of some 500 agricultural cooperatives, the construction of hundreds of schools, hospitals and low-cost housing units, early evidence of a new economic independence signaled by increasing production of rice and other staples, all indicate how great the stake really is.

For the United States, too, the stake is high, regardless of how such questions as the matter of compensation for expropriated U.S. properties are worked out. Cuba is the focal point of a manifestation that seems certain to spread farther in the hemisphere, and the United States can hardly afford to be indifferent. To cite a relevant passage by Herbert Matthews in *The New York Times*:

About one-quarter of all our exports go to Latin America and one-third of our imports come from the area. United States private investments in Latin America now reach the amazing total of about \$9.5 billion. . . . At every point it has to be said: "If we did not have Latin America on our side, our situation would be desperate. To be denied the products and markets of Latin America would reduce the United States to being a second-rate nation and cause a devastating reduction in our standard of living. . . . Latin American raw materials are essential to our existence as a world power. A friendly Latin America is necessary to our military security."

Apparently this, and not the mere dollar investment in Cuba, big as it may be, is the heart of the matter. The question remaining is—what to do about it?

It was the end of World War II that marked the close of the colonial period and the beginning of a wave of profound political, social and economic change throughout the world. In every instance, the essential drives are the same: for independence, self-determination, economic emancipation, social justice.

In the underdeveloped agricultural nations—and that defines most, if not all, of the American republics—the essential first step toward freedom is: agrarian reform. To withhold that is to withhold everything. To attempt to defend a dying feudalism is to face not the risk, but the certainty, sooner or later, of losing—everything.

"Whether history will record Cuba's Fidel Castro as an earnest patriot or a fellow-traveling adventurer," writes our former ambassador to India, Chester Bowles, "is anybody's guess. But one fact is already clear. His land-reform program . . . is indubitably in line with Latin American sentiment."

It is perhaps natural that the powerful interests threatened by social and economic change in Cuba and elsewhere should try to stem the tide. But it is not well-advised, and it would be a pity if their influence were to prevail in Washington.

Talk of punishing Cuba by cutting the sugar quota is nonsense. Cuba is not merely the world's major sugar producer, but virtually the only sugar-producing country that does not consume the bulk of what it produces. Cuban sugar supplies the need of the entire eastern third of the United States, and it is a vital supply, price-supported not merely because it is in large measure U.S.-owned, but because it is indispensable, as has been demonstrated in two world wars. To threaten economic sanctions against the Cuban government is to invite retaliation; e.g., Cuba could easily double its sugar production and dump a

vast and ruinous surplus on the world market in defiance of all existing marketing agreements.

FIDEL CASTRO remains as much the symbol of revolution—and of hope—in Latin America at large as he was for Cuba during the long struggle in the mountains of Oriente. The same forces that produced the Cuban revolution are at play throughout the hemisphere; the same aspirations that kindled the imagination of the *guajiros* of the Sierra Maestra and the bank clerks of Havana in 1957 is stirring in the hearts of the cane cutters of Santo Domingo and the bank clerks of Lima in 1960. There is no doubt that the Cuban revolution has accelerated the revolutionary process greatly, and perhaps has given it a shape that it never had before. It was no coincidence, but a warning, that Panamanian rioters storming into the Panama Canal Zone in December should have adopted "Viva Fidel Castro!" as their battle cry.

Former Ambassador Bowles, urging a realistic compromise with the inevitable, advises:

We can adjust ourselves in advance to the certainty that reason will not always prevail, that injustices will almost surely occur, and that the short-term price paid for long-term stability will often appear exorbitant.

Above all, let us not lose sight of the essential issue. The real choice in Latin America, as in Asia and Africa, is citizenship or serfdom, hope or despair, orderly political growth or bloody upheaval. Our failure to understand this choice, or to support the vital new elements which are striving to assert leadership, would be catastrophic.

What Bowles has to say is worth considering. The Congress, preparing to set the new sugar quota, might well think it over, and so might the State Department, before proceeding to implement the "firmer policy" toward Cuba that was announced only last week.

## APPENDIX III

### Exhibit No. 9

[NOTE.—The subcommittee has been furnished two transcripts of Mr. Tynan's program. They differ in some respects. The first one was obtained from Association Television Limited, of London, England, which carried the program; the second was furnished by Mr. Tynan's counsel. It has been decided to print the second, but to indicate by parentheses any words or phrases which do not appear in the first copy, and to insert between brackets such material from the first copy as does not appear, or differs from, the second copy.

[The program was titled "We Dissent" and the transcript gives the transmission date as Jan. 27, 1960.—EDITOR.]

WILLIAM CLARK

Good evening. This is William Clark and I returned just a few weeks ago from several months in the United States, where I have been almost every year since I went as a student in 1938.

Each time America seems more prosperous. Indeed, for 200 years, with a few temporary setbacks, that has been so till today America produces, earns, and spends more per person than any other people in the world. Of course there are inequalities, but this prosperity is for most of the many not just for the few. And most Americans do seem content with these lavish rewards.

Yet there is another tradition in America: a proud tradition of dissent. The Pilgrim Fathers sailed across the Atlantic because they were religious dissenters; the Founding Fathers—Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton—created the United States because they dissented politically from George III.

Have wealth and conformity, grey flannel suits and ranch homes killed that revolutionary urge, and smothered dissent and discontent? Well—have they?

(Short statements ending on statement from Trevor Thomas.)

You will be hearing more of these people because this is their document—a platform for Americans who have doubts about the American way of life. We think it important for these varied minority views to be seen in Britain as a reminder that the America of the so-called American Century is not just what it appears on the surface—in fact, it is still a dynamic society with new ideas, wise and foolish, half-baked and profound, bubbling up inside it.

First of all, let's get clear what Americans mean by conformity and find out just how powerful some think dissent is in America today. Let's start in New York.

And get the opinion of Professor Wright Mills, on the campus of Columbia University with his students.

WRIGHT MILLS

When you ask the question what do you mean by conformity and dissent, you assume that all men tend to be political and that they either conform or that they dissent. Now neither of those situations is really the case for some people at least in the United States today. The situation is a third. Namely, that they don't care either way, that they neither accept nor reject. So that the problem of conformity versus dissent I should rephrase and say that it has been displaced in the U.S. scene as well as elsewhere, as a problem of apathy, of political indifference, of just not caring. I suppose this sort of thing is most likely to happen in a society which is doing very well economically but I don't think that is the only cause of it. In the United States today there is no broad base of dissent, there is no broad instrumentality that is available for dissent and hence the people who are rejecting the current trends of affairs and those in charge of them, they tend to be scattered, they tend to be less groups than grouplets, scattered individuals, and they tend to be, of course, small circulation magazines. As far as the American labour movement is concerned, it is, of course, almost entirely an *adaptive* organization. It doesn't act, it's simply acted upon and then it reacts and it sees politics simply as a means for strictly economic or bread and butter ends; and hence since there is no party which is significantly different from any other party, as far as real power is concerned, a struggle for power, which is what you mean by politics. I don't see very much dissent what you might call dissent at all. I think it is confined to small groups of intellectuals in and out of universities and I think even there it tends to dry up very quickly.

In a world of Thomas Payne, all it took to speak and to speak effectively was a printing press. I don't know what it cost, but it certainly didn't cost what six issues of a relatively small circulation magazine would cost today. So that the capital requirement of these means of communication, not only newspapers (and magazines) but radio and television, have now become enormous. And hence, when we speak of freedom to speak just in that minimum sense of dissent, with any kind of effectiveness, well you have to speak of capitalism in the sense that it now owns those instrumentalities. And so perhaps the biggest obstacle to intellectuals' dissenting, assuming that they wish to, which I don't think many do, would be access to the means of communication. Freedom of speech as a formal fact exists, of course, quite fully in the United States. Nobody locks you up. But on the other hand, nobody has to lock you up because many intellectuals are locking themselves up.

CLARK

From Columbia to Greenwich Village, the Chelsea of New York, and Alex King, whose autobiography was a best seller, and whose highly unorthodox opinions attracted so much surprised attention in his own one-man American television series. We asked him how much nonconformity there is in America today.

ALEX KING

There is very little. There has always been very little. You know, when I was a very small boy below my teens, I once asked my mother, "Mother what is a prostitute?" And she looked kind of worried, she was a rather outspoken woman but I pressed her and I said, "Please tell me." And I had heard something about it and I said, "Has it got something to do with sex?" and she said, "Not necessarily," and finally she said, "You see a prostitute is someone who when you spit in their face, they say it is raining." And this is about the size of it. There were always a lot of prostitutes in the world and there are just more now. And to be nonconformist means that you're not a prostitute yet, not altogether. And I have been particularly aware of this because originally I was an artist and I was a book illustrator. Later I was a magazine editor and now of course I am mixed up with book writing and worst of all with television, you see. And the amount of prostitution increased in each case. Until now I'm absolutely surrounded by whores. There are some who are not; I'm not going to mention their names because they'll lose their jobs. But I think that's about the nature of it, you see we're all corrupted, everyone of us is corrupted, and the tendency of our life is to corrupt us more each day.

You know what interests me about television, so much that when I go to do my stint on anybody else's programme or my own, the people backstage, all of them are enormously well paid, inordinately well paid, speak to you with a sort of furtive smile, like conspirators, like we're all involved in a gargantuan swindle that is going to be discovered any minute, and we'll have to give back our Chriscrafts, our Jaguars, our expensive wives and children and trade them in for cheaper ones. And even actors of some (reputation) [repute] that you meet, in television studios, sort of apologize as if to say "I'm here for the money."

[Now you know perfectly well, just because a man has invented, let us say, an inferior, nauseating sandwich spread, does not or should not give him the authority to decide what sort of entertainment I shall have the next two years. Never has any potential art form been so invaded by idiots, by nitwits, and by numbskulls.]

WILLIAM CLARK

Apathy and super commercialism—so far these seem to be the forces favouring conformity, stifling dissent. What are the others?

We put this question to someone now living in obscurity, his State Department career cut short by a famous trial in which he was convicted of perjury: Alger Hiss.

ALGER HISS

I think this is a very big question because there are so many. I would think certainly one of them in the past ten years has been fear; sort of a nameless fear, but a fear of the unknown, of unusual, unexpected things. As a result of that, the thing sort of spread. There has been a tendency to conform in the professions, in education, and even in cultural matters.

WILLIAM CLARK

Mr. Hiss had something to say about the legal profession, for which he was originally trained.

ALGER HISS

Well, this is one of our finest areas of valuable nonconformity, I would say. Our greatest jurist-consul would be Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, whom I knew briefly for a year when I was his secretary.

Throughout his career he was noted and famed for his independence of thought, his grandeur of thought, and was actually known as the "great dissenter"—he and Justice Brandeis, another person in the same general category, a man who thought beautifully for himself. It is interesting that in more recent years what used to be Justice Holmes' lonely voice has become much more the majority

voice, not through any conformity from outside but because of the validity of his own opinions and judgment, coming somewhat belatedly to be recognized. So that to sum it up, I would say that our legal tradition is one that recognizes and has benefited tremendously by the power of nonconformist thought.

WILLIAM CLARK

(He saw possibilities of change in American politics.)

ALGER HISS

I [don't] (can't) imagine any dynamic, growing, developing country whose political scene wasn't constantly changing, and certainly this wouldn't be new in American history, American tradition. We've had different parties appearing, Teddy Roosevelt's party, the Progressive Party, the Debs Party, and more recently Henry Wallace's party. So I feel confident that it doesn't take much clairvoyance to anticipate that any growing developing country will of course mould its political institutions to fit its growing needs and developments. I (certainly) would think it likely that unless the two existing parties, perhaps by changing their own patterns, meet the needs, then they will have to anticipate the development and a growth of a new one.

CLARK

You may recognize this as the work of Jules Feiffer, who expresses his dissent in cartoons. What does he dissent from in American life?

JULES FEIFFER

I think apathy is the prime thing and the apathy has led to withdrawal. I'm really less bothered by things like political reaction than I am by the fact that there is no countermeasure against political reaction, that people don't get excited, people \* \* \* it would be lovely to see a few fanatics around. It would be lovely to see somebody screaming, somebody yelling, somebody really getting enthusiastic about picketing.

We have reached the age of ultimate toleration. Awhile ago, we had here in New York, a man called George Meteski who was called the Mad Bomber who put little bags of bombs in telephone booths in Grand Central Station and he could have hurt a lot of people. Everybody loved him. He became a hero, a folk hero. I think that there's much more attention paid to the personality rather than the intent of people, that a man with an attractive, fetching, personality can say, "Let's blow up the world tomorrow," and if he's cute, maybe boyish looking like John Kennedy, everybody will say, "Isn't that charming," and nobody listens. I could see a Hitler arising today and screaming his screams and people sitting passively by and saying, "Well you have to understand the home he came from," and, "He means well."

And nobody pays attention to the issues. Probably because the (frightening) issue today is whether we can bypass next year or not and it's too horrible to contemplate. Not just who's going to win this local war or who's not going to win this local war, it's what's going to be left and nothing is going to be left. Nobody wants to think about that.

WILLIAM CLARK

So far conformity seems the bugbear for those we've heard; yet by complaining about it they help to keep alive the tradition of nonconformity. One of the oldest established dissenters is Norman Thomas, who six times ran for the Presidency as candidate of the American Socialist Party. Today, at 75, sitting on a terrace overlooking Central Park, he is as salty and tough as ever.

NORMAN THOMAS

Two or three years ago, three or four years ago I forget just how many, somebody at Princeton University started a discussion on the question of why such conformity. And it was rolling along when a young fellow who had just recently made the editorial board, appropriately perhaps, named John Milton, wrote a statement in which he said, "Why shouldn't we be conformists?" And he cited a circular, a pamphlet very widely given to applicants for jobs by one of our

great oil companies, and in that they had a paragraph entitled "Personal Opinions." It followed "Personal Habits" and now it was "Personal Opinions." Your personal habits, you mustn't be alcoholic. Your personal opinions, you must be conservative. They can get you in a lot of trouble, it said. So be sure to keep them conservative, and to elaborate the theme. Well, this by way of the Princetonian got into the alumni weekly and I was an alumnus of Princeton (and I read it) and I was rather horrified. And it happened that I was going to speak at a college conference. So that gave me an excuse for calling up the company and demanding to know if the story was correct, and what they had to say. They sent down rather promptly that the man who wrote it, a very naive public relations man, full of ginger, you know, and bounce. And he was so happy to think he'd written this. "Why," he said, "we've circulated 400,000 copies of this in practically all of the leading universities, at least east of the Mississippi, and nobody has ever complained before and I literally couldn't make him understand why I thought this was irregular. So I appealed to a higher authority who did understand, and we brought about a verbal revision that was quite satisfactory. But so little interest was there in this whole scheme of things that we owe it all to a college boy to discover that this peculiar verbal acknowledgment of the fact that in order to get ahead, you want to conform, be a man in the grey flannel suit, be an organization man.

Oh, we're still a democracy, an imperfect democracy; but I'm not decrying it altogether, but practically we're governed by four bureaucracies. The Civil Government bureaucracy, the Military bureaucracy, the bureaucracy of management in big business, and big labor. That balance operates it, it may be shaken by some developments in labor legislation, and the steel strike, but it's operated the last ten years rather smoothly, in a kind of agreement and it's an agreement to enjoy life, to get as many things as we can create. To have the kind of city we look at over this terrace. But always under fear, for we know perfectly well that one mistake, one accident, one passion, could result in the ruin of it all. And we don't much like to think about it, and we don't know very well what to do; we ordinary people feel very strongly but we get no distinguished and imaginative leadership in our government. And the individual dissenter, nonconformist, has not exactly a voice crying in the wilderness; he's a voice crying in a mad world where we know that all this pomp and pride and all our comfort could go so easily. And knowing it, we don't know what to do, we escape, we evade; we don't argue, we evade.

We've got some organization, we're beginning to get a little more interest, more widely distributed, at least stopping tests and trying to check the nuclear armament. But there is no mass surge and no apparent leadership. I have a feeling all the time as if it may be just emerging. For I do not think of us as hopelessly sunk in the kind of apathy I've been describing. If I didn't believe that, I'd find it hard to carry on.

WILLIAM CLARK

Hard to carry on, perhaps, but Norman Thomas does still carry on. If the dissenters today lack leaders there is a new generation of individual dissenters growing up. In a moment we'll take a look at them.

NIPSEY RUSSELL

The summer season was splendid. It was such a thrill to go out to the beach in the summer, you know, and you see the girls stretched out on the beaches with bronze coloring, the oil, the suntan lotion. They just stretch there in the sun—sun baking in that golden color. You can't tell the Mau Mau from the Ku Klux Klan, sometimes. I never go to the beach to get brown. I stay brown all year round. And all the way down. No bathing suit marks on me. None of this two-tone.

[Looking back on the past year, these months have been remarkable indeed. Well, they've settled the integration difficulty in the south, insofar as it pertains to transportation. Oh, the southern whites were saying: "I will not sit beside a negro." The Negroes were saying: "To hell with it; I'll sit where I please." So that settled it. They tore out the seats and now everybody's standing up together. Very nice. Well, they never said they wouldn't stand together. They just wouldn't sit together.]



WILLIAM CLARK

Nipsey Russell appearing as he does each night at a night club in Harlem, New York's Negro quarter. An individual dissenter who uses humor to reflect (and color) the bitterness of his race.

NIPSEY RUSSELL

And then integration in the school is progressing. I had occasion to address that group of students in Little Rock under the supervision of Miss Daisy Bates. I told them, I said: "Children, you're going into the Central High this year, the local law enforcement agency and the Federal Government will stand behind the decree of the Supreme Court. So you're going into School. However," I said, "in this sociological drama, you will portray a rather poignant role. Do nothing, therefore, to disparage our cause. You represent the whole Negro faction. I say this because people are inclined to think collectively. Whatever you do will reflect upon our whole race. So when you go into that school, don't go around slapping people in the face and spitting on each other in the lunch room and all that nonsense. Don't go into that school," I begged them, "with switchblades in your pocket. This is so stereotyped it would reflect negatively on us. Don't go into that school," I told them, "cutting at people with razors. Go into the school proud, with your head held high. With a gun and some hand grenades, a dynamite cap, a flamethrower, some poison gas, artillery pieces. It's a classroom ballistic missiles. Let them see we can be civilized too.

WILLIAM CLARK

Now to turn to a writer, Norman Mailer, whose brilliant crude war novel, "The Naked and the Dead," gave him an international reputation which did not break his dissenting spirit. Two years ago Mailer moved towards a philosophy of total individualism, which he calls hipsterism. What is that?

NORMAN MAILER

Well, a hipster is a man who has divorced himself from history; he's a man who doesn't give any kind of a God damn about the experience of the past. The hipster could be called in a kind of a way a psychopath, a man who lives with nothing but an enormously intense sense of the present. His ideas, such as they are, are derived very much from the experience of the Negro. The Negro has really been the center of the hip in America, because the Negro never really belonged to American life. And so for that reason he had to develop a life of his own, a life which had as little to do with the white man's laws as possible. And the Negro, in the course of doing this, developed a morality which was sufficient for him although it had absolutely nothing to do with history, institutions, or the culture of the past. And of course I oversimplify it enormously, there are at least half of the Negroes in America are much more like whites than they are like Negroes by now. But it does to me seem true that the most adventurous and the most lively of the Negroes in America has developed a tradition of living in the present which has been almost an underground tradition and has by now given the boring, cancerous state of American life this new tradition of the Negro—has come to have an enormous appeal to Americans because it's a way of staying alive, it's a way of finding one's growth. Now it's quite nihilistic, of course, and it's quite ruthless in a way, everyone is, if you take it to its end, obviously every hipster must be first concerned with his own needs and pay [the minimum of] (very little) attention to the needs of others unless they happen to agree with his own. But what it does do that makes for a certain interest and vitality in American life is that it makes one redefine and relive all one's past experience and particularly all of one's present experience. And as a novelist, one of the reasons I'm quite obsessed with it, is that it turns morality inside out. And one's really got to learn how to write all over again which is the, I think, only interesting reason to stay a writer because if no one learns how to write, it gets pretty dull.

WILLIAM CLARK

And so we see dissent leading to disengagement, to men who express their disagreement with modern American society by ceasing to be part of it. It is this self-willed renunciation which I feel characterizes the widely but often falsely publicized Beat Generation. The oradle of the movement is 'way out west in

San Francisco, and the place where the cradle really rocks is Grant Avenue, a precipitous street full of bars, coffee-houses and hard-core Beats. The movement began about 12 years ago, when a handful of poets and painters decided—as they put it—to “disaffiliate” themselves from the pressures of American life. At times they erupt into parades like this one, held to celebrate the launching of a new publishing house in their district. The Procession culminates, like so many Beat evenings in a poetry reading. After the meeting we asked Bob Kaufman, who had addressed it, to sum up the Beat position, and his first response, reading from his own Abomunist Manifesto, was as extravagant and bizarre in its way as the night procession:

BOB KAUFMAN

The Abomunist Manifesto. Abomunists join nothing but their arms, legs, or other senses. Abomunists do not look at pictures painted by presidents and unemployed prime ministers. In times of national peril abomunists stand ready to drink themselves to death for their country. Abomunists will not feel pain no matter how much it hurts. Abomunists will not use the word “square” except when talking to squares. Abomunism was founded by Barabbas, inspired by his dying words “I wanted to be in the middle, but I went too far out.” Abomunism’s main function is to unite the soul with oatmeal cookies. Abomunists love love, hate hate, drink drinks, smoke smokes, live lives, die deaths. Abomunist writers write writing or nothing at all. Abomunists demand the reestablishment of the government in its rightful home at Disneyland.

WILLIAM CLARK

But asked later for a less “inside” explanation of the beat credo, he volunteered his.

BOB KAUFMAN

The artist in America has been trampled on for the past 30 years. First, by imported European ideas from France brought back by the expatriots and the authority of Ezra Pound over the poets and in the authorities by the leftists and proletarian writers who sort of submerged their individuality, in the Stalinist or Marxist ideology and somewhere along the line the individual artist was lost. And I think that what we’re looking for is a rediscovery of ourselves as artists and as people and in America it has become necessary to embrace some form of voluntary poverty and some form of voluntary ostracisation from society in order to sort of wipe out the dirt off your face and create some decent literature.

WILLIAM CLARK

The Beat network, or grapevine, threads its way back and forth across the American continent, zigzagging through Denver and Chicago, (Cincinnati,) Nevada and Ohio. On the other end of this sawtoothed axis, in Lower Manhattan, is Allen Ginsberg, one of the most internationally famous of the Beat poets.

GINSBURG (AND ORLOVSKY)

I’ll read a poem called “My Sad Self.”

“Sometimes when my eyes are red, I go up on top of the RCA Building and gaze at my world, Manhattan, my buildings, streets, my feats in lofts, beds, cold water flats; on Fifth Avenue below, which I also bear in mind, its ant cars; yellow taxis; men walking, the size of specks of wool; panorama of the bridges; sunrise over Brooklyn Machine; sun go down over New Jersey where I was born and Paterson where I played with ants, my later loves of 15th street, my greater loves of lower East Side, my once fabulous amours in the Bronx far away. Paths crossing in these hidden streets, my history summed up, my absences and ecstasies in Harlem, sun shining down on all I own in one eyeblink to the horizon.

WILLIAM CLARK

Ginsberg was joined in his regular cafe corner by Peter Orlovsky also a poet and sometimes called the “Beat Saint”. We asked them to define “Beat” poetry’s aim.

GINSBURG AND ORLOVSKY

To do it, not to define it for one thing. But to do what. Like there is a strange beauty in people and in the universe which is almost forgotten and almost sup-

pressed which you can see in the weird eyes of people looking at television cameras at times, if they look nakedly enough. It can be gassed out into poetry which can be communicated and which can be heard now and in a golden ear in Heaven. That's good. That's good, but what I like, I like poetry that smells, that has a smell to it. *What kind of smell?* Well, any kind of smell as long as I can look at a page and say "I smell something here". That's what I like.

Basically, so far, what we have done is attempted to construct a prosody that satisfied the rhythm of the American speech as distinguished from English speech. Which is to say we have had to invent our own measure of the line of poetry and construct a new organic form for the poetry. Basically, I would agree with that. But I believe that, and I would say that there is a cherry hanging from the inside of the skull of the mind that wants to light up like a red light bulb and flash out of the eye. It's that great final state that we're trying to arrive to.

Are we protesting? No, no, no. The quality of protest is—our quality is concerned with beauty and beauty never gets trapped in death. (Protest gets trapped in death, beauty never gets trapped in death.) Also let me give me a big literary answer—all the English and American criticism has been pretty incompetent. It has got hung up with all sorts of social ideas, hung over from the 30's, mostly jealous old liberals who have never made it into some area of beauty. The poetry is not primarily of protest, it is more an epiphany. It's like (a religious) [an] ecstasy has come to us and it is a quest finding a way of communicating.

WILLIAM CLARK

There is one point at which the Beats have found themselves unable or unwilling to disengage, to disaffiliate, not to care. The nuclear problem has involved their conscience. We see one direct result of its awareness in this poetic statement written two years ago, and spoken now by Laurence Ferlinghetti, whose San Francisco Beat bookshop is a landmark of the movement.

FERLINGHETTI

After it became obvious that the strange rain would never stop. And after it became obvious that the President was doing everything in his power to make the world safe for nationalism, his brilliant military mind never having realized that nationalism itself was the idiotic superstition which would blow up the world, and after it became obvious that the president nevertheless still carried (no matter where)—he went in the strange rain—a little (telegraph key which like a) can opener could be used instantly to open but not to close the hot box of final war. If not to waylay any stray asinine action by any stray asinine second lieutenant pressing any stray button anywhere, violet ray over an arctic ocean, thus illuminating the world once and for all, God Bless America. And after it became obvious that the law of gravity was still in effect, and that what blows up must come down on everyone including white citizens. And after it became obvious that the Voice of America was really the deaf ear of America, and that the President was unable to hear the under-privileged natives of the world shouting "No contamination without representation".

Then it was that the natives of the Republic began assembling in a driving rain from which there was no escape except peace.

And finally after everyone who was anyone and everyone who was no one had arrived, and after every soul was seated and waiting for the symbolic mushroom soup to be served and for the keynote speeches to begin, the President himself came in, took one look around and said "We resign".

WILLIAM CLARK

Still in San Francisco, and along Grant Avenue is the Bread and Wine Mission House, and here another beat poet recites from his own works and then explains his way of life.

PHILIP LAMANTIA

My name is Philip Lamantia. And I go around with whoever, which means all kinds of weird persons I like. Junkies, tricks, dummy poets, mads, hold-up men, squares, priests, monks, professional bums, beat Jews, Jew-haters, Spade-trumpet players, pot-heads, Zen nuts, [monks] Anti-spades, super gigolos, coke-heads, murderers, okie poets, smugglers, hippies, flips and black supremacy, white supremacy, and red Indian supremacy—*wild* ones. My myth is my people—They make grass grow on sky fire and who knows when the ghost of Edgar Allen

Poe lumins my nights. I'm high most of the time, the sickest of San Francisco all around me. I'm the sickest of San Francisco.

I want opium. Police confiscate opium. I want police to give me opium. I want them to stop busting non-criminals, people who want to recover their sense of being, dig, Searching for God, smoking marijuana, eating paodi. And because Chinese afraid of us, do not deny not smoke as mandarin, (shoot) [just] heroin; for we are all niggers and mandarins now. I'll buy all the (shake) [stock] of Chinatown. I'll buy all the junk of Oakland. I'll buy all. For I'm rich with the free gift of (grace) [grass] and the point precisely that if you haven't [made it to] (any other way to taste) Heaven, marijuana, cocoa, and opium make it for you. For me, when I'm in pain they take the pain away. If you are square, o.k., but stop pointing ignorant, stupid, scandal-fingers at me and getting us all locked up. If you are hip, you know what I signify. If you are listening you'll see me through the scales in my eyeballs, and weigh my words, well.

I made a few notes this morning about the beat and I have here something about avowing poverty and humility and extreme freedom from intellectual shackles and a direction by these people toward religions and enlightenment.

There was this other level to the beat that we all called apocalyptic. And yet, it was related to the sense of doom under the atomic age. Some of us became aware of (it then) [that] and I remember several people had visions of a great sunburst. This level was mostly related, as I say, to visions. Everyone was having visions at that time, one kind or another, and there was a vision exchanging thing that was going on too. In a broad sense, the only thing we did have in common and I suppose still have in common, is not having money. And also being interested in either Zen Buddhism, or as I personally am, in the mystical element of Christianity. And of course praying and generally accepting life as it is and (for me) not thinking in terms of any preconceived notions that were handed down to me by my teachers or mentors.

As far as rebellion—this of course brings up all sorts [of notions] of 19th century (notions) rebellion and I don't like that label and I don't like, I don't like the label "beatnik" which is contemptuous. Or the sinister, ghostly image that the mass of media had up until now has produced of us (in the U.S.A.) as a group of some sort of really subversive influence. Our visions may be interpretable as subversive, that is for you to decide, but we don't really consider ourselves anything particularly revolutionary—or revolutionary only, in the (old) sense that Christ himself was a revolutionary \* \* \*. Leave it there.

WILLIAM CLARK

As I said, that was the Bread and Wine Mission. A house of religion. What does the Minister of the Mission think of the Beat Movement.

DE LATTRE

I think many people will say it's not a movement. But I see an underlying movement that is there, primarily centered on the rebellion against conventional society. A feeling that conventional society has become predominately pre-occupied with the acquisition of material goods and that we have become more and more identified with our "props", all the things we have in the world. There's also a rebellion against the predominately rationalistic and analytical way of approaching life. Life is a problem to be solved, a series of steps carefully planned out. The whole enlightenment period which began long ago is reaching its culmination in a highly organized planned life which is losing its spontaneity. So the people here are trying to rediscover the roots of (intuition) [intention] and to discover the emotional spontaneous ground which gives vitality to life.

Our lives are very planned, but very dull and (only) joyless. And I think North Beach is an area of great celebration despite the propaganda about its deadness. It's an area that celebrates life and it tries to find a beautiful attitude towards life.

Here at the mission what we're trying to do is simply to respond to the creative urge in people, to expose people to creative acts, to respond to their rebellion and encourage them not to adjust to conventional society, which I think is every bit as corrupt as they say it is and which I myself rebel against but try to get them to carry their rebellion full course if they can, which means not just creating a more grotesque form of the thing they rebel against as many people here do. For instance, they rebel against material acquisitiveness and they'll then become emotionally acquisitive starting wanting to get their kicks, still wanting to hoard their emotions to themselves.

WILLIAM CLARK

And what as a minister of the Church, does he think of the fairly frequent references to the use of drugs.

DE LATTRE

Well, many people use narcotics in order to gain insight into what they feel is a deeper reality, even to see the face of God, as some of them have put it. I personally feel that one cannot arrive at this by dependency or by putting oneself in the hands of—passively—in an external agent such as a narcotic but I think that the impulse toward the deeper insight and a feeling of being separated from the deeper dimension of feeling and dynamic in life is a very real thing and that people are driven to these (extremes) [Extremes] as only a sign of the tremendous frustration of superficial, materialistic values which they've been living in.

WILLIAM CLARK

A few years ago a young Californian named Mort Sahl made a name for himself with a new style of comedy based on social and political comment. He appeared recently at New York's Copacabana—where comedians appear only when they've definitely arrived—

He had taken a long jump from San Francisco's nursery of offbeat performers, the famous "hungry i" nightclub. On the morning after his first night in New York we asked him how he became a nonconformist.

MORT SAHL

By default because the entire [standards of] society kept changing, I mean it's flexible to a point of having no standards and you just watch it change and I'm not at all that flexible. I'm a little more rigid and I have just learned to reason, so I'm kind of hooked on that and I can't change that fast so I have found that I'm standing out in bold relief to a group of people who have gone on to another point so I guess by definition, I'm a nonconformist.

I don't want to evade my responsibilities as an individual—that's the thing. I mean as an individual morality, that's to say, I appreciate changing the structure of society and most people see me as a really troubled member of the community. They have a vision of me agitating until the election, and if it comes out not to my liking, I'll go on being a social critic on the stage, or if it comes out to my liking, I'm sure they think I'm going to climb on a horse and say "Well, I'll be riding on to the next country now." But it isn't like that. I'm really, I do realize that you have to relate individually and relate is a psychoanalytic term—I'm not in analysis, I want to make that clear—hanging around with too many actors—but I think in other words you sort of find that while you were changing the world you shouldn't have to come home and suddenly discover that you're in bed with an assassin. That's the thing. But I'd like to see a better intellectual climate and not because I'm an intellectual but because I'm a spectator, and (for myself,) I do realize that your fate does not lie in Zen-Buddhism or in environmental structure or in psychoanalysis, it lies in relating to one girl. I become obsessive about that sometimes. I think about it and it depresses me and people don't know why I'm depressed. It's because I have a very high ideal of a perfect woman, and if I don't find her I'm very troubled and people run up to me with short-term goals and they say "We just got stereophonic sound" or "We're going to Europe" and then they don't understand when I say to them "It won't help".

WILLIAM CLARK

Mort Sahl began his career among the beats and had a few opinions about their way of life.

MORT SAHL

I'm not in favor of anarchy. I think the world is worth saving and I expect that if a guy writes a book on nihilism obviously the fact that he sat down and organized the text means he's reasonably positive. I don't believe in disengagement but I do believe that these guys and I'm talking about Kerouac, Ginsberg and some others, I believe that they are, well, I'd say that their tempo is right for themselves and in that sense they're not only as good as the society, they're much better than the society. That's what I think. Their tempo is right for them. How many people can say that?

WILLIAM CLARK

Much better than society. There seem to be very few organized societies that accept his attitude. In a moment, we'll see what penalties society—the state that is can inflict when it thinks dissent has been carried to extremes.

WILLIAM CLARK

So far, we've been dealing with people who criticized the American way of life or chose to withdraw from it. Some Americans have gone further—challenged it, willing to take the consequences, including gaol.

First, Arnold Johnson of New York, who was imprisoned on the charge of spreading advocacy of the overthrow of the American government by force.

ARNOLD JOHNSON

I happen to be just one of the 28 Communists who served time in prison just because of my ideas, or almost even more accurately as to what some paid stool pigeon said were my ideas (not even my ideas). That was true with all the others. At the present time, there are three Communist leaders who are in Federal prisons for their ideas. There are others who are also political prisoners, such as Puerto Rican nationalists, conscientious objectors, and others. Actually and truly all these people should be free and there should be an end to this kind of political persecution within America. These attacks that are made upon us finally curb the liberties of others—curb their academic freedom, their willingness to discuss questions, make them cautious and all these things. Then in addition to this group, there is a grouping of people who were born in other countries, came to this country in their early years and in this recent period faced deportation, exile, banishment. You know, when I was in prison I took the time to read the plays of Shakespeare. I got a copy of the so-called "First Folio." I was impressed with one simple thing, time and again Shakespeare, more than 325 years ago, was constantly agitating against banishment, in his plays, speaking about it as being one of the worst forms of punishment. And to think that that method has been revived to the extent it was stressed in the United States, well, that should all be changed. America would be far better off if it were to welcome back to its shores those whom it banished.

WILLIAM CLARK

Next, someone who seems to have inherited a fair measure of the inflexible attitudes of the Pilgrim Fathers, the Reverend Maurice McCrackin of Cincinnati.

REV. MAURICE M'CRACKIN

In 1945, I came to Cincinnati and became a cold pastor of the Western Cincinnati St. Barnabus Church, working in a very underprivileged area in the West end of Cincinnati, and because the children had special needs, the people in the churches in the community would send toys for us to distribute. And so I was always very careful to take out any toys that were guns, or any other military toys and it came to me that this is only a pious gesture when at the same time I was giving a large proportion of money each year for the purchase of live guns to put in somebody's hands to actually kill somebody. And so in my income tax returns for 1948, I indicated that I was no longer able to pay the total amount. In 1949, I withheld 70% which went to military expenditures. And then following years through 1954 I withheld 80%, telling the Government that I would like to pay the civilian tax but the other I wanted to use for causes that I believed were making for peace. From 1955 I have not filed any income tax. I have been asked by the Government on a number of occasions to come in and discuss the matter, my nonpayment. I would often write to them and say that I felt nothing would be accomplished by it, that my position was clear and that I felt that the pressure that they were bringing on me to pay this money was a coercion of my conscience and I could not in good faith pay something which I believed was wrong, nor could I help them in any way or cooperate with them in the collection of this money.

I was arrested on September 12th, just a little over a year ago [by] Judge Guthel, the District Federal Judge who through the years has been very hard on those who have conscience objective beliefs. First of all he said that I should be examined by psychiatrists to see whether I was able to face the trial and was competent. He then sent me to jail until I had purged myself of contempt and

I had no feeling of guilt and would take no such action, but I was held in the county jail on three different occasions and was brought to trial on the charge of refusing to obey a summons and to bring information. And I was sentenced on December 12th, a year ago, and more now. And I was for a period of six months [of this year] and [was] sent to [Allenwood] Pennsylvania, which is part of the Lewisburg penitentiary system and after serving an extra month because I was unwilling to sign a pauper's oath or to pay the fine, I was released on May 29th. I do not know whether the government will again take custody of my body, but God being my helper, the government shall never take possession of my conscience, nor of my spirit.

WILLIAM CLARK

Then Dalton Trumbo, who was one of the famous Hollywood Ten who went to jail for refusing to recognize the Constitutional right of a Congressional Committee to quiz them about their beliefs or affiliations.

Mr. Trumbo is a screenwriter. Lately he has been working on the script of a new spectacular film "Spartacus" starring Kirk Douglas, Charles Laughton, Peter Ustinov and Sir Laurence Olivier \* \* \* but it is not yet known whether Trumbo's name will appear on the credit titles. (But in the past few days, Otto Preminger, one of the best-known Hollywood producers, has defiantly announced that come what may, he will use Trumbo as writer in the film version of Uris's "Exodus.")

DALTON TRUMBO

The problem is that unorthodox opinions are forbidden in Hollywood. The motion picture industry for the past 12 years has worked under the curious theory that the private lives and thoughts and affiliations and associations of each of its employees is a matter of public concern, of corporate concern and of Congressional concern. This misapprehension of constitutional virtues in our country has resulted in a committee in the Congress called the Un-American Activities Committee, asserting unto itself the power to summon all persons in public life and particularly the entertainment areas of public life because there lies such a rich harvest of publicity for these squalid inquisitors. They summon the person, he is asked to answer, and compelled under law to answer questions relating to his associations, to his thoughts, to his opinions, to his political affiliations and to his writings. For example, one of the charges in my dossier in this committee was an ironic line I had written in a wartime script in which Ginger Rogers said, "Share and share alike, that's democracy." This I was called upon to explain and I declined not only that explanation but all others as involving and concerning no one but myself. The result if you take this course of action, can well be that you are indicted by Federal Grand Jury, arraigned for trial, placed under bond, tried, convicted; everybody (gets) [was] convicted; sentenced to jail, spend a year in jail, you pay your fine and you come out to discover that you are banned in any way from participation in your profession by the motion picture industry itself. Some 235 artists in the United States have been under this ban from 12 to 7 years. Writers occasionally have been able to hide their heretical identity by assuming other names. The actors, the actresses and the directors have been destroyed. (One of the \_\_\_\_\_ that has befallen citizens in the country has been the cold war and the way it has paralyzed honest Americans—the Americans who consider themselves liberals.)

There is a conservative point of view that always refuses to yield to change and seeks to impede it. But there has always been in this country a liberal point of view which has welcomed change. The hysteria in this country of the cold war and McCarthy, now subsiding, luckily, has not troubled the Republicans or the Democrats and the Liberal, the progressives who formerly were the initiators of advance in this country. You can call today a Republican a Communist and he'll laugh at you. You call a Democrat a Communist<sup>1</sup> and he will faint dead away. The result is that liberal speech in this country has acquired a preface which is mandatory. You arise to speak as a Liberal and you say, "Now mind you I'm not a Communist, and mind you I bow to no one in my hatred of the Soviet Union, and I loathe all local Communists, but really, we ought to have better housing in this country." The thing is not advocated for its virtue, its rightness, for the goodness it may bring to humankind, and even to American humankind if one wishes to be exclusive, the thing is advocated for reasons of political expediency.

<sup>1</sup> The following is inked in at this point: "and he'll turn pale; but call a liberal a Communist."

[There is only one dissenting force of any consequence at all, and that is the Negro people. The seventeen million Negroes in this country have moved. What they have achieved has not been given to them. Although again the liberal will say we must stop the Soviet Union from pointing a finger at our Negro people and their condition. Therefore, as a weapon against communism, let us free them, let them live, let our children sit down beside them because it would help us in a political war. This has not helped the Negro people. They have been helped by their own efforts, by their own organizations, by their own courage, by the intelligence of their own leaders.]

WILLIAM CLARK

This is Mr. Trumbo summing up the state of dissent in America today.

DALTON TRUMBO

(I should like to see labour unfettered by the restrictions that have been placed upon it by the Government and employers.) I should like to see a greater participation of all people in all of the wealth of the country. I presume you would say that ultimately and ideally I should like to see in this country the circumstances of socialism—of socialism without jails.

WILLIAM CLARK

The Press is of course another medium of organized protest and a fairly active one, but big newspapers are close to big business, so that dissenters sometimes find themselves moving from the journalistic "big-time" to small papers.

Here is David Wesley, who gave up a career on a very big national paper to help edit the local "Gazette and Daily" of York, Pennsylvania. Here, on one of his rare visits to New York, he told us what the Gazette stood for.

DAVID WESLEY

Well, we stand for nothing very radical or unusual except what you might call old Jeffersonian Democracy, I suppose. But it's perhaps a comment on what's happened in our society culturally and socially that this does make us stand out and be even liable to be called nonconformists. This is a commercial society. It is really no longer a producing society, it's a selling society. We produce so easily and so well that the problem for the producers is to sell their product. When you sell anything you have to sell it with words. The producers have to sell words and this is very much what has been happening \* \* \*. They take a word and wrap it up in a very attractive package (and put it on the counter) and sell it. But words are not reality, words are not things, they stand for things. Words merely represent things. But people today are responding to words as if they were things and this means that they are living on the symbolic level. And people who live on the symbolic level are, by definition, "divorced from reality."

We're not so much in the business of producing things, our big producers, but in making money. Money is not reality. A dollar bill is just a scrap of paper, of course, so here again, at the very core of our society, we're living on a symbolic level [we all do.] (—just as the mentally ill do). And that's why even though we have an affluent society, it perhaps can best be characterized by a vast accumulation of junk. And this is not only true of the cars we drive, or the houses we live in, or the bread we eat, but the plays we see and the movies or television shows we watch, and even most of the books we read. And it also explains the really stunning tragedy of the society at this particular time. Here in America, why, we have freedom of speech and nothing very meaningful to say, and freedom of the press and no press worthy of the name—practically all newspapers again are motivated by money, not by the responsibilities of journalism; freedom of petition and assembly and who assemblies, who petitions? And freedom from want and nothing very worthwhile to buy actually. This is really a considerable human retrogression in a period of what should be great human progress and what in many ways, is.

WILLIAM CLARK

Another place where protest can be encouraged, where dissent is tolerated, is the Universities. We've already visited Columbia. Now we go to Harvard to question the celebrated economist Kenneth Galbraith. You'll have noticed that many people so far have challenged the whole direction of the American economy. Of course, it is the most productive in the whole world, but \* \* \*.



KENNETH GALBRAITH

The question that all of this begs, of course, is production for what? What do we use these goods for? And when we begin to examine this question, it does seem to me that production, simple expansion of output, does leave a lot of important questions unsolved and has left a great many important questions unsolved. For example, we see the great contrast between the opulence of our private consumption, our automobiles, our houses, our furniture, and so forth; and the poverty of our public services, the poverty of our schools and of our street sanitation establishments, our cities are by no means as clean as they should be—of the poor quality of our city planning, the problem of urban sprawl. All of these other things which side by side with our virtuosity in the production of private goods, are causing us a great difficulty. A person devises a new product now that takes for granted that he must also devise the strategy for making people want it. So what do we see? We see the process of satisfying wants creates the demonstration that causes other people to want it. And it also nurtures the want itself. So what do we have? We have a kind of squirrel-wheel effect in which, by [our] satisfying wants we create wants, and in the process of satisfying those, we create more. Well, as I've said before, and I suppose there is a no worse habit for a writer, a scholar, than to plagiarize himself, the squirrel wheel is not the best possible model for the good society, is it?

My own view of the problem of remedy is that in the first instance it requires that we recognize that successful capitalism requires a very large public sector, a very large role for the service of the state. Private capitalism has been assumed by its prophets to flourish when government was small. I think all of the evidence shows that private capitalism flourishes and is tolerable only as the role of the state is large.

WILLIAM CLARK

The Trade Unions of course are powerful organizations in America but you may remember Professor Mills at the beginning pointed out that the large Unions, big labour, were relatively conservative. But the tradition of economic dissent, in spite of American prosperity is sharply reflected in many of the smaller—and as they're sometimes called, lefter—unions.

Here, Clinton Jencks, in San Francisco, President of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, tells something of his past, and his hopes for future action by American organized labour.

CLINT JENCKS

I was born and raised in the Rocky Mountains in Colorado, in the Western part of America. Where the country is one mainly of mining—coal mining and metal mining whose traditions are rich in labour history and I remember one of my sharpest memories as a boy, was of the struggles of the coal miners. There in my area, where we had a long and bitter strike which ended in a vigilante lynching of one of the strike leaders.

I remember another thing sharply from when I was young, that our great war time President Franklin Roosevelt said: He said, "I see a third of a nation ill housed, ill clothed, and ill fed." And even though, as a result of the war, the American worker has become one of the highest paid and most affluent in the world, still right down here in this beautiful city of San Francisco there are thousands who are living in slums. There are untold thousands who don't have enough to eat. When out in our productive, rich valley there is food in the fields; we're paying millions of dollars for surplus food storage that's rotting in warehouses, when people are hungry. There are long lines at the employment office every day and workers who want to work and can find no jobs. I don't think this is right, I don't think it is necessary and I think something can be done about it. And it's been my continued work and it's now through my union and in [part] (the) community to try to see if we can't so organize ourselves that these riches can be more fairly shared because there are need for all those brains and all those hands. There is [just] (food) enough for everybody, wealth enough for everybody. We have to find how to organize ourselves so that we can all participate in it.

Here, I must say, that we can certainly take a page from our brothers in Britain because they have a labour party, we have none here. So it is our hope that we will become more active politically, that we will have our own political party. We found that the other way just doesn't work, it doesn't get the job done. Now, there are a lot of people that disagree with that. But I feel strongly that the road shown by the trade unions in Britain is one that we definitely have to follow and

follow soon if we're to carry out our responsibilities to our own people and the responsibilities I think we have (too) as citizens of the world.

WILLIAM CLARK

One method of influencing dissent in America is lobbying—a concerted attempt to convert legislators and voters to your particular point of view. Dissent has its lobbyists too and here is one who works through these channels in both California and Washington. Trevor Thomas.

TREVOR THOMAS

For the past seven years I have been involved in a kind of political activity that has its origin in the religious Society of Friends. Friends, for some 300 years, has been concerned with the society that they find themselves in and of course have always attempted to search for nonviolent means of solving not only personal, neighborhood, but international conflicts.

The whole war and peace matter of course is reflected I think in our political life by what one person has called the "bipartisan euphoria." I have in mind, for instance, the perennial action by Congress in condemning and of course in proud and patriotic terms it's very difficult to disagree with, condemning Communist Chinese and saying, never, under any conditions, will we allow recognition by the United States or membership in the United Nations. I believe that Communist China must be recognised and the group that I work with has attempted to point out the advantages of doing this, of bringing Communist China within the United Nations.

[One of the things we have done in this state is to lead a campaign to abolish the death penalty as one facet of an overall revision of the penal system. Some of the things that were recommended just the last century have still not yet been done, and we're still not tailoring the sentences, the punishment if necessary, to the men. The death penalty lies at the bottom of this and we want to get rid of it.]

In this country we have a long history of opposition to universal military training, conscription of all young men. And yet under the impact of the cold war, these past few years, the protest has been less and less, to the point where in the last session of Congress there was virtually no protest to the Bill which extended the selected [training] (service) act.<sup>2</sup> But I do believe that we're going to have to look back to our historical precedents and to understand that the fastening of Universal Military Training on the necks of the people is very often the prelude to the very Prussian system that many of our ancestors came to this country to avoid.

CLARK

The dissenting churches which helped to found America have remained strongholds of crusading nonconformism, not only religious but political and social.

The Reverend Stephen Fritchman is the minister of the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles. We asked whether the church still carried out this function of dissent.

THE REV. STEPHEN FRITCHMAN

(Paragraph omitted.)

Very much so. We the Unitarian Church where I'm the Minister are working in the area not only of domestic problems here in this country, but we feel very much that a religion worth its salt at all is concerned with greater chances of survival of the human race, we are interested in the stopping of atomic tests, on the whole the liberal churches, the dissenting churches, my own included, are dedicated to the end of the war, colonial war, and all wars. And we are equally interested in the problems at our own doorstep of juvenile delinquency, of racial equality, of the rights of women, of the end of censorship, of real intellectual and social and religious freedom for the human spirit.

WILLIAM CLARK

What kind of opposition had he encountered.

<sup>2</sup>Selective Service Act.

## FRITCHMAN

The churches in America from the beginning have had a nonconformist role. In the days of Roger Williams in Rhode Island and Ann Hutchinson in New York, in the days of Tom Paine and Tom Jefferson, the colonists, later the states, gave the churches, after a lot of struggle, the role of dissenter and we have taken vigorous advantage of it over the years. In theology and in politics and in economics, as we settled the country, we settled our minds on a lot of matters.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has subpoenaed me once or twice, I have found getting transport, getting a passport difficult in years past, though I recently returned from a peace congress in Stockholm, and I would say the greatest obstacle that my congregation and I have faced was that of having to resist a state loyalty oath back in 1954, which we did successfully in four years, going through the channels of the courts to Washington, and maintaining that tradition that we referred to earlier of absolute and complete separation of church and state. The right to preach and pray and act as we please as advocates of religious freedom.

## WILLIAM CLARK

Perhaps the commonest expression of dissent in America consists in forming a special limited group of citizens to help educate and persuade others that a clear-cut reform is needed somewhere in the community. One such group is the Mattachine Society, the aims of which are explained by its director of publications, Harold Call.

## HAROLD CALL

Well, the Mattachine Society is an organization of laymen which is endeavouring to educate the general public and the homosexual about the problems of homosexuality in our culture today as well as a number of other problems concerning sex deviation and the adjustments thereto.

Our programme in a nutshell is to advocate a change of law in our 50 states which will make it no longer criminal when adults engage in sexual activity in private where both partners are willing and where there is no harm or force involved.

There is quite an antisexual attitude in the United States. We're not just an antihomosexual country. (In many ways we're an antisexual country.) However, on the other hand, we're a very hypocritical country about it because for instance almost everything in our advertising in connection with almost any product, whether it's food or an automobile or an automatic washing machine or a cosmetic or whatever else is designed to make everyone more sexually attractive it seems, and more rested, so he is or she is enabled to enjoy the act of sex. Yet we come right up to a wall where we say beyond this, when you're ready, we must not go.

Dr. Alfred Kinsey, when he looks at the sexual foibles of a country like ours, can see some fun in it perhaps. He said that, at a lecture in San Francisco in February 1957, he said "Ladies and Gentlemen, if all the sex laws of the State of California were rigidly enforced 95 percent of you wouldn't be here tonight—you'd be in jail." Dr. Kinsey was right because the sex laws in this country are such that they would touch just about everyone.

## WILLIAM CLARK

Mr. Call had this to say about the future of the society's campaign.

## HAROLD CALL

I think that because of the attention that's being given (in England) today to the recommendations of the Wolfenden Committee that there's a good chance there'll be some action of this particular committee's recommendations within the next few years and after that I think then the subject will start drawing more widespread and serious attention in this country and we do have a chance.

## WILLIAM CLARK

From private life to global survival, the committee for the sane nuclear policy was set up to work for the cause of nuclear disarmament. Its national chairman is Norman Cousins, the Editor of The Saturday Review. Here he tells us of his own position vis-a-vis the nuclear problem.

NORMAN COUSINS

I happen to believe a sane nuclear policy begins when we take the flat position that we would rather die ourselves than to drop these bombs on human beings. Other members of the committee believe that we have to have some basis for enforceable agreement. That Unilateralism won't work. But whatever our disagreements, we do agree on this: that it becomes the solemn responsibility and obligation of all the nations in the world, I'm not mentioning any one nation, it becomes the solemn responsibility of all the nations in the world to recognize that human life is now endangered.

It is endangered not only [through them] because of the threat of war, it is endangered by the existence of the steps that we take to achieve security. Because even in the act of testing these weapons we jeopardize the peace and the future.

Now some people for example, some scientists, say only a small number of people will die as the result of nuclear testing, that there'll be just a fractional increase in the leukemia rate. Now, that is true, but it might also be pointed out that the people who die are real people. And I suppose that if you were to see a parade of 25,000 to 50,000 people who died each year of leukemia or other diseases induced by Strontium 90 in their bones and tissue, and if you could see a parade of these real people, we would not say that this is just a small fraction. We believe in a world under law. We believe in a world under justice. We have to begin someplace. The human race cannot long survive on anarchy. The beginning of sanity we believe will be marked by the beginning of law on earth.

WILLIAM CLARK

Our last speaker for institutional nonconformity is Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic, a non-profit-making organization subsidized by the Ford Foundation dedicated to the single educational purpose of preserving and defending civil rights in America.

ROBERT HUTCHINS

The Fund found in the course of its experience as a Foundation giving away money to uphold Civil liberties, civil rights, that it suffered two difficulties. One was the McCarthy era then at its height. It made it almost impossible for anybody to talk about freedom or justice without being suspected of being a Communist and the other was the general confusion in the American society about what freedom and justice in the contemporary world could mean.

The primitive notion about democracy on which we were brought up, is that everybody can do something about everything.

When you find that because your labour union is now bureaucratic, the corporation that you work for is bureaucratic, when you find that the industrial machine has mechanized everybody, you begin to believe that there is after all nothing you can do about anything.

Well, as Aristotle once remarked, "Men do not deliberate about things that are beyond their power."

I don't believe that an active nonconformity can bring about anything except the most important thing, which is the continuation of the dialogue. The more one studies these matters and the more one observes the course of contemporary institutions, the more one comes to believe that this is the (heart) [height] of the matter. If the dialogue can continue, if the dialogue can be reasonably independent, if we can work towards what might be called the (civilization) [evaluation] of the dialogue, in which we don't expect to push anybody around but in which we expect to listen and be listened to in turn—perhaps this is the kind of civilization we want.

Transcript of end discussion of "We Dissent"<sup>3</sup> follows:)

WILLIAM CLARK

(Following Robert Hutchins, Fund for the Republic.)

"The kind of civilisation we want." Well, clearly, from what we've seen tonight a lot of Americans do not feel they have got the civilisation they want. They find it too acquisitive, too materialistic, too commercialized. They complain that there is no radical thinking, no real opposition party, no real radical leader, too

<sup>3</sup> The first transcript received by the subcommittee did not contain the four paragraphs following the comments by Robert Hutchins.

much apathy. We've heard this evening attacks on American conformity, on the need to appear like everyone else, the dangers of dissent. Is this all there is to be said? Well, it's getting late now, but we intend to continue the dialogue, in Bob Hutchins' phrase, in my regular "Right to Reply" spot on Friday. But before we do break, I would like to introduce the two participants in that programme, who've been with me here watching in the studio. First of all is Professor Eugene Rostow, from Yale University in America, who is over here at Cambridge for a year, an American in England, and secondly, Graham Hutton, an Englishman who spent many years in America and who has been there fairly recently. Well, to begin with I'd like to ask you, Rostow, do you think that Americans really need a right to reply to a programme like this?

EUGENE ROSTOW

Oh, not at all, not at all. I don't think this programme was unfavourable to America. Of course it doesn't present the whole story, but it didn't purport to do that. It presented a very interesting and very significant part of the story of American life, I should say. Part of it is the group of Bohemians, the left bank group who were repeating now what has always been done by Bohemians, trying in terms of personal experience to symbolize some of the problems everybody faces in living. They do it with greater or less success. I don't know whether any of them will emerge as new James Joyces or new Ernest Hemingways, but nonetheless that's one important function. The others, many of the other speakers, I should class those who were not too far out in extreme positions as participants in the dialogue through which we live.

WILLIAM CLARK

Hutton, what would you say?

GRAHAM HUTTON

Well, the thing that struck me most about it all was that this was not just dissent from Americanism. There seems to be so much emphasis all the time as if it were dissent from Americanism. When Galbraith was talking, for example, about the affluent society, goodness gracious, the society of France or Germany is affluent compared to that of an underdeveloped country. They'd trade their situation for a quarter of what the French have got, and for a fifteenth of what the Americans have got, and the Russians have got Beatniks and the Russians have got the same problems and no doubt there's a minority there that feels like it, but I must say what impressed me most of all was the thought that the United States and United Kingdom can do a programme like this and I'd almost give an eye tooth, Rostow, to see a ninety-minute programme on the Beatniks of Britain, and the minority of Britain, and I could pick a very good list of the cast. I'd like to hear instead of Mailer and Hutchins and the people over there, in America, I'd like to hear Alan Taylor and John Osborne and Bessie Braddock and Michael Foot and so on and so forth all the way through. It'd make a wonderful programme. But it's a protest and a dissent against something which is common to the whole of this way of living.

WILLIAM CLARK

Well, I think that you're probably right, Hutton, and Rostow, that this is in fact something much deeper than merely an American phenomenon. We are facing, in fact, now something which is really at the root of our affluent society, the society of the West. We can't go on with that now but on Friday night I hope we really can get down to this matter of how far it really is true that there is a protest in our society and in American society about this state of affairs. Well, till Friday night then. Goodnight.

---

#### APPENDIX IV

(The following letter which had been requested by the subcommittee (p. 11) was found by Mr. Beals after considerable search

through his files. It reached the committee, however, too late to be incorporated in his testimony:)

*Exhibit No. 4*

APRIL 12.

DEAR BEALS: Thanks for your letter and the card, mailed separately. I think that I've already covered your questions, in my letter of the 9th. But just to reassure you on several points:

1. UPI's report was based on a misunderstanding. It was not *our* group, but another, which met in the Consulate on April 1st. We had been invited to join. I sent my wife and Dick Gibson to make clear our position: Cuban-American friendship groups are fine and we're for them. However, we don't wish to merge with anyone, and we think it best to limit membership in our Committee to U.S. citizens, for obvious reasons. The report has been denied—by me, and by the Consul (today).

2. Communism. No one on the Committee has had any political affiliation of any kind, to my knowledge. No one of the invited or actual sponsors of the Times ad is a Communist. Sartre may have been, at one time. If so, the Daily Mirror did not mention it, as they almost certainly would have done.

To summarize: we are not a lobby for anyone, except to the extent that trying to disseminate the *truth* about a cause which we consider good can be construed as lobbying. Certainly we are not *paid* lobbyists. On the contrary, we are all digging into our own pockets, to conduct this campaign.

I think your reasons for not wishing to be cochairman are all quite valid. Certainly your wishes will be respected. As I explained on the telephone last week, we were thinking only in terms of an *honorary* position, for the purposes of the Times advertisement, and are very grateful to you for lending the considerable prestige of your name and good will for that purpose. Of course it would have been good to have you in a more than honorary role, but the problem is very clear.

For the future, in any event, I do hope that you'll continue to take an interest, even if from a distance. And if you know of anyone in your area who'd like to take on the task of actively organizing a chapter of the Committee—that would be wonderful. As I told you, we've been getting a fine response—more than a thousand letters to date, quite a few entirely unsolicited contributions, and also quite a few offers of voluntary help. Quite encouraging, all in all. Incidentally, Alan Sagner, who really got the ball rolling on this thing, has just returned from his first visit to Havana, and he's most enthusiastic. Says he's *shocked* by the contrast between actuality and reportage here, even though he had felt all along that the entire picture was not being presented in this country.

That's all for the time being. Best regards, and again many thanks for your help and moral support from

Yours very truly,

BOB TABER,  
R. B. T.

118 West 79th St., New York 24, N.Y.

# INDEX

---

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

## A

	Page
All China Federation of Democratic Youth .....	73
Almedia .....	47
American Committee to Investigate Labor and Social Conditions in Cuba ..	8
American Socialist Party .....	107
American Youth delegation .....	74
Aptheker, Herbert .....	63
Associated Television Limited, London .....	56, 57, 104
ATV. (See Associated Television Limited.)	

## B

Baldwin, James .....	6
Bank of Cuba .....	46
Bates, Mr. ....	52
Batista .....	45, 78
Batistaite .....	8
Beals, Carleton .....	25, 31, 35, 40, 78
Testimony of .....	1-11
"Biography of a Revolution" (book) .....	97
Bisbé, Prof. Manuel (chief permanent delegate of Cuban mission to U.N.) ..	42, 81
"Blood on the Sugar" (pamphlet) .....	9
Board of Passport Appeals .....	74
Boston University .....	8
Boudin, Leonard .....	11, 13, 88
Attorney for Robert Taber .....	13
Boudin, Rabinowitz & Boudin .....	11-13
Braddock, Bessie .....	121
Brandeis, Justice .....	106
Bridges (Harry) Victory Committee .....	9
British Television Network .....	56
Broadway Season (magazine) .....	63
Brooklyn contractor .....	10
Brown, Frank London .....	6
Burov, Nicolai .....	71

## C

Call, Harold .....	119
Capote, Truman .....	6, 56
"Castro's Cuba," text of article by Robert Taber in The Nation (exhibit 7) .....	97-104
Castro, Fidel .....	4, 8, 46, 49, 55, 78
Castro government .....	50, 87
Castro, Raul .....	46, 47, 51
CBS (Columbia Broadcasting System) .....	1, 7, 13, 33, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52
Chase National Bank .....	53
China .....	74
China, Communist .....	73
China, Red .....	71
Chou En-lai (Premier of Communist China) .....	71, 72, 74
Christian Century (publication) .....	8
Cienfuegos, Camilo .....	46
Clark, William .....	105-121

	Page
Clarke, John Henrik .....	6
Colodny, Prof. Robert G .....	6
Columbia Broadcasting System. (See CBS.) .....	
Columbia University .....	105, 106, 116
"Coming Struggle for Latin America, The" (book) .....	7
Communist Party .....	58
Communist Party of Great Britain .....	54
Communist Party, U.S.A. .... 26, 40, 51, 54, 57, 58, 63, 69, 70	
Harlem Youth section .....	74
Communist Youth Festival .....	71
Communist Youth Organization .....	70
Community Church .....	40
Community Church of N.Y., Social Action Committee of .....	35
Congress Party at Lucknow, India Youth Section of the .....	74
Connolly, Paul R., Jr. (counsel for Santos-Buch) .....	77, 78
Cornell Medical Center .....	77
Cornell University .....	77
Cousins, Norman .....	59, 61, 119, 120
Critics' Circle .....	64
Crosbie, Paul .....	8
Cuban consulate in NYC .....	75
Cuban Embassy .....	7, 41-43, 70
Cuban Government .....	4, 5, 10, 47, 50
Cuban mission to U.N. .... 43, 45, 80, 81	
"Cuban Revolution: Crisis in the Americas, The" lecture topic .....	35
"Culture in Trouble" (article) .....	63
Current History (publication) .....	7

## D

Daily Worker .....	27
Davis, Benjamin .....	40
de Beauvoir, Simone .....	6, 56
De Latre (Minister of "Bread & Wine" Mission) .....	112, 113
Dennis, Eugene .....	40
Diners' Club .....	64
Dodd, Senator Thomas J .....	1, 13
Douglas, Kirk .....	115
Driscoll, David .....	33, 34

## E

Eisenhower, President .....	35
El Prado (Cuban restaurant) .....	78, 90
Exhibit No. 1. Letter to Carleton Beals from Robert Taber, February 9, 1960. .... 3	
Exhibit No. 2. Letter to Robert Taber from Carleton Beals, April 5, 1960. .... 4	
Exhibit No. 3. New York Times advertisement re Fair Play for Cuba Committee .....	6
Exhibit No. 4. Beal's correspondence with Taber .....	11, 122
Exhibit No. 5. "How I Came to Communism: Symposium," by Waldo Frank .....	27, 93-96
Exhibit No. 6. Letter to "Dear Friend" signed Marjorie More re Fair Play for Cuba Committee .....	35
Exhibit No. 7. Fair Play, volume 1, No. 1, April 29, 1960 .....	36-39
Exhibit No. 8. "Castro's Cuba," by Robert Taber in the Nation .....	40, 97-104
Exhibit No. 9. Letter from Vincent Redding, New York Times, to Benjamin Mandel .....	51-52
Exhibit No. 10. Transcript of TV program "We Dissent," Associated Television Limited, London .....	66, 104
Exhibit No. 11. Picture of Joanne Grant and others with Chou En-lai, Red China Premier .....	72
Exhibit No. 12. Statement on Joanne Grant prepared by Passport Division of State Department .....	73
Exhibit No. 13, 13-A. Photostats of checks which paid for advertisement in New York Times .....	83-85
"Exodus" (movie) .....	115



## F

	Page
"Fair Play" (pamphlet)-----	35, 69
Fair Play for Cuba Committee-----	1-121
Fecteau, Richard George-----	73
Feiffer, Jules-----	107
Ferlinghetti, Laurence-----	111
Fernandez, Marcella-----	50
Fifth amendment-----	68, 76
First amendment-----	16, 20, 28, 29, 68, 76, 86-89
Foot, Michael-----	121
Ford Foundation-----	120
Frank, Waldo-----	3-7, 17, 18, 24-27, 31, 35, 69, 71, 78, 93-96
Fritchman, Rev. Stephen-----	58, 118, 119
Fund for the Republic-----	120

## G

Gaillard, Albert-----	74
Galbraith, Kenneth-----	116, 117, 121
"Gazette and Daily" of York, Pa-----	116
Gibson, Richard-----	6, 69, 78
Gifford, Frank-----	8
Ginsberg, Allen-----	110, 111
Gorce, Roger (nom de plume used by Tynan)-----	54
Grant, Joanne Alileen, testimony of-----	67-76
Green, Dr. Maurice-----	6
Greenwich Village-----	106
Guevara, "Che"-----	46

## H

Haddad, Edmonde-----	6
Hall, Adelphi-----	74
Harlem Youth section (of Communist Party, U.S.A.)-----	74
Harper's (magazine)-----	7, 92
Harvard College-----	77
Harvard University-----	116
Harrington, Rev. Donald-----	6, 40
Hearst Headline Service-----	27, 97
Heller, Mr. Robert-----	57
Hiss, Alger-----	56, 57, 106, 107
Holmes, Oliver Wendell-----	106
Hollywood Ten-----	115
"How I Came to Communism" by Waldo Frank-----	27, 93-96
"How Not To Promote Anglo-American Understanding" (speech by Senator Dodd)-----	60-63
Hutchins, Robert-----	120, 121
Hutton, Graham-----	121

## I

International Labor Defense-----	9
International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers-----	59

## J

Jencks case-----	58
Jencks, Clinton-----	58, 59, 117
Johnson, Arnold-----	57, 58, 114
Johnston, Senator Olin D-----	1
Justice, Department-----	70

## K

Kadar, Janos-----	74
Kaufman, Bob-----	110
Keating, Senator Kenneth B-----	1
Khrushchev-----	74
Killens, John-----	6
King, Alex-----	106
Kirstein, George-----	44
Kirstein, Mrs-----	44

## L

	Page
Lamantia, Philip	111
Latin American Confederation of Labor	7
Lenin Stadium	74
Lens, Sidney	6, 7
Liborio	78, 90
Llerama, Mario	46
Long Island Press	13
Los Angeles	56

## M

McCrackin, Rev. Maurice	114
McWilliams, Cary	3
Madres, Sierra	46, 47
Mailer, Norman	6, 56, 109, 121
Mainstream (publication)	63, 64
Mandel, Benjamin	1, 13
Mao Tse-tung	74
Mattachine Society	119
Matthews, Elva dePue	6
Mayfield, Julian	6
Mendoza	47
Mills, Prof. Wright	105, 117
More, Marjorie (code name)	10, 34, 40

## N

Nation (publication) article from	2, 3, 18, 35, 40, 45, 74, 97, 97-104
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners	9
National Committee for People's Rights	9
National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell	9
New Masses	27, 93
New World Review (magazine)	71
New York	41, 43, 56, 67
New York Hospital	77
New York Journal-American	91
New York Passport Agency	73
New York Times	69-71, 75, 76, 78, 82, 83, 91
Advertisement re Fair Play for Cuba Committee	2,
	4-6, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19-24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 42, 51, 55
New York University	68, 70
New Yorker (magazine)	12, 53, 55, 64
New Yorker publishers	54
Newhouse newspapers	13
Newsday, Long Island	13
Noble, Prof. Eugene	6
North, Joseph	40

## O

Observer (newspaper)	63
Oriente Province	47, 51
Orlovsky, Peter	110, 111
Osborne, John	121
Otulaski, Enrique	46

## P

Papandrew, Rev. John	6, 40
Parnell, Mr. Val	57
Passport Division	73
Perez, Faustino	47
Picture taken in 1957 showing Joanne Grant, Chou En-lai	72
Pla y Badia, Dr. Berta Louisa	75
Pound, Ezra	110
Preminger, Otto	115
Prestes (Luis) Defense Committee	9
Primas, Mr.	42
Princeton University	107
Provisional Committee of Cuba	8
Purdy, James	6

## Q

	Page
Quintana, Joseph.....	6

## R

Reader's Digest.....	7
Reap, Joseph.....	75
Redding, Vincent.....	52
Redington, Mr. Michael.....	57
"Red Star Over Latin America" (chapter of book).....	7
Reed, Reverend.....	3
"Rightful Rule in Cuba" (pamphlet).....	8
Roa, Raul.....	41-45
Roa, Raulita.....	79-82, 87-89
Rodriguez, Carlos Rafael.....	47, 51
Rosen, Jacob.....	74
Rostow, Prof Eugene.....	65, 66, 121
Royal Society of Literature.....	64
Russell, Nipsey.....	108, 109

## S

Sagner, Alan.....	3, 6, 17, 23-31, 33, 42, 78, 79, 90
Sagner & Son.....	33
Sahl, Mort.....	113
Sammes, Mrs.....	26
San Francisco.....	56
Sanchez y Basquet, Carlos Manuel Lazaro Felix.....	75
Sane Nuclear Policy, Committee for a.....	68
Greater NY Committee for.....	68
Santa Clara.....	47
Santiago.....	47
Santos-Buch, Charles A., M.D.....	77-102
Biograph.....	77
Testimony of.....	77-102
Sartre, Jean Paul.....	6
Saturday Evening Post.....	7
Saturday Review, The (publication).....	119
Schroeder, Frank W.....	1, 11-13
Senter, David.....	97
Sierra Maestra.....	78
Singleton, John.....	6
Sixth World Youth Festival.....	73
Smith Act.....	58
Sobell, Morton.....	9, 10
Sociology, U.S.A. (magazine).....	63
Sokolsky, George.....	3, 5, 27, 91
Sourwine, J. G.....	1, 13
Soviet Beryozka dancers.....	71
Soviet United Nations mission.....	71
Soviet Russia.....	91
"Spartacus" (movie).....	115
Stachel, Jack.....	41
Star Journal.....	13
State Department, Passport Division of.....	73
Steinway Hall.....	70
Strack, Celeste.....	8
Stuart, Lyle.....	69
Supreme Court.....	16
Syracuse University.....	68, 70

## T

Taber, Robert.....	69, 78-92, 97-104
Taber, Robert (text of article by).....	97-104
Taylor, Alan.....	121
Tazos, Filipo.....	46
Telegrams to Internal Security Subcommittee from Leonard Boudin.....	11, 12
Thomas, Norman.....	57, 61, 107

	Page
Thomas, Trevor.....	118
Thurston, G. A.....	6
Trumbo, Mr. Dalton.....	58, 115, 116
Tyler, Stephen.....	74
Tynan, Kenneth.....	6, 11, 12, 92, 104
Testimony of.....	53-67; 75
Statement of.....	64

## U

Ullham, Fred P.....	57
Unitarian Church.....	118
United Nations.....	42, 44, 49, 68, 75, 89
United Nations Building.....	81, 82
U.S. Festival Committee.....	70, 71
Utica, N.Y.....	68

## V

Vienna.....	71
"Virgin Spain" (book).....	4

## W

Wakefield, Dan.....	6
"We Dissent" (TV program, London) text of.....	56, 60, 104, 121
Weinstein, Sidney.....	6
Wesley, David.....	116
"What's Right With America" (program).....	59
Williams, Robert F.....	6
Wolfenden Committee.....	119

## Y

Yale University.....	65, 121
----------------------	---------







# FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

---

---

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

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

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

PART 2

---

APRIL 25, MAY 16, 1961

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina	KENNETH B. KEATING, New York
JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado	NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut	
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan	
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri	
WM. A. BLAKLEY, Texas	

---

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

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut, *Vice Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina	KENNETH B. KEATING, New York
	NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

J. G. SOURWINE, *Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*



## FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

---

TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1961

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2:10 p.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, Senator Thomas J. Dodd (vice chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Dodd, Kenneth B. Keating and Norris Cotton.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director; and Frank Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator DODD. The committee will be in order.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a brief statement regarding the purpose of this hearing and the continuing character of the committee's investigation.

The committee meets, as always, with its full authority, and with its mandate from the Senate undiminished.

The special interest today, within the general field of Communist activity, is the field of Communist youth activity, and the committee will seek information particularly, from the witness today, about the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Our witness is Richard Gibson.

Senator DODD. Raise your right hand.

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

Mr. GIBSON. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF RICHARD THOMAS GIBSON, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator DODD. Give your name and address, please.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. Chairman, could we have the cameras and lights off during the course of the testimony? We do not object to pictures being taken before or after, but it is very disturbing.

Senator DODD. All right, we shall give them a minute or so.

Will you give your name and address?

Mr. GIBSON. My name is Richard Gibson. My address is 788 Columbus Avenue, New York.

Senator DODD. You are accompanied by counsel?

Mr. GIBSON. I am.

Senator DODD. Would you identify your counsel?

Mr. GIBSON. Stanley Faulkner, 9 East 40th Street, New York 16, N.Y.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, in the executive session with this witness, I, as counsel for the committee, asked a question of Mr. Faulkner with regard to Nat Witt, which indicated that he was connected with Mr. Witt in the practice of law. I am informed by Mr. Faulkner that this is not so and never was so, and I think that in justice to him, the record should show this.

Senator DODD. Well, the record is clear as to that now.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, you were served with a subpoena to appear here today. You are here in response to the subpoena?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you been given the committee's booklet of information for witnesses?

Mr. GIBSON. My attorney has.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you had an opportunity to see it?

Mr. GIBSON. Personally, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was not a copy handed to you?

Mr. GIBSON. No, it was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You could have had access to the copy your counsel has had if you had wanted?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I was not instructed to look at it. Therefore, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, I shall tell you that this booklet, which I see lying there on the table before you, contains among other things the text of the resolution under which this committee has authority and the mandate by which we operate. Did you hear the opening statement with respect to the purpose of today's hearing?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were present, were you not, at the beginning of the testimony of Mr. Romerstein?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were not here?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then I shall tell you that the committee is sitting, as always, with all of its jurisdiction and powers, these being inseparable; that the committee's purpose, in sum, is to learn continuously and continually all it can about the activities of the Communist conspiracy so that it can discharge its function to the Senate of deciding what legislation, if any, can be offered or enacted to meet or counter Communist threats to the security of the United States, and to attempt to frame such legislation where it is determined that legislation can be drawn for that purpose.

The narrower objective of today's hearing is to gain information with respect to Communist youth activity, and even more particularly with respect to two organizations, one known as Advance, and the other known as the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

The committee has called you because it has information that you are the active directing head of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and that you have associations and connections with Advance; that you have in your possession information respecting these organizations which will be of value to the committee.

Now, I ask you, at the time you were subpoenaed to appear here today, you were in attendance at a mass meeting in Union Square in New York City, were you not?

Mr. GIBSON. I must confer with my attorney.

Yes, I was.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was the nature of that mass meeting?

Mr. GIBSON. I shall have to confer with my attorney again.

Sorry, but I must decline to answer that question for the following reasons: I question the jurisdiction of this committee to inquire in this area; secondly, I feel that it lacks any legislative purpose; and thirdly, I believe it lacks pertinency.

Senator KEATING. Let me make this clear. You do not claim your privilege under the fifth amendment of the Constitution, do you?

Mr. GIBSON. I have not been directed to answer this question.

Senator DODD. I shall direct you now to inform the committee of the rights upon which you stand.

Mr. SOURWINE. The reason this question is pertinent to the committee's inquiry is that the committee has information that this particular mass meeting had a connection with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Now, will you answer the question as to the nature of the meeting?

Mr. GIBSON. Since I have been directed to answer this question, I must state that, for the reasons previously given and on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you similarly decline to answer regarding your address at that meeting and the subject of your address?

Mr. GIBSON. Have I been asked that question?

Mr. SOURWINE. I shall ask you now.

Mr. GIBSON. Are you asking me about what you would ask me?

Mr. SOURWINE. The intent was to elicit the information if possible.

Mr. GIBSON. I—

Senator DODD. Why do we not ask him? Have you made a speech there?

Mr. GIBSON. I have prepared a statement, which I believe the chairman, in the executive session, said I would have an opportunity to present.

Senator DODD. That is not what I meant. I asked you whether or not you made a speech at the meeting at which you appeared and were served the subpoena under which you are appearing now.

Mr. GIBSON. I must confer with my attorney.

I must decline to answer that question on all of the previously stated grounds.

Senator KEATING. Did you see the movie which was shown here?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, I show you an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times on Friday, April 21, 1961, at page 23-C of that newspaper. Are you familiar with this advertisement?

Mr. GIBSON. I am afraid I must decline to answer the question on all of the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is quite obvious, Mr. Gibson, that you are the Gibson referred to in that ad, whether you are willing to admit it on the record or not.

Will you tell us what you had to do with the preparation and placement of this ad?

Mr. GIBSON. For the reasons previously given, and on the basis of my rights under the first and the fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now there is nothing about the placement of this advertisement in the New York Times which can possibly incriminate you if the ad is honest, is there?

Mr. GIBSON. Excuse me, I did not hear that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I say there is nothing about the placement of this ad in the New York Times which can possibly incriminate you if the ad itself is honest, is there?

Mr. GIBSON. I must again decline to answer on all of the grounds I have previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I shall state for the information of the witness that the committee's information is that this ad was paid for by check to the Waterman and Getz Agency, 370 Lexington Avenue, New York, in the amount of \$4,536; that this was a certified check; that it was signed with the name, "Richard Gibson."

I have here a photostat of this check. I want to show it to this witness.

Now, Mr. Gibson, is not that your signature?

Mr. GIBSON. For the reasons previously stated—all of the reasons—I must decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. May this check go in the record at this point, Mr. Chairman?

Senator DODD. Yes, the photostat.

Mr. SOURWINE. The photostat, yes.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 23" and is reproduced on the following page.)



Senator KEATING. May I ask one other question?

Have you read this advertisement in the New York Times?

Mr. GIBSON. For all the reasons previously stated, Senator, I must again decline to answer.

Senator KEATING. In other words, you think it might incriminate you to read the New York Times?

Mr. GIBSON. I am very sorry, but I must decline to answer for all of the reasons previously stated. I would like to recall to you, sir, that I asked to present a statement and that I was given some assurance by the chairman at the executive session that I would be allowed to present this statement. I hope that I will be.

Senator DODD. Go ahead, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, this check was certified. The certification voucher of which we have a photostat here, was signed by one Roach as teller. If the committee should deem it of importance, if there is any doubt about the identity of this witness as the man who presented the check, we can call Mr. Roach and ask him if this is the man who presented the check.

I would like, in order that it be preserved for the record, that this voucher be inserted in the record.

Senator DODD. Yes, it may be admitted and inserted in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 24" and is reproduced below :)

EXHIBIT No. 24

CERTIFIED VOUCHER

THE CHASE  
MANHATTAN  
BANK

BRANCH

DATE

4/19/61

Waterman & Co. for purchase of the...  
for purposes of the American Club...

CHECK NUMBER

4/17/61

AMOUNT

4534-

AMOUNT  
VERIFIED  
WITH

H.

TELLER

Paul

RECORDED BY

100-10000

Senator DODD. I think the committee should make an exhaustive investigation of this whole transaction, this ad, the funds used to pay for it, and the source of the money and all details.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, this check was drawn on the account of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee of the Institute for Improvement of Inter-American Relations, Inc., 799 Broadway. What is the Institute for the Improvement of Inter-American Relations, Inc.?

Mr. GIBSON. For all reasons which I have previously stated, and on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you an official of the Institute for Improvement of Inter-American Relations, Inc.?

Mr. GIBSON. I must again decline to answer for all of the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is of some significance, Mr. Chairman, that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, when it was organized, was an organization solely in and of itself, and not a committee for anything at all. That was just the name for it. It now turns up to be the Fair Play for Cuba Committee of the Institute for Improvement of Inter-American Relations, Inc., which looks as though it had broadened its outlook somewhat.

Senator DODD. Broadening its operations somewhat.

Senator KEATING. It looks like it is lengthening its name.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, do you maintain—

Senator KEATING. May I ask this, Mr. Chairman?

Is that all in the corporate name, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee of the Institute for the Improvement of Inter-American Relations, Inc.? Is that all one name?

Mr. GIBSON. Was that question directed to me?

Senator KEATING. To you, yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully say that I decline to answer for reasons which I stated previously.

Senator DODD. I must say I must ask you to answer that question. You have identified yourself as Richard Gibson, an official of this organization. You are directed by the Chair to answer the question.

Mr. GIBSON. On the basis of my rights under the first and the fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Senator DODD. I want to make perfectly clear to you that I am ordering you to answer this question, notwithstanding your claim. You told us that you are an official, and we want this question answered.

Mr. GIBSON. I shall have to consult with my counsel, then.

I am very sorry, but on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must respectfully decline to answer.

Senator DODD. All right, the record is clear.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you maintain an account at the 14th and Broadway Branch of the Chase Manhattan Bank?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does the Fair Play for Cuba Committee have accounts in any banks other than Chase Manhattan?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer, for all of the reasons previously stated.



Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know a Miss Clark at the Waterman and Getz Agency in New York?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer, for all the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. This surprises me, Mr. Chairman, because it is the committee's information that Mr. Gibson does not know any Miss Clark and did not deal with her in any way.

Is that not true, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON. I am afraid I must decline to answer, for the reasons which I have previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. The committee's information is, Mr. Chairman, that all of the dealings in connection with this ad were conducted on the part of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee by a Miss Green, a Miss G-r-e-e-n who used the telephone number, Oregon 4-8295 for her calls back and forth with the Waterman and Getz Agency.

Do you know this Miss Green, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON. I must state that I must decline to answer for the reasons previously given, and on the basis of my rights under the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us who are employees of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer, for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman—

Senator DODD. Now, the Chair wants you to answer this question, notwithstanding your claim.

Mr. GIBSON. Excuse me, I must consult with my counsel.

On the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Senator DODD. You understand that you have told us you are an official of this organization. We are interested in finding out about it, and we want to know if it is a violator of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

I want to tell you again that I want the record perfectly clear that the Chair has ordered you to answer this question.

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. I shall preface this series of questions, Mr. Gibson, by the statement to you that I have not endeavored to open up argument with you. I am asking these questions for the factual content of the answers I hope to get.

Senator DODD. I just want to impress upon you that it is important, and it is the business of the Congress to find out if the Foreign Agents Registration Act needs to be amended or strengthened. We already have evidence before this committee that your predecessor in office in this Fair Play for Cuba Committee received money from a foreign government to run an ad in the New York Times.

Now you have admitted here that you are his successor as an official of this organization. There is in evidence before this committee another ad in the New York Times. We have asked you to answer these questions; I have ordered you to answer them. Now I have ordered you as chairman of this subcommittee to answer them, and I want it to be perfectly clear in your mind what you have been ordered

to do, and that there will be no doubt in your mind and the reasons for the order, do you understand?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator KEATING. May I ask a question?

Mr. SOURWINE. If the Chair will permit me—this may be equivocal—but I would like to ask it of the witness.

Your refusal to answer, did that comprehend a refusal to answer the question as to whether you understood the Chairman?

Mr. GIBSON. I must consult with my attorney.

As far as the question is concerned, I can state I did understand.

Senator DODD. It appears to me that you are trying to bait this committee and defy it and indicate your contempt. I want the record to show that this committee is actually aware of what you are trying to accomplish.

Mr. GIBSON. Senator, I came here with a statement which I am prepared to make. I believe it was stated that I would have the opportunity to make that statement. I again respectfully request the right to do so.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Gibson, you have testified that you are the acting national executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. How long have you acted in that capacity?

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer that question on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator KEATING. I ask that the chairman direct him to answer that question.

Senator DODD. The Chair directs you to answer the question put to you by Senator Keating, notwithstanding the claims you have asserted.

Mr. GIBSON. I must consult.

Upon advice of counsel, I may reply to that question that I have been the acting national executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee for approximately 3 months.

Senator KEATING. You are succeeding Mr. Taber in that capacity?

Mr. GIBSON. I must consult.

Yes.

Senator KEATING. What are your duties as the acting national executive secretary?

Mr. GIBSON. For the reasons previously given, and on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must respectfully decline to answer.

Senator DODD. The Chair orders that you, Mr. Witness, answer the question, notwithstanding the assertion of your rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. GIBSON. On the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I again respectfully repeat that I must decline to answer.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a further question of this witness, premised on the fact that this witness has testified that he is the acting national executive secretary and that he succeeded Mr. Taber in that capacity?

Do you know where Mr. Taber is now?

MR. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer that question for all the reasons previously stated.

SENATOR KEATING. How did you succeed him? Was it by an election or by appointment?

MR. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

SENATOR KEATING. I think he has opened the door on that, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR DODD. Yes, I think there is no doubt about it.

The chairman of the committee must direct you to answer that question.

MR. GIBSON. I must consult.

For the reasons previously given, and on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

SENATOR DODD. Very well; the record is clear. The Chair has ordered you to answer.

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, having put your name to this ad in the New York Times as the functioning head of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, will you tell us, do you know that the statements in this ad are true?

MR. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer for all of the reasons previously stated.

MR. SOURWINE. This ad states that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has more than 6,000 members, with 21 chapters in U.S. cities, and 4 chapters in Canada. How do you know this to be true?

MR. GIBSON. I must decline to answer, for all the reasons previously stated.

MR. SOURWINE. Will you tell us in what cities the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has chapters?

MR. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer for all the reasons previously stated.

MR. SOURWINE. This ad states that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has student councils on more than 40 university campuses in the United States and Canada. Will you tell us where those 40 councils are?

MR. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer on all the grounds previously stated.

MR. SOURWINE. Where are the records of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee membership kept?

MR. GIBSON. On the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

MR. SOURWINE. Well, as the acting national executive secretary, you have a list of the members, do you not?

MR. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

MR. SOURWINE. You certainly have a list of the chapters?

MR. GIBSON. I must again decline to answer, for all the reasons previously stated.

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this witness be ordered and directed to produce before this committee, on a date which the chairman shall fix at his discretion, any lists in his possession showing the members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the locations of

the chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and the identity and location of the university campuses on which the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has student councils.

Senator DODD. All right.

The Chair orders you to produce the records as set out by counsel 1 week from today at 2 p.m.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully request that a subpoena be prepared requesting the specific items?

Mr. SOURWINE. We shall furnish you with a certified copy of this record, which has all the force of a subpoena. There is no magic in a subpoena. All that is needed is evidence that the committee has ordered the production of certain documents.

Mr. FAULKNER. There are certain legal policies, and I think a subpoena is the proper form.

Mr. SOURWINE. The committee will be the judge of how it will order the production of these documents. If you intend to make a point that the order is illegal or invalid because it is not in the form of a subpoena, that is your privilege. The order has been made by the chairman of the committee in open session on the record. We will furnish you with a certified copy.

Senator DODD. That is 1 week from today, at 2 p.m.

What is the date?

Mr. SOURWINE. That will be May 1. That will be May Day.

Is that a bad day for you, Mr. Gibson? Would you rather have it another day?

Mr. GIBSON. I am afraid I must decline to answer, for all the reasons previously stated.

Senator DODD. We can put it over to another day if you are busy that day.

Senator KEATING. That is all right, it is the 2d, not the 1st.

Senator DODD. Would it help you any if it were on the 3d?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer for all the reasons previously stated.

Senator DODD. It is for your own convenience. We are trying to find out what day will be most convenient for you. This order is issued. You are not going to change that. It is just the date which is at issue, that is all.

Mr. GIBSON. I am at your command, whatever is convenient for you.

Senator DODD. Fine. We shall fix it for a week from today, the 2d day of May, at 2 p.m.

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Chair will permit me, may I, for the convenience of counsel, ask that it be another day? I have to be in Washington here on Monday, and I shall be tied up on a case. I would prefer it later in the week so that I can get back to New York and come back again. I would ask, if it suits the convenience of the committee, to make it later in that week, Thursday or Friday.

Senator DODD. The 4th of May?

Mr. FAULKNER. At what hour?

Senator DODD. At 3 p.m.

Mr. FAULKNER. That is all right with me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, this ad in the New York Times describes the Fair Play for Cuba Committee as a nonprofit American organization. Is this the correct description?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer for all of the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is the Fair Play for Cuba Committee incorporated?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator DODD. The Chair orders you to answer, notwithstanding the assertion of your rights under the first and fifth amendments. This is clearly a matter we have a right to inquire into. You have identified yourself as an officer of the organization.

Mr. GIBSON. I must confer with counsel.

I must state, upon advice of counsel, that I am not certain really, about the legal status of the structure of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. But I shall probably know next Thursday.

Senator KEATING. Did I understand you to say you did not know?

Mr. GIBSON. I said I am not clear about this, and I shall find out if you are interested.

Senator KEATING. Well, when you signed a check with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and some other words, "Inc.," you knew you did that, did you not?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator DODD. Well, you are ordered to answer that question also.

Mr. GIBSON. On the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I respectfully decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, is the Fair Play for Cuba Committee registered anywhere, under State or Federal law, as a nonprofit organization?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer for all the reasons previously given.

Senator DODD. Is it registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer—no; it is not.

Senator DODD. Are you saying no, it is not, or—

Mr. GIBSON. I can state that it is not.

Senator DODD. It is not registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act?

Mr. GIBSON. It is not.

Senator DODD. All right.

Go ahead.

Senator KEATING. Let me ask one other question.

You have stated you are the acting national executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Does the Fair Play for Cuba Committee pay you a salary as acting national executive secretary?

Mr. GIBSON. No; it does not.

Senator KEATING. Do you receive a salary for your work for any organization?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I am a CBS fellow at Columbia University Graduate School in African Studies.

Senator DODD. A what kind of fellow?

Mr. GIBSON. CBS, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Senator KEATING. Under a fellowship they have established?

Mr. GIBSON. Granted by the CBS Foundation for people in electronic journalism, or in the field of communications, to study whatever they wish in the graduate school. I have been studying African studies for this year.

Senator KEATING. How long have you been studying there?

Mr. GIBSON. I have been there since September.

Senator KEATING. The fellowship was granted for 1 year?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. And does that pay all of your expenses?

Mr. GIBSON. It certainly does.

Senator KEATING. How many of those fellowships are there?

Mr. GIBSON. Eight, nationally.

Senator KEATING. Throughout the country?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Are you a resident of New York?

Mr. GIBSON. I am.

Senator KEATING. And you are a U.S. citizen?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I am.

Senator KEATING. A native-born American?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I am an American Negro, and I have lived here quite too long, in any case.

Senator DODD. Do you know the names of the seven besides yourself who received Columbia Broadcasting System fellowships?

Mr. GIBSON. I know the names of some of them. I do not know if I could rattle them off at one fell swoop.

Senator DODD. You can take your time; you do not need to rattle.

Mr. GIBSON. I would be glad to provide the names, but I would like to give them privately. After all, these people are not involved with me in any way, and I shall give them in confidence.

Senator DODD. I think that is fair enough.

Did the CBS know that you were a member or an officer, or had any connection with Fair Play for Cuba Committee when you got this fellowship?

Mr. GIBSON. Quite frankly, I do not know.

Senator DODD. Did you know Robert Taber at that time? He was then a CBS official.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know anything about that. I know that as far as I am concerned, I do not know what they knew.

Senator DODD. Well, you know Robert Taber?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Well, now, he was an official of the Columbia Broadcasting System and the secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Senator KEATING. He was a correspondent, I think, rather than an official.

Mr. GIBSON. He was not an official of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Senator DODD. All right, we shall not quibble about that. I think you know what I mean. He certainly was an employee of the Columbia Broadcasting System, was he not?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. About the time you got your fellowship, I ask you again, did CBS know you were associated with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I must repeat, quite frankly, I do not know.

Senator DODD. Did you tell them?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not believe it was any of their business what I was doing.

Senator DODD. I did not ask you that.

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Senator DODD. You did not tell them?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. They have never asked you since?

Mr. GIBSON. Later, yes.

Senator DODD. They have?

Mr. GIBSON. I understood that on the basis of a letter from Senator Byrd, of Virginia, who also supposedly had made certain criticisms of me because of my involvement with certain Negro causes in the South, as well as the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, because of the visit of agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Columbia Broadcasting System felt impelled to ask for my resignation.

Senator KEATING. Have you resigned?

Mr. GIBSON. I resigned, yes.

Senator DODD. As what?

Mr. GIBSON. I resigned as a newswriter. I was an employee. I am no longer an employee, I am a holder of a fellowship.

Senator DODD. You were also employed by the CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes. The fellowships are open only to CBS employees, or to persons engaged in teaching electronic journalism, or employees of educational television and radio stations.

Senator DODD. I see. You are no longer employed by Columbia Broadcasting System, so I take it they asked you to resign?

Mr. GIBSON. That is correct.

Senator DODD. But you still continue with this fellowship at Columbia University, which is paid for by the Columbia Broadcasting System?

Mr. GIBSON. Indirectly it is. It is a foundation which is not directly subsidiary to the company.

Senator KEATING. When were your services terminated by CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe it was in June or July, around that time; in the summer.

Senator KEATING. Of 1960?

Mr. GIBSON. The summer of 1960, yes.

Senator KEATING. But you started your work under the fellowship in the fall of 1960?

Mr. GIBSON. In September.

Senator KEATING. And had the fellowship been awarded to you before your services were terminated?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, it had.

Senator DODD. Did you handle news for CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. I did.

Senator DODD. You did?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I was the first Negro newswriter they ever had; I must say rather regretfully.

Senator DODD. And Taber also handled news, did he not?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Did you ever handle any news about Cuba and Castro?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

I might add that we called on the officials of the company to go over any scripts that we wrote to find bias. The offer was declined, but it was quoted by the Writers Guild of America East, of which I am a member.

Senator DODD. I guess it did not go. They certainly discontinued your employment?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, they did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, this ad in the New York Times declares that the only source of income for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is the contributions of fairminded Americans. You know that to be an untrue statement, do you not?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights and privileges under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, now, Mr. Gibson, do you not know that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee first came to public notice with an ad in the New York Times which was paid for in substantial part by funds supplied by Raul Roa, Jr., a Cuban official?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer for all the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. This ad says, Mr. Gibson, the long list of arrests and jailings of Castro followers in Florida, Texas, and other parts of our country is a matter of record.

Will you tell us where this so-called long list is a matter of record?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have such a list?

Mr. GIBSON. I again must decline to answer for all the reasons previously stated.

Senator KEATING. Was your fellowship at CBS backed by Mr. Taber?

Mr. GIBSON. No, Mr. Taber had nothing to do with my fellowship.

Senator KEATING. Where were you a correspondent at the time you applied for the fellowship?

Mr. GIBSON. Excuse me, I did not hear.

Senator KEATING. Where were you a correspondent at the time you applied for the fellowship?

Mr. GIBSON. I was not a correspondent, I was a newswriter employed by WCBS Radio News in New York City. I also worked occasionally for WCBS Television.

Senator KEATING. And how was the test conducted? By a submission of your background and a paper of some kind?

Mr. GIBSON. It was on the basis of a program of studies, background, personal interviews, number from, I suppose, 20 to 30 candidates, and 8 were selected from them.

Senator KEATING. Is your only income the income you get from the fellowship?



Mr. GIBSON. It is, except for perhaps an occasional sum of money that might come from writing on the outside.

Senator DODD. Who asked you to become acting national executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I must confer with my counsel.

I must decline to answer that question, on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, in this ad which you caused to be placed in the New York Times, you declare: "Congress has surrendered its functions to conspirators."

If this statement is true, it certainly affects the internal security of the United States. Will you tell this committee to what conspirators has Congress surrendered what functions?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer that question on all the grounds I have previously stated.

Senator KEATING. May I ask a question?

You signed this ad. Did you write the ad?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator KEATING. Did you know of its contents before it was inserted in the paper?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer for all of the reasons previously stated.

Senator DODD. The Chair will order you to answer that question.

Mr. GIBSON. I again state that I must decline to answer, on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator KEATING. May I ask another question?

You have supplemented your income somewhat by writings. In what publications have your writings appeared?

Mr. GIBSON. Not very many; the Nation magazine.

Senator KEATING. The Nation?

Mr. GIBSON. The magazine, the Nation. A novel of mine was published in Italy, and I believe that was the last income I received from independent sources of income; in other words, from writing.

Senator KEATING. What is the name of the novel?

Mr. GIBSON. It was published in England under the title of "A Mirror for Magistrates," published in 1958 by Anthony Bland, Ltd., in London. It was published in Italy by Bon Viano.

Senator KEATING. Has it been published in the United States?

Mr. GIBSON. No, it has not. I am still looking for a publisher.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us, Mr. Gibson, why it is that so many oldtime Communists are working so hard for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on all of the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the relationship, if any, between the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and Advance?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer that question for all of the reasons heretofore given.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the relationship between the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and the Communist Party, USA?

Mr. GIBSON. None.

Mr. SOURWINE. None at all?

Mr. GIBSON. No, and I am not a Communist at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is a good question. Are you a member of the Communist Party, USA?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I am not a member. The color of my politics is not red, it is black.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has no connection whatsoever with the Communist Party, USA?

Mr. GIBSON. I state that at least it does not have it through me, and I do not know of any other way.

Senator DODD. That is not the same thing. Your answer should be very carefully put on this record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Certain of the members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee are Communists, are they not?

Mr. GIBSON. I am sorry, we do not inquire into the politics of anyone. Quite frankly, I do not know. We do not ask. We do not ask anyone's race, religion, or politics; we are only interested in one thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean to say you are not aware that there are Communist members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I can state quite frankly that I am not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are not aware that there were Communists among the founders of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I am not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are not aware that there were Communists among the organizers of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Not that I have had anything to do with.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you telling us that you are not aware that old-time Communists from one end of this country to another are out working for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, helping to organize, demonstrate, participate in its activities?

Mr. GIBSON. If they are, I am not aware of it.

Senator DODD. This is very interesting.

Mr. GIBSON. I know one thing; I am not a Communist.

Senator DODD. That is not what you have been asked.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know the politics of the people involved. I have never been engaged in politics in the United States in any way.

Senator DODD. That is not what you have been asked about. If you would listen to the question, we would like to get the answer. Counsel has asked you a number of questions, all pointed to an answer as to whether or not you know that there are Communists actively engaged in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Mr. GIBSON. I said that I did not know, and I have never made any inquiries about the political beliefs of people involved in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Senator DODD. My question is, How sure are you that the Communists are not very active?

Mr. GIBSON. I did not say I was not sure. I said that I did not know, and to the best of my knowledge.

Senator DODD. I see. You said you are not sure.

Mr. GIBSON. I did not say I was not sure; I said to the best of my knowledge, there were no Communists. I certainly am not in contact with Communists that I know of.

Senator DODD. You will not tell us how you became acting national executive secretary?

Mr. GIBSON. I must again state that I decline to answer for all the reasons previously stated.

Senator DODD. Why do you not want to tell us who it was that solicited you to become acting secretary of this organization?

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer that question for all of the reasons previously given.

Senator DODD. We have some information as to how it came about.

Mr. GIBSON. Excuse me.

Senator DODD. This committee has some information which will be developed later as to how you became acting secretary. I think you are entitled to know this, because you are being asked some rather important questions here today.

Mr. GIBSON. All right, fine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, do you know Jake Rosen?

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is not Mr. Rosen connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. On the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to state for the record—and listen closely, Mr. Witness—this is a question to test the credibility of the witness in connection with the flat statement that he did not know of any Communists in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

I put it to you as a fact, Mr. Witness, that you do know Jake Rosen, that you do know of his connection with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and that you do know that he is a member of the Communist Party, USA. If this is untrue, I ask you to deny it.

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer that question on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator DODD. Pay attention, please. You are directed by the Chair specifically to answer this question. It is of great importance to this committee. It is entirely germane; it goes to the very heart of our business.

Mr. GIBSON. I must confer with counsel.

Senator DODD. Let me add, and pay attention, you have opened this up yourself. You have answered other questions, and this is relating to those answers that you have already given.

The reason I ask you to pay full attention is I want to point out to you it is very important to the members of this committee. We are trying to get this information for a very valid legislative purpose.

Mr. GIBSON. I must confer with counsel.

On the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must respectfully decline to answer that question.

Mr. SOURWINE. You understand that you are declining to answer after you have been ordered to do so, notwithstanding your assertion of your rights under the first and fifth amendments?

Mr. GIBSON. I am stating that, on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Another question, Mr. Chairman, for the same purpose as the last one, to test the credibility of the witness' statement that he does not know of any Communist on the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

I put it to you as a fact, and ask you, if it is untrue, to deny it, if it is incorrect or inaccurate, to correct me, that you know one Wendy Nakashima, that you know that she is a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, that you know she is a member of the Communist Party, USA.

Mr. GIBSON. I have never heard of her.

Mr. SOURWINE. Why could not you be equally forthright if that were the fact with regard to the question about Jake Rosen?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer for all of the reasons I have previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Waldo Frank, who was one of the organizers of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on all the grounds I have previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, in the ad that you caused to be placed in the New York Times, on Friday, April 21, 1961, your name is the only one on the ad.

In the Fair Play for Cuba Committee ad of April 6, 1960, there were a number of names. Can you account for the fact that none of those names appears on the ad this year?

Mr. GIBSON. For reasons previously given, and on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must respectfully decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it due, in part, to the fact that some of these Fair Play for Cuba Committee members have resigned following the publication of the testimony before this committee of Dr. Santos-Buch, which showed the Cuban source of financing for the committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer, for all the reasons previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Donald Harrington, for one, has resigned, has he not?

Mr. GIBSON. Who is that?

Mr. SOURWINE. Donald Harrington.

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer for all the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many times have you been to Cuba, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have your expenses to or from a point outside the United States ever been paid, with your knowledge, by a foreign government or foreign national?

Mr. GIBSON. On the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have your expenses in a foreign country ever been paid for by or on behalf of the government of another country?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever received money directly or indirectly from the Cuban Government, or any representative thereof?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does the Fair Play for Cuba Committee have any rule barring Communists from membership?

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. Sourwine, would you repeat that question?

Mr. SOURWINE. Does the Fair Play for Cuba Committee have any rule barring Communists from membership?

Mr. GIBSON. There is no rule. There are no rules on membership that I know of.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, is it not true that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is doing the propaganda job of the Castro government?

Mr. GIBSON. I must decline to answer that question on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, I show you several documents clipped together. They are, first, a mimeographed letter dated April 7, 1961, beginning, "Dear Friend," and signed, "Richard Gibson, Acting Executive Secretary." Then a copy of the April 1, 1961, issue of Fair Play, and then a reproduction of a column with the byline, Joseph Barry, from the New York Post of Wednesday, January 25, 1961.

I want you to look at these and then I have a question to ask you.

Mr. GIBSON. What was the question, Mr. Sourwine?

Mr. SOURWINE. You have those before you now. So far, I have only shown them to you. These were all mailed out together. They were received in a single envelope. Did you have anything to do with these mailings—that is, with the mailing of these three items?

Mr. GIBSON. On the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must respectfully decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. I shall put it to you as what is almost a self-evident fact, but I shall ask you, if it is incorrect, to correct it; if it is wrong, to deny it; that you did instruct these mailings to be made, that they were made by your order and with your knowledge by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee as an appeal for funds for that committee.

Mr. GIBSON. What was the question, Mr. Sourwine?

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that not true?

Mr. GIBSON. For the reasons previously given, and on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us who paid for these mailings?

Mr. GIBSON. I must again decline to answer for all the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may these documents which have been shown to the witness be admitted at this point?

Senator DODD. Yes, sir.

(The documents referred to were marked "Exhibit 25, 25A, and 25B" and read as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 25

FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE  
799 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y.  
OR 4-8295

April 7, 1961

Dear Friend,

Our committee is in need of financial help ...

The enclosed copy of the April 1 issue of FAIR PLAY documents the plans for a Washington-sponsored invasion of Cuba. These shocking facts are confirmed by this morning's NEW YORK TIMES which baldly states that the Florida-based invasion forces "are being trained by United States experts." It adds: "Since last fall the training has been centralized under the direction of a united Cuban political command. This command ... has enjoyed the tolerance and cooperation of United States officials."

Last night, CBS's "World Tonight" program reported "unmistakable signs" that invasion plans are in their final stage.

Our committee has the enormous responsibility of rallying public opinion against this criminal effort to overthrow the government of Cuba ... the first government in the island's history that has enjoyed popular support.

During its one year of intensive activity, our committee has found that to the extent that we have been able to reach the public with the facts about Cuba and U.S.-Cuban relations, a heartening number of people have been persuaded of the dangerous folly of Washington's anti-Cuban policy.

NOW IT IS CRUCIAL TO REACH THE WIDEST POSSIBLE NUMBER OF AMERICANS.

As the first step in this direction we propose to distribute a minimum of 100,000 leaflets, warning of the current danger and stating the key facts that have been suppressed or distorted by the molders of American public opinion.

We have decided to carry through this action even though we don't have the money on hand to do it. Our activity to date has completely drained our meager financial resources. Within the next few weeks each of our members and supporters will receive a detailed financial report covering the year of our existence. We believe the report will show that we have squeezed a maximum of fair play mileage from every dollar contributed.

But we cannot get the urgently needed added mileage unless every supporter of Fair Play for Cuba rushes financial aid.

Please help. Send the most generous contribution that you can ... today. Don't let Cuba become a bloody battleground.

Sincerely,

/s/ Richard Gibson  
Acting Executive Secretary

EXHIBIT No. 25-A

*ACLU Protests Travel Ban, Page 4*  
*The CIA Plot Against Cuba, Page 2*

# Fair Play

Vol. 2 No. 13

April 1, 1961



New York

15 cents

## A Moral Disaster for the United States

The formation of a so-called Provisional Government of Cuba in the United States would have been a complete farce if there were not repeated and undeniable reports of U.S. support for such an enterprise through the Central Intelligence Agency. The discredited political hacks picked to head this "government," by themselves, pose no danger to the Cuban Revolution, but it has long been known that counterrevolutionary forces financed by the CIA, have been using Florida, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Costa Rica as training areas and staging points for attacks against Cuba. There have even been reports that these mercenaries are being trained by U.S. officers in conjunction with former members of the Batista army. It is also known that mercenaries for an invasion of Cuba are being recruited in New York and elsewhere in the East and in Los Angeles and along the West Coast. Clearly, none of this activity could take place without the knowledge or approval of the U.S. Government.

### Aggression

The counterrevolutionaries have repeatedly hinted that the Kennedy Administration is willing to supply them with all the planes and ships they need for a landing on the shores of Cuba, and, if necessary, to back them up with U.S. troops once they can grab a foothold on the island to establish their "Provisional Government." Despite a veil of secrecy, the word is out that the big invasion attempt will be made in a matter of weeks, perhaps even days. Thus, it is no exaggeration to charge that the United States is preparing an overt aggression against Cuba.

Since its founding a year ago, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has urged an investigation of the activities of Cuban counterrevolutionaries in this country. And we have called on all responsible members of Congress to carry out a thorough investigation of the activities of the CIA in pushing these puppets on in their criminal enterprise. But the CIA has shown nothing but utter contempt for the American people and their representatives in Congress. Even the State Department has thrown up its hands in despair, claiming it has no say in determining and little knowledge of the manoeuvres of the CIA. Reckless and provocative action on the part of this agency could lead this country willy-nilly into a major war or at least a number of smaller military actions that would neither enhance the prestige of the United States nor serve the cause of world peace.

FPCC has repeatedly urged President Kennedy to resume negotiations with the Cuban Government. There can be no doubt that the Cuban people and their gov-

ernment sincerely want to reestablish normal and friendly relations with the United States, but they are determined never to abandon their Revolution and return to the unhappy position of a U.S. satellite. Fidel Castro has declared on a number of occasions that the door is still open for negotiations with the United States. President Kennedy has yet to indicate that he is willing to discuss anything with Cuba. Washington apparently has decided upon a final military solution of the Cuban problem, regardless of what the rest of the world, or the American people, for that matter, will think.

### Repression in the US

Because FPCC has worked feverishly to alert the American people to this danger, because we have never given up hope of persuading our leaders to return to reason, FPCC itself has come under heavy fire. But when the attacks in the press and in Congress from the witchhunters failed, when FBI intimidation was proven futile, our enemies turned to violence and threats of violence. Thugs have sought to break up FPCC meetings. In Los Angeles last month, Cuban counterrevolutionaries, aided by "Young Conservatives," started a pitched battle at a meeting where FPCC Founding Member Robert F. Williams and Vincent Hallinan were speaking. Six of the hoodlums were arrested, one of them after a gun battle with a Los Angeles detective. Later, police discovered an illegal cache of arms. In the face of these threats, we asked Attorney General Robert Kennedy to reaffirm our constitutional right to free speech. We are still awaiting an answer from Mr. Kennedy.

One thing is certain: a military action against Cuba will also be the signal for repression here at home. Just as the Algerian War has meant the suppression of civil liberties in France, so a U.S. colonial war in the Caribbean will mean the further curtailment of freedom here in the United States. Your support for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee at this perilous time is vital to the defense of democracy throughout the Americas. We need your dollars, indeed your nickels and dimes, to continue our work of alerting the American people to the danger of a blood bath in the Caribbean. Such a blood bath could only be a moral and political disaster for this nation. It is because we are as much concerned for our own country as for Cuba that we again urge all Americans to call on President Kennedy to halt the race towards war before it is too late and to seek a just settlement of all differences with the Cuban Government in a spirit of understanding and on a level of equality.

## Blueprint for Aggression:

"Regime to fight Castro is being formed here—Invasion is planned in spring," with this blazing four-column headline, New York's *Herald Tribune* (Mar. 22) announced the latest and most ominous Central Intelligence Agency scheme. From political and economic aggression, Washington is shifting to the military arena, in a desperate attempt to destroy the Cuban revolution.

The *Baltimore Sun* reported the details on how New Frontiersmen set up a puppet government. Dated Miami (Mar. 4): "A secret conference of anti-Castro Cubans has opened in Washington today... the word here is that the warring factions were pressured into getting together by an agency of the U. S. government. The pressure, it is stated, took the form of a threat to withdraw financial support from all the groups. This source also says that certain U. S. government officials are taking part in the Washington meeting."

### US Dollars

Time reported (Jan. 27): "The Frente apparently gets virtually all the US financial aid to Cuba's underground, estimated to range from a minimum of \$135,000 monthly to as high as \$500,000 on occasions, and Mr. 'B' the CIA agent in charge..." The CIA has plenty more. The *NY Post* stated (Nov. 12, 1959): "Authoritative congressional sources have estimated CIA's annual appropriation at between \$350,000,000 and \$500,000,000."

The *Miami Herald* (Mar. 12) reported that counter-revolutionary leaders say "once rebel troops in Cuba secure a strategic area of land, the provisional government will step in, declare the land a free territory and ask anti-Castro governments to come in and help them fight Castro."

Joseph Newman (*NY Herald Tribune*, Mar. 30) suggests the most logical possibility in which an "area near the top of the (Escambray) mountains" may become the site of the CIA-Cuban regime.

What next? There is solid evidence that the CIA may be preparing an invasion of Cuba.

A diabolical plan for subjugating Cuba was published in the July 16, 1960 *National Review*, —it has proven prophetic. The article by Anthony Harrigan called for an initial invasion of Cuba by counter-revolutionaries in the US, invoking the Monroe Doctrine, halting shipments of supplies and spare parts to Cuba, an arms embargo and a sea blockade.

*I. F. Stone's Weekly* (Jan. 16) revealed that on Jan. 4, correspondents "were given a background not-for-attribution briefing on our plans to choke off the Castro regime with a sea and air blockade."

Finally, says Harrigan, "a single lightning blow" would fall, on the theory that Americans would not accept a prolonged "Korea-type" war in Cuba. The single

lightning blow would be a mass flight of planes over Cuba. "Since the US might not wish to use its own military planes, manned by its own air personnel, on missions against Castro, it would be necessary for free Cubans to obtain a tremendous fleet of privately-owned light planes. This is not at all far-fetched."

For areas out of reach of light planes, "US military aircraft, operating under secret orders with CIA officers in charge, (would) carry out airdrops... A provisional government of Cuba could call on the US for open assistance in the pacification of the country."

Drew Pearson (Feb. 11, 1960) revealed a secret White House conference where former US Ambassador "Bonsal told both the President and Secretary of State... that any intervention by the USA, whether economic through sugar quotas or military regarding the US Naval Base at Guantanamo, would only play into Castro's hands." The possibility of using Guantanamo's naval base to crucify the revolution has apparently been under consideration.

Time (Aug. 8, 1960) recalls that in May 1954 "with the United States CIA as a silent partner, a Guatemalan colonel named Carlos Castillo Armas launched his counter-revolutionary invasion of the Red-dominated country. As F-47s swooped down over Guatemala City with US pilots at the controls."

### Guatemala Base

One of the most chilling revelations appeared in the *NY Times* (Jan. 10) under this headline: "US helps train an anti-Castro force at secret Guatemala air-ground base." The dispatch from Retalhuleu, Guatemala reports: "There is intensive daily air training here from a partly hidden airfield. In the Cordillero foothills back from the Pacific, commando-like forces are being drilled in guerilla warfare tactics by foreign personnel, mostly from the US."

The secret jet airstrip was completed in an 80-day crash program in the late summer of 1960, under the worst possible climatic conditions by a North American construction company, Thompson-Cornwall. Jet fuel storage tanks dot one side of the area. Every approach to the airstrip is guarded by armed sentries. The air base is big enough to handle jets and military air transports. Dr. Ronald Hilton of Stanford University was told in Guatemala that the US-CIA had acquired the large tract of land, at an outlay in excess of \$1,000,000.

Don Dwiggin, who is aviation editor for the Los Angeles *Mirror*, was told by an anti-Castro gun-runner about a "fantastic air-raid operation scheduled for some time early in 1961," pilots are being offered \$25,000 to fly on this mission. "The plan is for them to streak in low over the water, boom over the coastline at 4 a.m. one morning, and bomb Castro's oil storage tanks."



## How the CIA Plots Against Cuba

Dwiggins adds: "Anti-Castro planes actually have pulled off such raids, —but with pamphlets, not bombs" (*Nation*, Jan. 7).

The sedate *NY Times* reported without wincing (Mar. 26): "Unmarked planes fly over Cuba daily, evidently supporting the oppositionists with arms and messages from the Cuban exile community in Florida."

Photos of armed mercenaries training in Florida are appearing in the US press with impunity. An editorial titled "Asylum or Staging Ground?" in the *Nation* (Jan. 7) asks whether these provocative staging operations are "ignored because Washington wants to step up its war-of-nerves against the Castro regime?" Despite encouragement by Washington, it is certain that no group of petty mercenaries can challenge a united armed Cuban people.

### Cuba's Strength

R. Hart Phillips (*NY Times*, Mar. 26) reports from Havana that Cuba is a military fortress with 45,000 regular troops and 300,000 militia members with the best of weapons. "Castro is able to concentrate thousands of militia and soldiers within a few hours at a given point." Castro feels confident "that he is almost invulnerable. Observers are inclined to agree with him except in the case of a trained, experienced army and air force equipped to destroy the Castro fighting forces." Nothing short of US air and ground forces can be effective.

The *Miami Herald* (Jan. 11) published a story detailing the Miami-Guatemala airlift. "So secret are the flights that checks with air traffic control centers when such planes are known to have left the Opa-Locka (Navy) field revealed no flight plans. How many have gone from Miami? ... a month ago, the total numbered over 4,000 guerillas and more than 100 pilots ... The volunteer discovers he can write home, but his letters are censored. His landing in Guatemala is made at Retalhuleu." The training camps are nearby, both are in the Cordillera foothills.

Besides the establishment of a Quisling regime, a jet airfield and staging areas, the US is also training its own shock troops. The *Wall Street Journal* (Feb. 27) delicately discusses the beefing up of US army guerillas at Fort Bragg, N.C. while hoping for another Guatemala.

"Such a force poses grave hazards, to be sure. Among them: American military men could be put in the sensitive position of organizing revolutionaries and subversives against Red governments, even though the US is not officially at war.

"Though the Special Forces are not necessarily involved, it's no secret that this country is already furnishing weapons and supplies to anti-Castro forces in central Cuba's Escambray Mountains and training counter-revolutionaries in Florida and Guatemala.

"The training school for American Special Forces also provides instruction to what it terms 'civilian employees of the government,' presumably intelligence agents."

There's the democratic inspiration of crushing nascent agrarian reformers, "in at least one instance, the US did engineer a revolt—against the left wing government of Guatemala in mid-1954. An anti-Communist force of Guatemalans, trained and financed by American intelligence agents, gathered in neighboring Honduras for its attack on the government of Communistic President Jacobo Arbenz. After less than a month's fighting, the rebels won. Ever since, Guatemala has been a fairly strong backer of US policy."

The article relates that US guerillas "are quite literally taking tips" from Mao Tse-Tung and Ché Guevara. According to the *NY Times* (Mar. 28), Kennedy is said to be "profoundly impressed" by Guevara's study, but the Pentagon strikes a note of caution: "In such operations it is essential that the people be sympathetic and that the army have their confidence." Aye, there's the rub.

Unfortunately for Kennedy and the CIA, Joseph Newman, in his *NY Herald Tribune* series (Mar. 23) is forced to admit that "Castro and Guevara are literally adored by the large number of poor and humiliated Cubans, especially the Negroes. They see these two leaders as saintly and honorable men, dedicated to removing injustices and discrimination."

### The Ubiquitous CIA

Reckless organizers of the Guatemalan reaction and the U2 fiasco are ever present. The *Miami Herald* (Mar. 13) relates that "foremost exile chiefs" of the counter-revolution say that the Democratic Revolutionary Front "is sponsored and subsidized by the CIA." A Cuban official of the Frente said: "Not one ammunition boat leaves for Cuba, not one plane leaves for the training camps without a CIA agent aboard. Gun-running boats without a CIA agent along are almost always stopped by US authorities."

*Time* reported in 1953 that the CIA "was from the start engaged in a wide range of covert activities." Besides traditional espionage, agents spread across the world with "a few 20th century improvements such as plastic explosives." There are now an estimated 40,000 CIA employees. Gunboat diplomacy in its modern guise utilizes secret agents, subversion and sabotage, while holding the armed forces in reserve.

Hanson Baldwin, military analyst for the *NY Times*, in discussing the CIA (Jan. 15, 1956) summed up a grave danger: "Uncontrolled intelligence agencies are in a position to dominate policy making, and hence government. Their very secrecy gives them power, there are few to accept or reject their findings."

—by Henry Spira

## ACLU Protests Travel Ban

The American Civil Liberties Union has added its voice to the chorus of protest against the State Department's unconstitutional ban on travel to Cuba. In a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, made public on March 22nd, the ACLU restated its belief that the right to travel is a constitutionally protected right which should be curbed only under extraordinary circumstances "which clearly and presently threaten the continued life of our nation."

The ACLU conceded that freedom of movement is not an absolute right, but it rejected "the idea that foreign policy should define and restrict the exercise of constitutional rights otherwise available."

While recognizing that a "large breach...exists" between the United States and Cuba, the ACLU letter said "we are not at war. It would seem therefore the government's action flows from its desire to make travel control an instrument of foreign policy, particularly when its announcement is interpreted in the press as an effort to curb American citizens who have been invited by the Cuban Government to visit that country." On January 19 the Department of State added Cuba to the list of countries which American citizens cannot visit without the government's permission. Exemptions may be granted in cases where travel is considered to be in the "best interests of the United States"; newsmen and businessmen who have previously established interests in Cuba can qualify.

"The State Department asserts that when diplomatic relations are broken off (as in the case of Cuba) the United States is unable to extend normal protective services to its citizens; and this is sufficient justification to restrict travel to specified geographical areas since by Congressional statute the President is required to assist an American citizen in trouble abroad," the ACLU letter, signed by its executive director, Patrick Murphy Malin, pointed out.

But, it added, this factor conflicts with an individual's right to travel, secured by both the First and Fifth Amendment. As a solution, the ACLU proposed: "If the government believes in good faith that circumstances will prevent it from extending its usual good offices to protect its citizens traveling in any particular geographical area, it should so notify prospective travelers. But since this obligation is merely a statutory and not a constitutional one, such travelers should be permitted expressly to waive their right to protection if they so choose. Such a waiver does not entirely solve the government's problem if a citizen runs into difficulty, but it relieves the government of responsibility to protect American citizens abroad who have not sought such protection."

---

## Fair Play Banquet

The N.Y. FPCC is organizing a gala fund-raising banquet on Friday, April 28th. Carl Braden, field secretary of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, will be one of the main speakers. Also scheduled to speak is Rowland Watts, National Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union and *Afro-American* correspondent William Worthy. Witty James Higgins, Assistant Editor of the *York, Pa. Gazette and Daily*, will be toastmaster. Other speakers will be announced shortly.

Contribution is \$7.50 per plate, which we hope will bring in some badly needed dollars for the FPCC treasury. Remember the date: Friday, April 28th, at 7:30 p.m. Make reservations now for yourself and your friends by calling the N. Y. Chapter at OR 4-8295.

To: The Fair Play for Cuba Committee  
799 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y.

I wish to become a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Enclosed is my check or m.o. for \$5.00 covering dues for one year, including subscription to *Fair Play* .....

I do not wish to be listed as a member,\* but would like to receive *Fair Play* and other free literature. Enclosed is my check or m.o. for \$5.00 to cover handling and mailing costs for one year .....

I would like to have a more active part in supporting the cause of Fair Play for Cuba. Enclosed is my contribution for .....

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

\*Membership does not, of course, imply blanket endorsement of policies of the Committee nor of the opinions expressed in FAIR PLAY, nor will the name of any member be used in any policy statement without the permission of the member.

FAIR PLAY. Published by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, 799 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y. Richard Gibson, Editor.

EXHIBIT No. 25-B

NEW YORK POST, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1961

DATELINE: YOUR WORLD

## Viewpoints

JOSEPH BARRY



Paris.

Dear Allen:

Congratulations to your roommate on his Carnegie grant. When he comes to Paris to study "The Reaction of the French Intellectual to the Curtailment of Civil Liberties due to the Algerian War," I'll be glad to help him.

Pity his subject isn't a little more sweeping—"The Moral Crisis of the French Conscience" or "The French Intellectual In Face of an Unjust War." It would include his proposed study in the proper context. Fortunately, he will arrive at the beginning of the end of that war, I think, after the impact of the intellectual revolt has already been felt and has moved de Gaulle, France's most powerful intellectual of the moment, in the direction he was lethargically inclined.

As the revolt occurred, I tried to describe it in terms understandable to Americans. Frankly, I'm afraid I failed. How do you explain an intellectual's turning to treason—aiding and even fighting for the FLN rebels against the French army—to people to whom the treason of Patrick Henry is a comfortable quotation of 200 years ago rather than a provocation to reexamine the meaning of patriotism today?

I referred to the Mexican War—as unjust a war as we have ever waged—as our Algerian War, and cited Thoreau's conscientious objection and civil disobedience. But it's easy to feel noble about something a century ago when so noble a man is cited as an example. And—let's be honest—it's easy to strike noble attitudes and take stern moral positions on another country's unjust and dirty war.

Finally I chose a far-fetched example. Suppose, I wrote, that America undertook the reconquest of Cuba in its national interest (always, of course, defined by the interested nation) and we were about to enter the seventh year of fighting isolated guerrillas who had other (obviously mistaken) nationalist interests? What should be the attitude of an American man of conscience? What should he counsel his son about to be drafted? What should be his own behavior?

Suppose, to complicate the matter realistically, American action were "simply" armed support for the anti-Castro majority (what else?) that dragged on for years due to the stubbornness of the terrorist pro-Castro minority? Believe me, most Frenchmen, until literally yesterday, were absolutely convinced that the FLN was a terrorist minority in Algeria. The pro-FLN French intellectual has not been a romantic Byronic figure, any more than the "Indian lover" in frontier days or the "Mexican lover" during the Mexican War.

\* \* \*

Castro, it is said, has betrayed the Cuban revolution. Does this condone our undertaking a counter-revolution? Castro is no longer a Robin Hood. It might be proved, but a Santa Anna. So was Santa Anna a Santa Anna, yet Thoreau found that no justification for an unjust war. Santa Anna, to prove his possible parallel with Castro, declared himself dictator (after being recalled to Mexico in the years following her defeat) with the title Serene Highness. Should we, consequently, have insisted on acquiring not only Texas, New Mexico and California, but also Mexico itself for the sake of the Mexicans? An historical argument can be made for it by those who can argue that way.

I'm tempted to apply to Carnegie myself for a grant. I'd like to study *in situ* "The Reaction of the American Intellectual to Reports of Preparations for an American Invasion of Cuba."

Sounds objective enough, doesn't it? Or should I change "reports" to "rumors"?

Actually, what concerns me is not so much the accuracy of the rumors—though reports of training camps in Guatemala, Florida, and the CIA knows where else, sound real enough—but the inertness of our intellectuals. A colleague, for one, accepts the reports as facts, facts of international life; apparently American armed interference in Cuba to be part of the new liberal *realpolitik*, because Castro is listing towards communism, if not already shipwrecked on its shores, and also, I'm afraid because President Kennedy in his campaign indicated that such action would be part of his Cuban program.

\* \* \*

Is the American intellectual about to identify himself with the Kennedy Administration because of its academic content and because of his own lonely Eisenhower years as an outsider? Is he going to become the practical man who wants to get things done? Are there to be American Malrauxs and no Pasternaks or Jean-Paul Sartres? Is there to be no American separation of conscience and state? Are we to win Cuba and not only further lose the uncommitted world, but, what is a far greater loss, lose ourselves?

As for me, I would rather see Cuba Communist than an American colony. If Cuba were invaded, I would aid Castro. If this be treason, may a Carnegie study make the most of it.

Good luck to us all, and all the best,

JOE BARRY

FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE  
799 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY 3, N.Y.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, I show you a photostat of a paper entitled, "A Note to Fair Play Readers," bearing the names of Robert Taber and Richard Gibson. Are you familiar with that?

Mr. GIBSON. I again respectfully decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is a mailing piece of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. It has your name on it. Is that not correct?

Mr. GIBSON. I again respectfully decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. May this be off the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator DODD. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Marvin Markman?

Mr. GIBSON. I did not meet Mr. Markman until this morning in this very room.

Mr. SOURWINE. You met him for the first time this morning?

Mr. GIBSON. I met him for the first time this morning.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, are you concerned in any way with the threat to the security of the United States that is posed by the establishment of the Communist dictatorship just 90 miles off our shores?

Mr. GIBSON. First of all, I must state that I am very much concerned for the security of the United States, at least for my own security, being in the United States at the moment, and being a Negro. But I must frankly state in all sincerity that I do not believe that there is a Communist regime 90 miles from the United States.

Mr. SOURWINE. That answers the question.

I show you three ads from the National Guardian of March 6, 1961. One of these refers to a party of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee to be held in the Bronx. One refers to a Fair Play for Cuba Committee rally to "Hear the Truth About Cuba," with speakers James Higgins, editor of the York, Pa., Gazette and Daily; Bert Wainer, editor, FPCC Student Council Newsletter; and chairman, Barrows Dunham, philosopher, author, lecturer.

The third refers to an address, "Africa's March to Freedom," by Richard Gibson of the Liberation Committee for Africa and acting executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

I ask you, did you have anything to do with the placement of any of those three ads?

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer that question on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who paid you for the lecture which is advertised there?

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer for all of the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. May these three ads go in the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator DODD. Yes, they may be put in.

(The advertising referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 26" and reads as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 26

(National Guardian, April 6, 1961, p. 11)

---

**PARTY, FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMM.**  
 Hear taped interviews with Cuban people. Short eye-witness account by recent visitor. **SAT., MARCH 4, 8 p.m. at 1804 Longfellow Ave., Apt. 2 E. WY 1-1367. 7th or Lex. IRT E. Bronx express to 174 St. sta. Contribution \$1.**  
**Disc. & Refreshments**

---

(National Guardian, March 6, 1961, p. 11)

---

**FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMM. RALLY**  
**"Hear the Truth about Cuba."**  
 Speakers: **James Higgins**, editor, York. Pa. Gazette & Daily; **Bert Wainer**, editor, FPCC Student Council Newsletter. Chairman: **Barrows Dunham**, philosopher, author, lecturer.  
**FRI., MARCH 10, 8 p.m. at PHILA. ETHICAL SOCIETY, 1906 S. Rittenhouse Sq. For information contact FPCC P.O. Box 7971, Phila. 1.**

---

(National Guardian, March 6, 1961, p. 6)

---

**Richard Gibson of the Liberation Committee for Africa & acting exec. secy of the Fair Play for Cuba Comm. will discuss, "AFRICA'S MARCH TO FREEDOM" FRI., MARCH 3, 8:30 p.m., 116 University Pl. (off Union Sq. Ausp: Militant Labor Forum Don. 50c**

---

Mr. SOURWINE. Finally, I show you, Mr. Gibson, a mailing piece of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. It says, "The Cuban Revolution Uncensored," William Worthly, correspondent for the Baltimore Afro-American, former special correspondent for CBS and Time, Inc.; "Cuba and the Fight for Equal Rights," by Robert Williams, editor, the Crusader; Southern NAACP leader who won reversal of the "Kissing case"; recent visitor to Cuba, Friday, April 14, 1961, 8 p.m., Century Room, Cosmopolitan Hotel, 18th and Broadway.

This appears to be an ad flyer or announcement for an organization dealing with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee for Denver.

I ask you if you have seen before now a copy or the original of which this is a copy?

Mr. GIBSON. For the reasons previously given, and on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must respectfully decline to answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that organizing meeting for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in Denver held in April of this year?

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer, for all the reasons previously given.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has the Fair Play for Cuba Committee issued a charter for a Denver branch of the committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I must again decline to answer for all the reasons I have previously stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. May this go into the record at this point?

Senator DODD. Yes.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 27" and appears on an adjoining page:)

EXHIBIT No. 27

**C** We the undersigned citizens of Denver and Boulder, have followed with interest and grave concern the mounting crisis between the United States and Cuba, and, with equal concern, the apparent manipulation of the facts about Cuba on the part of the American press.

Since U. S. policy toward Cuba, as heralded by the press, is less than peaceful, the situation is quite serious, and is now cause for close scrutiny by all Americans. However, the supporters of our government's present policies, which includes permitting counterrevolutionary troops to train in Florida, endeavor to silence and intimidate those who criticize those policies. It is natural, therefore, that we suspect the motives and sincerity of the opinion which seeks to limit debate and news, and we most try to assist those whose views are hampered.

We need look no farther than the handling by certain papers in Denver and Boulder of the news that pro-Castro opinions were presented to a college class. We are heartened that the Colorado University students, who were to be protected from these opinions, dramatically voiced their resentment in a petition, containing hundreds of signatures, denouncing the incursion into academic freedom by these papers.

Because of those things, we are happy to inform you that a FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE will be organized in Denver, and that the Temporary Steering Committee for this organization will present two speakers of note. While we ourselves may or may not individually participate in this committee, we announce it to you, because we encourage responsible dissent. The particulars are to the right:

- Eutimio Duran  
Social Worker
- William N. Fleming  
Writer
- Howard Gruber  
Professor
- Virgeen Hedgecock  
Housewife
- Lee Jessor  
Psychologist
- Richard Jessor  
Professor
- Harold V. Knight  
Writer
- Celis Litmao  
Housewife
- Milton Litman  
Lawyer
- Walter B. Lovelace  
Editor

- Thomas J. Meloney  
Minister
- Charles S. Milligan  
Professor
- Harry Nier  
Lawyer
- T. E. "Duke" Robertson, Jr.  
Musician
- Willie Segal  
Professor
- Carol Sprague  
Housewife
- Hall T. Sprague  
Education
- R. Franklin Terry  
Clergyman
- Forrest Williams  
Professor



**The Cuban Revolution  
Uncensored**

**WILLIAM WORTHY**

Correspondent for the Baltimore Afro-American, former Special Correspondent for C.B.S. and Time, Inc. Covered South Africa, Panamajon, China, Cuba.

**U**

**Cuba And The Fight  
For Equal Rights**

**ROBERT WILLIAMS**

Editor THE CRUSADER: Southern NAACP leader who won reversal of the "Kissing Case"; recent visitor to Cuba



National sponsors of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

- Carleton Beals
- W. E. B. DuBois
- Waldo Frank
- Richard Gibson
- Alexander Meiklejohn
- C. Wright Mills
- Harvey O'Connor
- Linus Pauling
- Jean Paul Sartre
- I. F. Stone
- Robert Taber
- Willard Uphaus
- List incomplete

**B**

**Friday, April 14, 1961**

**8:00 P.M.**

Century Room, Cosmopolitan Hotel  
18th & Broadway

ADMISSION 90¢

For Tickets call KE 4-6923 or TA 5-2779

Aspices  
FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA,  
STEERING COMMITTEE

**A**

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no further questions for this witness, but I think it is possible we may later recommend that he be recalled before the committee after we have inquired into the question of the members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee who are Communists.

Senator DODD. I think it is quite certain we want you back, and you will be notified. We are 100 percent certain, so we shall continue the present subpoena. You are under subpoena to this committee, and we shall notify you—

Senator KEATING. Mr. Gibson knows about 3 o'clock—

Mr. SOURWINE. Instead of a subpoena, would you prefer to have an understanding that if given reasonable notice in time, you will come, upon notice to your counsel, or would you rather have us come to you with notice?

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. Gibson will appear and respond to any subpoena, and it does not have to be personally served upon him. If, Mr. Sourwine, you will mail the subpoena to me, I shall produce Mr. Gibson at the appointed time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is this agreeable, Mr. Gibson? You will accept service of the subpoena calling for your appearance if served upon your attorney?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. I have a further question I would like to ask.

When did you first go to work for CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. I began working for CBS, I believe, in December of 1957—1958, excuse me.

Senator DODD. Did you know Robert Taber at that time?

Mr. GIBSON. Probably not right away, but I probably met him shortly after.

Senator DODD. Did you meet him after you were employed by CBS, or before?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, some time after, I believe.

Senator DODD. To whom did you first talk in CBS when you were employed by CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. That question is not very clear to me. Do you mean who employed me in CBS?

Senator DODD. Yes, I want to know what the circumstances were of your employment in the first instance.

Mr. GIBSON. I was interviewed by Mr. John Day, who was the director of news at CBS.

Senator DODD. Did you say John Daly?

Mr. GIBSON. No, Day. Mr. Daly is at ABC, or was at ABC.

Well, I was interviewed by him, and on the basis of my experience, my qualifications—they had not had any Negro writers in this firm. There was considerable pressure upon them to hire a Negro, and they had said before that they had never found a qualified Negro. Well, I happened to be qualified.

Senator DODD. What were your qualifications?

Mr. GIBSON. I had worked for 3 years in France, the Agence France-Presse, and I found, in France, the job that I could not have gotten in the United States. I got, therefore, the experience, and so I came back to the United States by sheer accident and got a job at CBS. I was offered a job.

Senator DODD. You were offered one?



Mr. GIBSON. I was told that they were under pressure, that they were looking for someone, by the Urban League of Greater New York.

Senator DODD. Who told you?

Mr. GIBSON. Someone—I do not recall now, but a friend of mine or an acquaintance, who was connected with the Urban League. I saw their directors. They inquired into my background and spoke with CBS. Then I had my appointment with Mr. Day.

Following this, after being given an extraordinary number of tests, I was put on probation for, I think, 3 or 4 days, and required to write a number of news shows which, to the best of my knowledge, no white applicant had ever been asked to do. Finally I was hired.

Senator DODD. Do you remember at just what point you met Taber?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I do not.

Senator DODD. Do you have any recollection at all?

Mr. GIBSON. It must have been within the first 2 months after my employment.

Senator DODD. Did you work together?

Mr. GIBSON. Not always. Sometimes we were in the same shop, but I never worked with him on anything.

Senator DODD. Was your work similar to his?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, we were both writers of shows. Naturally, he was doing much more complicated things than I was.

Senator DODD. That interests me. What was the difference between your duty and his?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, for one thing, he was writing much longer newscasts. Being the low man, the new man there, I did the short, 5-minute newscasts, and so forth.

Senator DODD. Did you and Taber, for example, both have the same superior?

Mr. GIBSON. Oh, yes.

Senator DODD. What was his name?

Mr. GIBSON. John F. Day, originally.

Senator DODD. This is the same person you were employed by?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, and later we had another superior.

Senator DODD. What was his name?

Mr. GIBSON. David E. Driscoll.

Senator DODD. These were your only superiors in the sense of those you dealt with day by day?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, in the corporate structure of CBS, it is rather difficult to say at any one time who is your superior. There were people below me, editors, and so forth, who read, corrected, and censored copy.

Senator DODD. Are you going to give us the names of the other seven nominees for the fellowship?

Mr. GIBSON. I shall do that privately.

Senator DODD. Will you do that today?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, as many of them as I can remember. I am not altogether certain, because I do not come into contact with them daily.

Senator DODD. Did you know Mr. Worthy when he was employed by CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. Did you know him since?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Where did you meet him?

Mr. GIBSON. I am not certain where I met Bill Worthy. It was in the United States. It has been some months ago—more than that; a year, I think. I know of him. Every Negro knows Bill Worthy's name.

Senator DODD. What is his relationship to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. None.

Senator DODD. None at all?

Mr. GIBSON. No. He is not a member. To the best of my knowledge, he is not a member, anyway.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, he is listed on that flyer of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee as a speaker for the organizing meeting for April of this year, is he not?

Mr. GIBSON. I said to the best of my knowledge, he is not a member.

Senator DODD. Maybe I said a member. I think I said do you have any relationship with him.

Mr. GIBSON. You asked me if he is a member, and to the best of my knowledge, he is not.

Senator DODD. I see you are being very technical about your answers.

Does he have any association with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. He has an association with me, a very friendly association.

Senator DODD. I said does he have any association with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. He has an association with me, but it is very personal. That is the only way I can phrase it.

Senator DODD. Is this how you account for his appearing as a speaker at the Denver meeting?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not arrange anything with Mr. Worthy, and I have nothing to do with Mr. Worthy's speaking engagements. I did not have anything to do with that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who paid him for that appearance, or his expenses for his trip to Denver?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I am afraid I do not. I did not have anything to do with it.

Senator DODD. You have told us that you did prepare news broadcasts for CBS. I think you also said that some of these had to do with Cuba?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Did any of them have to do with Cuba after Castro?

Mr. GIBSON. Since I was employed by CBS in December—the end of December—naturally, they did; December 1958.

Senator DODD. Did you and Taber ever talk about the substance of these broadcasts concerning Castro Cuba, which you prepared for CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. No, we did not.

I must state at this point that our scripts were read by editors and, later, as I mentioned earlier, when CBS asked me to resign, I challenged them to examine the scripts. I was backed up by the union, the Writers Guild of America East, and they declined to do so.

Senator DODD. Why did they tell you—did they give you a reason for asking for your resignation?

Mr. GIBSON. They did. One of the reasons given was a letter from Senator Byrd, which concerned me, but not only that; also because I was an associate of Mr. Robert Williams in Monroe, N.C., who was a very valiant Negro leader in a very difficult situation in the United States in the South. Senator Byrd did not seem to approve.

Senator KEATING. May I inquire, you said that was one of the reasons. What were the other reasons given by CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. The other reason was my association with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Senator KEATING. Those were the only reasons?

Mr. GIBSON. And the visits of agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to various executives of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Senator KEATING. Did you receive a letter from them at the time that your work with them was terminated?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Senator KEATING. This dismissal was oral, was it?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes. Well, I believe I gave them a letter of resignation. We reached an agreement in conjunction with the union, and I submitted a letter of resignation after an agreement had been worked out.

Senator KEATING. With whom did you negotiate in that connection, in CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not recall the name of the person. He was the vice president in charge of personnel, but I really did not know him before, and I do not recall his name now.

Senator DODD. You did not talk to Mr. Day about that?

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Day expressed his regrets that the company felt the way it did, but he had nothing to say.

Senator DODD. Let me ask you about this. When CBS told you that your association with Fair Play for Cuba was one of the reasons for asking you for your resignation, did you raise any questions about this? Apparently you did.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I did.

Senator DODD. What was the point of their objection?

Mr. GIBSON. That I was too controversial and that they could not stand to have the FBI agents visiting them as often as they apparently were.

Senator DODD. I suppose they were familiar with the ads your organization ran in the New York Times?

Mr. GIBSON. There was no mention of that.

Senator DODD. You knew about that?

Mr. GIBSON. There was no mention of it.

Senator DODD. I understand that. I say you knew about it?

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer that question on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator DODD. I was going along pretty far on this. You are certainly not going to tell us at this point you do not want to admit you knew about the ads in the New York Times? You have told us about so many other things. I think you will have to acknowledge that you opened the door pretty wide now.

Mr. GIBSON. I again stick to my denial, my previous denials on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments. I must decline to answer that question.

Also, I wonder if it is the legislative purpose of this committee to censor American news.

Senator DODD. We know we told you our legislative purpose at the very outset, and we are not going to explain it to you on that ground. If that was your only ground, the Chair will order you right now to answer. You have opened up this door. We have talked to you about the fact that you were writing news broadcasts for a very large, influential corporation that broadcasts news all over this country, at the time you were a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and at the time your organization was running ads in the New York Times, which I think it is completely fair to say were complete lies.

But my question to you is: Did this come up between you and your superiors at the time you were asked to resign?

Mr. GIBSON. No, it did not. That was not what was put to me. At that time, mention was made of a letter from Senator Byrd protesting my presence on the staff of CBS News, and not only because of my connection with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, but also because of my connection with certain activities in the South and because of the fact that, as they said, they had grown rather tired of the controversy and of the visits of FBI agents.

Senator KEATING. In your testimony at one point, you said you had never been active politically in the United States. I thought you put stress on the words, "in the United States." Have you ever been active politically in any other country?

Mr. GIBSON. I can correct that and say I have not been active politically in or outside of the United States. What I meant to say is I have never been involved in any kind of organization, political or fraternal or anything, until I became connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Now, naturally, while living abroad, I have come to respect and know Africans who are fighting for their liberation, Algerians—who are also Africans. I knew these people quite well, and I must state again I did not find them to be Communists, but simply people like myself who wanted the same things that I want. But this was not a political association, really. It was friendly, and I never was involved in anything until I became connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Senator KEATING. Do you consider the Fair Play for Cuba Committee a political committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not consider the Fair Play for Cuba Committee to be political, no. I consider it to be an organization dedicated to presenting a certain viewpoint. You may say it is political, but that is your prerogative.

Senator KEATING. I am asking you about it. Do you personally stand back of all the statements that were in that ad in the New York Times?

Mr. GIBSON. As I have stated previously concerning the ad mentioned, I must decline to answer questions concerning that ad or any other ad on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator DODD. I think you had a statement you wanted to make. Do you still want to make it?

Mr. GIBSON. I have a statement I would like to read.

Senator DODD. Does it have to do with the substance of the hearing?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe it does. At least, it has to do with my particular position, and that is all that I am really speaking for here.

Senator KEATING. First, will you tell me about how long your statement is?

Mr. GIBSON. My statement runs 2 pages, sir; 2½ pages.

It is with pride and a clear conscience that I come before this subcommittee, which has tried so hard to stifle free speech in this country by every means at its disposal. I am proud of the work of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which is only 1 year old.

Senator DODD. Just a minute. I did not hear that. Tried so hard to what?

Mr. GIBSON. I said I am proud of the work of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which is only 1 year old.

Senator DODD. No, no; go back and start over.

Mr. GIBSON. It is with pride and a clear conscience that I come before this subcommittee, which has tried so hard to stifle free speech in this country by every means at its disposal.

I might add that I think that some of your questions today certainly bore that out.

I am proud of the work of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which is only 1 year old.

Senator DODD. Since you have interrupted yourself, I might add that some of your answers leave much to be desired.

Mr. GIBSON. I am proud of the work of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which is only 1 year old. It has been successful in alerting an ever-growing number of Americans to gravity of the criminal enterprise carried out by the U.S. Government against the peaceful and progressive people of Cuba and their revolutionary government. The sordid details of this aggression have been amply reported by the U.S. press and are, I am certain, familiar to all of you.

Senator KEATING. You are aware, are you not, that that is exactly the line of the Communist Party and of the Soviet Union?

Mr. GIBSON. I am aware also it is the line of Prime Minister Nehru of India, the line of the President of Guinea, the line of Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, the line of the President of—

Mr. SOURWINE. How about Lumumba?

Mr. GIBSON. The U.S. Government—

Senator DODD. Wait a minute. We have a right to ask you some questions. You have demanded to read the statement.

Did you use this kind of material in writing your news broadcasts for CBS?

Mr. GIBSON. Did I use this? I am afraid the CBS would not have passed this.

Senator DODD. I know your answer; did you use this sort of thing?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Senator KEATING. Are you spreading this kind of propaganda at Columbia University among your colleagues there?

Mr. GIBSON. I am at Columbia University to learn, not to spread propaganda.

Senator DODD. You have a lot to learn, all right. I hope you get some learning there.

You say you did not use this when you wrote news broadcasts for CBS. Did you use this kind of material in writing for the Nation magazine?

Mr. GIBSON. To the best of my knowledge, no; I wrote about certain specific things.

Senator DODD. You know what you have told us is untrue, do you not?

Mr. GIBSON. What is untrue?

Senator DODD. This that you read here about the peace-loving government of Cuba?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know, I do not believe that the Cubans attacked the United States.

Senator DODD. You had better go back to Columbia for some more of that learning.

Mr. GIBSON. I think at Columbia, there might be some people who feel as I do. But be that as it may.

The sordid details of this aggression have been amply reported by the U.S. press and are, I am certain, familiar to all of you. The U.S. Government, through the supersecret Central Intelligence Agency, armed, trained, and financed the Cuban counter-revolutionaries and other mercenaries who attacked Cuba a little more than a week ago.

Mr. SOURWINE. This man is testifying under oath, Mr. Chairman.

What information do you have with respect to any arms furnished to any mercenaries who went to Cuba?

Mr. GIBSON. My information comes entirely from the U.S. press: from the New York Times, from Time magazine, from the columns of Mr. James Reston.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have no information except what you read in the paper?

Mr. GIBSON. That is all I have.

Senator DODD. This is a kind of a round robin. You help to feed some of that stuff, and then you eat it yourself.

Mr. GIBSON. I have never met Mr. Reston.

On behalf of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and speaking personally for myself and for many other American Negroes, I can only express delight at the utter and dismal defeat of this act of international banditry.

I am also proud that I, an American Negro who has personally known real oppression and racist tyranny here in the United States, should have been chosen to head the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. I am proud that so many of my people have been active in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you, in fact, chosen to head that committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Apparently I must have been.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have stated that you were. Now, were you?

Mr. GIBSON. I said I was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who chose you?

Senator DODD. I declare that you are directed to answer that question. You volunteered it.

Mr. GIBSON. I decline to answer that question on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator DODD. You had better listen. Your interests are really involved here. You have stated voluntarily before this committee that you were chosen to head up this committee as acting secretary. I assure you, and I am sure your counsel will assure you, that you must answer the question now that counsel put to you, and I order you to do so.

Mr. GIBSON. I must confer with counsel.

On the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments, I must decline to answer.

Senator DODD. You fully understand that you were ordered to answer the question?

Mr. GIBSON. Acting on the advice of counsel, I must decline to answer on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Senator KEATING. You have told us that you were chosen to head the committee, and you are very proud of it, and you decline to tell us any of the circumstances under which you were chosen?

Mr. GIBSON. I have declined to answer that question on the grounds, all the grounds, previously stated.

Senator DODD. And I ordered him to answer the question.

Mr. GIBSON. I am proud, too, that I am an officer of the Liberation Committee for Africa, which was one of the Afro-American organizations that planned the demonstration in the United Nations Security Council on February 15 in indignation at the murder of Premier Patrice Lumumba of the Congo. He suffered the fate that the CIA would have wished also for Cuba's valiant Premier Fidel Castro.

It is appalling how little, white politicians in this country understand the feelings and resentment of Negro Americans at the continuing racist oppression that permeates the life of this Nation. It is a disgrace that there are members of this very subcommittee who have dared to defend segregation and all the misery that it implies for my people.

Instead of investigating the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, I would suggest that you investigate the patently un-American activities of the White Citizens Councils and the Ku Klux Klan. Indeed, why not investigate the Central Intelligence Agency, which has done so much to bring the world prestige of the United States to its lowest point in many years?

And why not investigate the Mississippi police who last month unleashed savage dogs on Negro students in Jackson, Miss.? Those students were peacefully demonstrating against the violation of their rights and privileges, guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

No police dogs are used against Negroes in Cuba. As Joseph Newman reported in the New York Herald-Tribune on March 23d:

Castro and Guevara are literally adored by the large number of poor and humiliated Cubans, especially the Negroes. They see these two leaders as saintly and honorable men, dedicated to removing injustices and discrimination.

In today's (April 25) issue of the New York Post, 31 Afro-Americans, including myself, have signed the following statement:

CUBA

A DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE BY AFRO-AMERICANS

Because we have known oppression, because we have suffered more than other Americans, because we are still fighting for our liberation from tyranny, we Afro-Americans have the right and the duty to raise our voices in protest against the forces of oppression that now seek to crush a free people linked to us by bonds of blood and a common heritage.

One-third of Cuba's people are Afro-Cubans, of the same African descent as we. Many of our own forefathers passed through Cuba on their way to the slave plantations in the United States. Those who remained on the island knew the same brutality that their brothers suffered on the mainland. After emancipation, they too knew disenfranchisement, they too became second-class citizens, peons exploited on the huge United States-owned landholdings.

Today, thanks to a social revolution which they helped make, Afro-Cubans are first-class citizens and are taking their rightful place in the life of their country where all racial barriers crumbled in a matter of weeks following the victory of Fidel Castro.

Now our brothers are threatened again—this time by a gang of ousted white Cuban politicians who find segregated Miami more congenial than integrated Havana. We charge that this group of mercenaries who hope to turn back the clock in Cuba are armed, trained, and financed by the United States Central Intelligence Agency. This criminal aggression against a peaceful and progressive people must not be allowed to continue. But if it does, we are determined to do all we possibly can to hinder the success of this crime.

William Worthy, foreign correspondent for the Baltimore Afro-American, declared recently: "If Cuba is attacked, I and others who know the facts will denounce the attack as an evil and wicked colonial war deserving of opposition and resistance by Afro-Americans." Worthy warned that, if such an attack took place: "In this country we would see civil rights setbacks from coast to coast. Our enemies would be strengthened and emboldened."

Afro-Americans won't be fooled. The enemies of the Cubans are our enemies, the Jim Crow bosses of this land where we are still denied our rights. The Cubans are our friends. The Cubans are the enemies of our enemies.

Now, President Kennedy has declared that it is the policy of the U.S. Government to aid all peoples who are fighting against tyranny. We heartily approve of this new attitude on the part of the U.S. Government. I would like to draw to your attention, and I hope indirectly to the President's, the telegram which Cuba's distinguished Foreign Minister received and read to the Political Committee of the U.N. General Assembly on the night of April 20. The telegram read—

Senator Dobb. Is that the distinguished Foreign Minister whose son put up the cash for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer that question on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

The telegram read—

Senator Dobb. That is the sworn testimony before this committee about the son of "the distinguished Foreign Minister."

Mr. GIBSON. I must respectfully decline to answer that question on the basis of my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

The telegram which Foreign Minister Roa read to the Political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly read as follows:

Please convey to Mr. Adlai Stevenson this message: Now that the United States has proclaimed military support for people willing to rebel against oppression, oppressed Negroes in the South urgently request tanks, artillery,



bombs, money, use of American airfields and white mercenaries to crush the racist tyrants who have betrayed the American Revolution and Civil War. We also request prayers for this noble undertaking.

The telegram was signed by Robert F. Williams, President of Union County, N.C., branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Then there is the serious matter of the violation of U.S. neutrality laws. These laws are well known to the members of this subcommittee.

Senator DODD. By the way, are you over the two pages?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I am just about to finish.

They state quite explicitly that no U.S. citizen or foreign resident may engage in recruitment for and the planning of an armed action against another country. It is bad enough that Batista supporters and other Cuban counterrevolutionaries should have been permitted to plot on the territory of the United States, but it is completely intolerable that an agency of the U.S. Government—the Central Intelligence Agency—should have financed and directed this criminal enterprise. This is something that really cries out for investigation by responsible Members of Congress.

There have been many charges coming from this very subcommittee, maintaining that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is a "Communist operation." Well, it is not, and I state under oath that I am not and never have been a member of the Communist Party. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee is a nonprofit organization of fairminded Americans who seek to counter the many lies concerning the Cuban revolution and its leaders. We are deeply concerned by the hatred of the leaders of this Nation for a people and government that has proved to the world that it is possible rapidly to wipe out political tyranny, economic exploitation, and racial discrimination. It is up to the leaders of this country to show that they can do as well.

I thank you.

Senator KEATING. I just want to make this comment. It is, I believe, well known that there is no more sincere or dedicated advocate of rights for our minority citizens than the junior Senator from New York. It always has been so and it is also true of the senior Senator from Connecticut, the chairman of this subcommittee. I simply want to say that a statement such as this, of a character like this, has set back the cause for which we are working. I am very grateful that such statements do not speak for the vast number of patriotic, sincere Negro Americans in this country.

Senator DODD. I could not agree with you more. I am grateful for your reference to me. This is the sort of outrage we have to put up with at times to live up to our free system.

Mr. Gibson, we shall see you again.

We are adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 5:28 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)



## FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1961

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call at 10:45 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, Senator Thomas J. Dodd presiding.

Present: Senators Dodd and Keating.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director, and Frank Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator KEATING (presiding). The subcommittee will please come to order.

Mr. Gibson, you will please take the stand.

Will you stand and raise your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear that the evidence you will give in this proceeding will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GIBSON. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF RICHARD THOMAS GIBSON, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, you are here in response to a subpoena of the subcommittee?

Senator KEATING. May the record show that he is accompanied by counsel, who gave his name and address at the last hearing.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. Senator, may I have the privilege at this time of interposing certain legal objections for the record?

Senator KEATING. You mean to the subpoena?

Mr. FAULKNER. To the subpoena and to the hearing. I shall make it very brief.

Senator KEATING. If they are brief, you may do so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may we have an answer, first, to the pending question as to whether the witness is here in response to the committee's subpoena?

Mr. GIBSON. What was the question?

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you here in response to a subpoena of the subcommittee?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Faulkner, you have some objection to the subpoena?

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes, I object to the subpoena, which calls for the production of certain records. My objection is predicated upon the

fact that this subpoena was not served upon an organization, it was not served upon an individual in his official capacity as an officer of an organization. Therefore, I feel that there is no legal compulsion, besides any other reason that may be raised by the witness, in the event that he does not produce the information or records called for by this subpoena. That is No. 1.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman.

Senator KEATING. I shall hear counsel. My understanding was that all that was necessary here, according to the stipulation entered into at the last hearing, was to notify you as his counsel. I may be mistaken.

Counsel, will you enlighten us on that?

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to be sure that we understand this objection first.

Is the objection technical in that the subpoena does not state that Mr. Gibson is an officer of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, or do you object to the fact and contend that he is not an officer of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. FAULKNER. I do not contend that he is not an officer of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. He testified before the committee, at the last session, that he is an officer. My contention is a legal one, and that is that the subpoena is not directed to him as an officer, No. 1, and No. 2, it is not directed to the organization which has control over the records called for by this subpoena.

Mr. SOURWINE. On this point, Mr. Chairman, as the Chair well knows, there is no magic in a subpoena. The important thing is the order of the committee and its communication to the witness. In this case, the witness was under order of the committee, entered in open meeting, to produce these documents. There is no question that he is the man who is an officer of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Witness' counsel asked for a postponement of time. The postponement was made. It was evidenced by a subpoena which was served through the office of the witness' counsel, Mr. Faulkner, in accordance with the agreement which was entered into and will appear on the open record.

It is the contention of counsel for the committee that the committee's order is valid, has been properly evidenced, has been communicated to the witness. The fact that he is here and has seen this subpoena is evidence that it has been communicated to him, and under the circumstances, I think he is bound by the committee's order and that there is no technicality which may be raised against the subpoena under these circumstances.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Faulkner, did you, in fact, deliver this subpoena to the witness?

Mr. FAULKNER. You mean physically deliver it?

Senator KEATING. Yes, sir.

Mr. FAULKNER. No, it was not necessary. He is here in response to an order from the committee. There is no doubt about that.

Senator KEATING. Will counsel read into the record at this point the instructions to the witness at the conclusion of the last hearing?

Mr. SOURWINE. The witness, at the conclusion of the last hearing, was instructed to—

Senator KEATING. I want the exact words in the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir. The witness was instructed:

bring with you any and all lists in your possession showing (1) the members of Play for Cuba Committee, the locations of the chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and the identity and location of the university campuses on which the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has student councils.

The subpoena which was issued, in response to which the witness is here, directed his appearance on this day and to—

bring with you any and all lists in your possession showing (1) the members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee; (2) the locations of the chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee; or (3) the identity or location of the university campuses on which the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has student councils.

The subpoena showed on its face that it supersedes a similar order for appearance May 4, 1961, entered in open hearing on Tuesday, April 25, 1961.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Gibson, you heard the direction to you at the last hearing in reference to the production of these records?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, sir.

Senator KEATING. The objection is overruled.

Proceed, Counsel.

Mr. FAULKNER. My second objection is that the direction for the issuance of this subpoena and the production of certain records does not indicate that this was an order and direction for the issuance of a subpoena by a majority of the subcommittee.

Senator KEATING. Under the rules under which we operate, one member of the committee constitutes a quorum.

Counsel, will you explain that?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee is conclusively presumed to speak for the committee unless there is a showing to the contrary. A subpoena signed by the chairman or any member of the committee authorized by the chairman to sign the subpoena is valid. This subpoena was signed by the chairman of the subcommittee and by the chairman of the full committee. There is no question about it.

Senator KEATING. It is a common practice not only of this committee but all other committees, am I correct, all other congressional committees?

Mr. SOURWINE. So far as I know, this is true.

Senator KEATING. Was it ever signed by all the members of the committee?

Mr. SOURWINE. No, sir.

Senator KEATING. The chairman normally issues a subpoena?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir. In some cases, the chairman of a subcommittee or the sitting member.

Senator KEATING. The objection of counsel is overruled. Senator Dodd will now preside.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this has pertinency to the objection raised by counsel. For the purpose of determining that, I would like to ask counsel a question.

Does your objection in any way, the pending objection, embrace a contention that the requirement of the rule with respect to the taking of testimony by a quorum of one has not been complied with?

Mr. FAULKNER. That was going to be my next objection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then I shall save this for that objection, Senator. I have spoken all that need be said with regard to the subpoena.

Mr. FAULKNER. Now, if I may be heard on the third objection, now that Senator Dodd has entered the room—

Senator DODD (now presiding). I am sorry to have been delayed. I have been out of town and just got back.

Mr. FAULKNER. And we have two members of the subcommittee sitting, I raise an objection to a quorum of two, unless there is some resolution adopted by the subcommittee authorizing and approving a subcommittee of two Senators to take testimony in open session.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have here photostatic copies of resolutions of this subcommittee pursuant to authority of subsection 3 of rule XXV, as amended, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, Senate Resolution 18, 81st Congress, 2d session, and the resolution of the Judiciary Committee thereunder approved January 20, 1955, and the resolution of the Internal Security Subcommittee thereunder approved, February 7, 1955. A quorum of one Senator of such subcommittee is authorized to sit for the purpose of taking sworn testimony of any witness in open session.

I offer this for the record.

Senator DODD. Yes, it should be placed in the record, and I shall order it placed in the record.

(The documents referred to were marked "Exhibits Nos. 28 and 28-A" and read as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 28

MARCH 29, 1955.

RESOLUTION

Pursuant to authority of subsection (3) of rule XXV, as amended, of the Standing Rules of the Senate (S. Res. 180, 81st Cong., 2d sess., agreed to February 1, 1950) and the resolution of the Judiciary Committee thereunder approved January 20, 1955, and the resolution of the Internal Security Subcommittee thereunder approved February 7, 1955, a quorum of one Senator of such subcommittee is authorized to sit for the purpose of taking the sworn testimony of any witness in executive session.

JAMES O. EASTLAND.  
HERMAN WELKER.  
WILLIAM E. JENNER.  
PRICE DANIEL.  
OLIN D. JOHNSTON.  
JOHN M. BUTLER.

EXHIBIT No. 28-A

APRIL 20, 1955.

RESOLUTION

Pursuant to authority of subsection (3) of rule XXV, as amended, of the Standing Rules of the Senate (S. Res. 180, 81st Cong., 2d sess., agreed to February 1, 1950) and the resolution of the Judiciary Committee thereunder approved January 20, 1955, and the resolution of the Internal Security Subcommittee thereunder approved February 7, 1955, a quorum of one Senator of such subcommittee is authorized to sit for the purpose of taking the sworn testimony of any witness in open session.

JAMES O. EASTLAND.  
WILLIAM E. JENNER.  
HERMAN WELKER.  
OLIN D. JOHNSTON.  
JOHN M. BUTLER.  
PRICE DANIEL.

Senator DODD. The objection is overruled.

Mr. FAULKNER. According to the rules of procedure which I have before me, there was a rule adopted March 29, 1955, which appears to indicate that a quorum may consist of less than a majority, or whatever, two-thirds, provided two-thirds of the subcommittee members concurrently authorize a quorum.

Now, I raise for the record the question as to whether two-thirds of the subcommittee have authorized a hearing at which only two Senators may act as a subcommittee.

Mr. SOURWINE. The signatures on this resolution, Mr. Chairman, number six. There are nine members of the subcommittee.

Senator DODD. All right.

The objection is overruled, and I suggest to counsel that that is the situation.

Go on.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, have you brought with you such lists as you had in your possession at the time of your former appearance before this committee showing the members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I had no list in my possession at the time of my previous appearance before this subcommittee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you brought with you lists showing the locations of the chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you brought with you lists showing the identity and locations of the university campuses on which the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has student councils?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you furnish those two lists now?

Mr. GIBSON. I shall read first the Fair Play chapters—

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you furnish the list, please? We asked for documents, not testimony.

Mr. GIBSON. There are no documents. I have one telegram; I have one list containing nine chapters, which are the only ones we have on file. The other has a list of cities.

Senator DODD. Let us see the document, whatever it is. You said you had one; let us see it.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. Senator, these are personal items.

Senator DODD. I do not care what they are. The witness told us in answer to a question by counsel that he had brought with him a list of chapters on campuses of American colleges. I ask him to supply the list.

Mr. FAULKNER. He is prepared to read them into the record.

Senator DODD. I do not want them to be read into the record, and I rule that they be presented to the subcommittee forthwith. We are perfectly capable of putting them in the record. We want the list right away.

You say you have it; now present it to us.

Let the record show that the witness is conferring with counsel, and let the record show the time he confers.

(The witness conferred for 3 minutes.)

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. Senator, the time was taken between counsel and the witness, for the record, in order to add up and look at the names of the chapters and student councils.

Senator DODD. Mr. Counsel, we are perfectly capable of adding and reading.

Mr. FAULKNER. We are doing this for our own purposes. We are submitting this list showing 23 chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and 37 student chapters.

Senator DODD. Well, let us see it.

Mr. FAULKNER. That was a quick count.

Senator DODD. We shall not hold you to the count.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, does this list show all of the chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. No, it does not, but I do not have any other list, nor of the other chapters. We have sought to obtain the information from various people, but we keep no files.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you saying you do not know where these other chapters are?

Mr. GIBSON. I personally do not, no.

Senator DODD. Wait a minute. I think you could ask him first if he knows whether or not there are other chapters.

Mr. SOURWINE. I misunderstood. I thought he had testified he did know.

Do you know if there are other chapters?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I believe there are.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where they are?

Mr. GIBSON. They are in the process of being formed.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean they do not exist?

Mr. GIBSON. They may have a temporary committee or something like that, but we don't keep any list of chapters, and this list had to be constructed out of my own memory.

Senator DODD. Let me ask you a couple of questions.

You say some of them are in the process of being formed?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. How do you know this?

Mr. GIBSON. Because I've heard from people.

Senator DODD. Whom have you heard from?

Mr. GIBSON. Many people.

Senator DODD. Well, name one.

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know at this point. Where was one?

Senator DODD. How do you know you heard it, then?

Mr. GIBSON. How do I know I heard it?

Senator DODD. Well, can't you help us at all? You say you heard it, and I suggested that you tell us from whom you heard it, how you heard it.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I've heard it from persons involved, I suppose. But I don't have any file in my mind; I don't know.

Senator DODD. You don't have any what in your mind?

Mr. GIBSON. File in my mind, nor in my office.

Senator DODD. I didn't expect one in your mind. I think you can help us if you try, if you refresh your memory. When did you hear?

Mr. GIBSON. I haven't the slightest recollection.

Senator DODD. A week ago, a month ago, a year ago?

Mr. GIBSON. No, some time in the——

Senator DODD. You say some time. What do you mean?

Mr. GIBSON. I really don't know.



Senator DODD. You don't have any idea?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, within the last month or so.

Senator DODD. How many have you heard about?

Mr. GIBSON. I have no recollection. I haven't kept any track of them at any time.

Senator DODD. How many have you heard from?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know.

Senator DODD. You don't have any knowledge? One or twenty?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't think it was 20.

Senator DODD. Was it 10?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know.

Senator DODD. Five?

Mr. GIBSON. I really don't know.

Senator DODD. Was it just one?

Mr. GIBSON. You can pull any number out of the hat at all, but I don't know.

Senator DODD. Are you sure you heard this from anybody?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I think so.

Senator DODD. How do you know that? You are saying now you are sure. How are you sure?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, we had a banquet which 500 persons attended. People told me there.

Senator DODD. Where was the banquet?

Mr. GIBSON. It was in New York.

Senator DODD. When was the banquet?

Mr. GIBSON. I forget the date.

Senator DODD. About when?

Mr. GIBSON. A couple of weeks ago.

Senator DODD. Where was it?

Mr. GIBSON. At the Brass Rail restaurant.

Senator DODD. Who attended? What took place?

Mr. GIBSON. 500 persons attended, so I don't know all their names, nor very many of them.

Senator DODD. Tell us what happened that makes you think you heard something there.

Mr. GIBSON. People spoke to me there.

Senator DODD. Who spoke to you there?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't recall their names, or even know their names. Many people were there I'd never met before.

Senator DODD. Was it just to speak?

Mr. GIBSON. No, people were there.

Senator DODD. You don't know who?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. You're not certain, then, there are any other chapters?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean for all you know, there may be only these nine?

Mr. GIBSON. No, if you will notice on the telegram, there are 14 others listed, but I don't have firsthand knowledge of any of them.

Mr. SOURWINE. There are 14 other what listed?

Mr. GIBSON. Fourteen other chapters.

Mr. SOURWINE. The telegram lists chapters, does it?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where is the information with regard to student councils on campuses?

Mr. GIBSON. If you would read the telegram, you'll find it there, too.

Senator DODD. Mr. Sourwine, why don't you read this in now, so it will be known to everybody?

Mr. SOURWINE. This telegram comes from Berta Green. Who is she?

Mr. GIBSON. She is my secretary.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is she employed by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is she in a position to know what this telegram is about?

Mr. GIBSON. I suppose so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does she have the records of where the chapters are?

Mr. GIBSON. No, there are no records.

Mr. SOURWINE. She is just sending this telegram from her recollection?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. To refresh your recollection?

Mr. GIBSON. I guess so, because I don't know.

Senator DODD. Who refreshes her recollection?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't have the slightest idea—God.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did she send this telegram in response to a request from you?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did you ask her for?

Mr. GIBSON. I said I didn't know how many there were and I couldn't recall, would she please send me a list.

Mr. SOURWINE. You asked her to send you a list?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. A list of what, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON. Of names of chapters, locations of chapters, and student councils.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that all you asked for?

Mr. GIBSON. That's all.

Mr. SOURWINE. You asked her to send you a list of the locations of the chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and the student councils of the committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you didn't ask her to exclude anything?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. How do you account for the fact that she has named a number of adult chapters, but has not named any of the adult chapters that are on this other list you presented?

Mr. GIBSON. Because that list was a list that I had which she had a copy of.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you must have asked her to send you chapters that were not on the list that you had.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't tell us that.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, have it your way.

Mr. SOURWINE. I don't want it my way, I want the record to show the facts, whatever they are.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, what are the facts?

Mr. SOURWINE. I'm trying to find out from you.

Mr. GIBSON. The facts are that she sent me a list of chapters. I have a list of nine chapters; she did not duplicate them. I don't believe that I said to her that she should exclude anything. I don't recall that. Anyway, that is the list such as we have.

Mr. SOURWINE. This list, typed on white paper, lists nine chapters, and it says at the top, "List of Fair Play Chapters, Public Addresses."

May this go in the record at this time?

Senator DODD. I said it should be read in.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would it be sufficient if we named the cities, Mr. Chairman?

Senator DODD. I think I would like it read in. It won't take a minute.

Mr. SOURWINE. Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Post Office Box 26251, Los Angeles, Calif.; Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Post Office Box 2615, San Francisco, Calif.; Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Post Office Box 13847, Tampa, Fla.; Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Post Office Box 7762, Detroit, Mich.; Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Post Office Box 4474, Chicago, Ill.; Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Post Office Box 7971, Philadelphia, Pa.; Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Post Office Box 7603, Baltimore, Md.; Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Post Office Box 1264, Palo Alto, Calif.; Fair Play for Cuba Committee, 799 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Senator KEATING. Let me ask a question, Mr. Chairman, at that point.

All of those are listed as post office boxes except for the one in New York City. Do you have a record of the addresses of the headquarters of the others?

Mr. GIBSON. To my knowledge, there are no other addresses, any other headquarters. We have the only office that I know.

Senator KEATING. The others don't maintain offices?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. They all operate out of post office boxes?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Do you have a record of who the officers are of the other chapters?

Mr. GIBSON. No, we keep no records. In some cases, we don't recollect, but I have no record and I have never met most of them.

Senator DODD. I have here in my hand a copy of what I gather to be a statement or press release dated Washington, D.C., May 15, Fair Play for Cuba Committee, 799 Broadway, New York, N.Y. Are you familiar with this?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Well, I notice that my name is in here and I'm referred to as Senator Dodd, Republican from Connecticut. I wish you would correct that.

Senator KEATING. That is the first kind thing I've heard this witness say about the chairman.

Senator DODD. Well, the last paragraph, however——

Mr. FAULKNER. Is that a serious objection, Senator?

Senator DODD. I want to ask about this. The press release says that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, with national headquarters at 799 Broadway, is a nonprofit American organization with more than 7,000 members. Chapters have been formed in more than 21 U.S. cities and 4 Canadian cities, and student councils are in existence on more than 40 United States and Canadian college campuses.

Mr. GIBSON. This, by the way, Senator, is an estimate, because we have no list.

Senator DODD. Thank you. I think it would be helpful to the press if you told them that when you put out a release.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, it's an estimate. That's why we say more than 21, because we really don't know. I believe in that list there is more than 21.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean you say more than 21 because you don't know how many there are?

Mr. GIBSON. That's quite correct.

Senator DODD. And more than 40 chapters on college campuses?

Mr. GIBSON. I think so, but again, I really don't know.

Senator DODD. If you're no more accurate about the number of chapters than you are about my political affiliation, that's not surprising.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is a press release you distributed here this morning, isn't it, that the Senator just read?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, it was distributed yesterday, but I had extra copies.

Mr. SOURWINE. The telegram reads:

PD New York, N.Y. 15 1036 P EDT Richard Gibson, Carroll Arms Hotel, First Street at C, NE., Washington, D.C.

Adult chapters in Washington, D.C., Newark, Boston, New Haven, Denver, Cleveland, Seattle, San Diego, Hartford, Lynn, Santa Clara, Brooklyn, Queens, Bergen County, N.J. Student chapters at Antioch, University of California, C.C.N.Y., Stanford, Columbia, University of Colorado, Brooklyn, Queens, Cornell, UCLA, Fisk, LACC, University of Chicago, Roosevelt College, University of Wisconsin, Carleton College, University of Minnesota, University of Indiana, Yale, University of Virginia, Oberlin, Brandeis, Harvard, University of Washington, University of Michigan, Wayne, Brown, MIT, St. John's, Boston University, University of Ohio, Grinnell,<sup>1</sup> Tufts, Bennington, Goddard, University of Kansas, Reed College.

<sup>1</sup> Subsequent to the hearing the following letter was received by the chairman:

GRINNELL COLLEGE,  
Grinnell, Iowa, May 26, 1961.

HON. JAMES EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Internal Security Subcommittee,  
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: An Associated Press dispatch datelined Washington, D.C., May 17, reports testimony given your subcommittee by Mr. Richard Gibson, acting executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

According to the dispatch, Mr. Gibson included Grinnell College in a list of institutions at which chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee have been established.

I respectfully request that the record of the subcommittee be corrected to show that Mr. Gibson's testimony with respect to Grinnell College was incorrect. There is not now nor has there ever been a chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee on our campus.

We most vigorously resent Mr. Gibson's incorrect and unfounded statements pertaining to our institution.

Yours sincerely,

HOWARD R. BOWEN, *President.*

May that also be inserted in the record?

Senator DODD. Yes, both the telegram and the list may, of course, be placed in the record. They have been read in, but they may be placed in, besides.

(The documents referred to were marked "Exhibits No. 29 and 29A" having been read in full were placed in the committee file.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, I want to determine on this record whether there is any significance to the words, "public addresses," in connection with this list of nine chapters?

Mr. GIBSON. No, that's the only address that we have.

Mr. SOURWINE. They do not have any private addresses?

Mr. GIBSON. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there any difference in status or category between chapters listed on this typed list of nine and the chapters listed in Berta Green's telegram?

Mr. GIBSON. I'm not certain. I assume that in some cases, she either could not remember or did not have any address for the chapters.

Mr. SOURWINE. She hasn't given any addresses for any of them?

Mr. GIBSON. I assume that would be the reason.

Mr. SOURWINE. I'm trying to find out, do these chapters have public addresses, whereas the chapters named in the telegram do not have any public addresses?

Mr. GIBSON. They do not have any addresses.

Mr. SOURWINE. They don't have any addresses?

Mr. GIBSON. We don't have it, anyway. Not yet.

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't know how to get in touch with these chapters if you wanted to?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. How do you get in touch with them?

Mr. GIBSON. Through the general mailing.

Senator DODD. Is that how you address the president or whatever he is at Yale?

Mr. GIBSON. Through the general mailing. I have no idea who the chairman is at Yale.

Senator DODD. How do you get in touch with them?

Mr. GIBSON. Through the general mailing.

Mr. SOURWINE. How would you address your letter?

Mr. GIBSON. I couldn't send him a letter if I wanted to.

Mr. SOURWINE. How would you get in touch with him?

Mr. GIBSON. It has never arisen that I had to.

Mr. SOURWINE. You want this committee to believe that the acting general secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee never has any occasion to get in touch with the chapters of the committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Very rarely.

Mr. SOURWINE. Very rarely is not never.

Mr. GIBSON. We have no list and in many cases, I could not do it, except through a general mailing, to send out a mailing to all members asking them to contact us.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean by a general mailing?

Mr. GIBSON. A mailing that went out to everybody.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have a general mailing list which includes members of your Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and also others to whom you send your literature?

Mr. GIBSON. It has anyone on it, anyone who has ever been interested, anyone who has been put on the mailing list, who has asked for materials or suggestions, gets this. But it does not show any membership, or anything.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have a copy of that list?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where is a copy to be found?

Mr. GIBSON. At my office.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that Mr. Gibson be directed to furnish the subcommittee a copy of this list?

Senator DODD. I so order it, Mr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON. Upon receipt of a subpoena, a copy will be submitted.

Senator DODD. No, the order is all that is necessary. A subpoena is not necessary, but I'll put it in writing for you if necessary, so you can have it in a few minutes.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Do you have, in addition to any mailing list, do you keep any plates for the purpose of addressing letters?

Mr. GIBSON. I will, upon receipt of whatever you wish to send me, I'll consider this.

Senator KEATING. My question is a factual one. You can either answer it or not.

Mr. GIBSON. I didn't understand your question.

Senator KEATING. My question is, do you maintain, in addition to the mailing list, certain plates for the purpose of addressing the literature?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, in fact, we have no list at all, we just have plates.

Senator KEATING. You just have plates?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, that's all.

Senator KEATING. So I think it is very important, Mr. Chairman, that the subpoena call for the production of the plates as well as the mailing list, because apparently, the testimony of the witness is that he doesn't maintain any list, he simply maintains plates.

Senator DODD. Well, I think what we can do is send you a certified copy of this record. But in any event, we would like to save you the inconvenience of turning over your plates. Maybe we can find a way to do that.

For example, how would it suit you if we sent someone from the subcommittee staff up to your office and you prepared a list from the plates while such a person was there? Would that be more convenient for you?

Mr. GIBSON. I would have to consider that, Senator. But I wonder what the entire relevancy, really, is to the legislative purpose of this committee, the names of these people? What legislation are you going to make involving the individuals?

Senator DODD. I'll tell you what it is. There has been evidence before this committee, sworn testimony, that advertisements were placed in the newspapers with funds supplied by Castro.

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe Fidel Castro's name is on the list.

Senator DODD. Just a minute and I'll tell you.

If your agency is not registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, this committee is interested, and we shall suggest to the Attorney General that he may be interested. That is why it is pertinent.

Senator KEATING. May I add, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the possibility of amendments to the foreign agents registration law, that may be necessary.

Senator DODD. That is what I mean. We're under the impression that this law needs remedial action, and if it does, we want to know about it.

Mr. GIBSON. With all due respect to the subcommittee, I do think that with all the amendments you might wish to impose, I don't think that the names of individuals who, in some cases unsolicited, received this literature, would be of any legislative purpose, but would be useful in harassment, in reprisal, in causing people to lose jobs, and loss of standing in the community. This, I think, is the real intent.

Senator DODD. I wish I could estimate how many people you have caused great trouble in Cuba and elsewhere in the world through your organization and its falsehoods. I'm not able to estimate that.

Mr. GIBSON. Why don't you bring Mr. Dulles here about the falsehoods?

Senator DODD. Go ahead, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, you have said several times, "We keep no records." I would like to ask if it is the policy of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee not to keep records?

Mr. GIBSON. It is.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that policy adopted to conceal your operations, since the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been shown, by testimony before this committee, to have been initially financed by Cuban funds?

Mr. GIBSON. The policy was set by Mr. Robert Taber some time ago; I don't know exactly when.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know why he fixed that policy of not keeping records?

Mr. GIBSON. On the membership, I do know, to prevent reprisals against individuals who may, through no fault of their own, be on our mailing list.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not keep records, then, and this was a deliberate practice, and the purpose was to conceal the operations of the committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Not to conceal the operations of the committee, to protect the members or subscribers.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is the Fair Play for Cuba Committee an incorporated body or a body registered as a nonprofit educational organization in the State of New York?

Mr. GIBSON. It is.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do the laws of the State of New York require such an organization to keep any minimum records?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have not advised yourself with regard to that?

Mr. GIBSON. I have not been advised; I believe there may be some records.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not know what is required of your organization under the laws of the State?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I'm not a lawyer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, the Fair Play for Cuba——

Mr. FAULKNER. May I make inquiry as to what this recently added electrical equipment is for?

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON. That is a radio, for a broadcast.

Mr. GIBSON. May I ask that this not be turned on?

Senator DODD. If you object to it. My view and that of Senator Keating is that if that is objected to——

Mr. GIBSON. Having worked for CBS News, I know what you can do with a little bit of sound tape and some scissors.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you repeat that, please?

Mr. GIBSON. Having worked with CBS News, I know what you can do with a little bit of sound tape and some scissors.

Senator DODD. Did you ever do any yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I'm not a technician in that line of work, I'm afraid.

Senator KEATING. For the record, I concur with the Senator. I think if the witness objects to having his voice heard over the radio, his objection should be honored.

Senator DODD. Very well, we'll not have the radio microphones there.

I'm greatly interested in your observation about the radio. I would like to hear more about that if you care to tell us?

Mr. GIBSON. I'll speak to you privately about it, if you care to find out about the mysteries of radio.

Senator DODD. Do you qualify as an expert in this?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I wouldn't be an expert on it.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee distributes the publication Fair Play, of which I hold up a copy, does it not?

Mr. GIBSON. It does.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does this publication have a list of subscribers?

Mr. GIBSON. It has no separate list of subscribers. We have a mailing list. Everybody on the mailing list gets Fair Play.

Mr. SOURWINE. Whether they have sent in any money or not?

Mr. GIBSON. In some cases, yes; I don't know. They all get it, everyone on the mailing list. How they got there, I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the last page of this issue of Fair Play, dated May 10, 1961, is a coupon, obviously intended to be clipped. You're familiar with that, are you not?

Mr. GIBSON. I am.

Mr. SOURWINE. This coupon says:

To the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, 799 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y. I wish to become a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Enclosed is my check or money order for \$5, including dues for 1 year, for subscription to Fair Play.

There is a little square box to be checked.

Now, some people do send their coupon in, with a checkmark in that box, along with a check for \$5, don't they?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. When they do, do you list them as a dues-paid member?

Mr. GIBSON. We do not make a list, but a plate.



Mr. SOURWINE. Do you send them a receipt?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you put their names on a list of subscribers to Fair Play?

Mr. GIBSON. We have no list of subscribers, we have a mailing list.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you don't put their name on a list of subscribers and you send them a receipt for \$5, aren't you defrauding them?

Mr. GIBSON. He gets Fair Play when we mail it out. I don't think he is defrauded.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you stop mailing it out he won't get it?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't suppose he would.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have no list of subscriptions sent in to Fair Play with money to pay for it?

Mr. GIBSON. I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there any such list maintained by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Senator DODD. You sent out more than one edition of this Fair Play pamphlet or however you describe it. You must have something somewhere.

Mr. GIBSON. We have only the plates, Senator.

Mr. SOURWINE. So the name goes on a plate?

Mr. GIBSON. Right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, the next sentence on this coupon reads:

I do not wish to be listed as a member, but would like to receive Fair Play and other free literature. Enclosed is my check or money order for \$5 to cover handling and mailing costs for 1 year.

Now, some people do check that box and send money in, don't they?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you segregate those names in any way from the names of the people who check the first box?

Mr. GIBSON. Not at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you're not playing fair with the people who check the second box and believe they don't want to be mixed in with the membership, do you?

Mr. GIBSON. I'm very sorry, but this is the way it is. The others get a membership card. That is the only thing they get.

Mr. SOURWINE. They get a membership card?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you keep a record?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who issues the cards?

Mr. GIBSON. I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you sign them?

Mr. GIBSON. Or Robert Taber.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are they numbered?

Mr. GIBSON. They used to be. They are not now.

Mr. SOURWINE. They are not signed now?

Senator DODD. Wait a minute.

Robert Taber?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. He's not signing any now?

Mr. GIBSON. Not since the end of January.

Senator DODD. That's before he took asylum in Cuba?

Mr. GIBSON. He didn't take asylum in Cuba.

Senator DODD. He is there?

Mr. GIBSON. He's there, but why should he take asylum?

Senator KEATING. Have you heard from him since you were here last time?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. By letter or telephone?

Mr. GIBSON. By telephone, probably monitored by every agent in the U.S. Government.

Senator KEATING. I hope so.

Mr. GIBSON. Judging by the disastrous results of Mr. Dulles' spade-work before, I hope he is getting better.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has your organization been requested by the Justice Department to register under the Alien Registration Act?

Mr. GIBSON. It was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you register?

Mr. GIBSON. We did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You refused to register?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; we did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has the Department proceeded against you?

Mr. GIBSON. No; it has not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to show the witness this issue of "Fair Play" and ask if this is—you can hardly see it from up here—if this is the May 10, 1961, issue of "Fair Play" which your committee has mailed out to the names on the plates?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; it is.

Senator DODD. You'd better look at it.

Mr. GIBSON. I think its the same. Unless you can counterfeit it.

I hope you sent \$5.

Mr. SOURWINE. There are two items here which I respectfully offer for the record. One is entitled "Eastland Tries Again," and there is an explanation from the viewpoint of Mr. Gibson, apparently, of his experience with this subcommittee. It is interesting to note that, in the penultimate paragraph of this article, it is stated:

The FPCC national leadership is considering with our counsel all legal aspects of his latest demand, but they wish to assure all FPCC members and supporters that no matter what the threat, they will not expose a single one of them to these vicious inquisitors.

I ask that this may go into the record at this point.

Senator DODD. I haven't seen this. I would like to.

Mr. SOURWINE. The second item is on the back page and it is headed "FPCC During Invasion," and it purports to tell some of the activities which the committee says it engaged in. I should like to ask that this also be admitted in the record.

Senator DODD. This is another one?

Mr. SOURWINE. This is from the same issue, it is a 4-page document.

Mr. FAULKNER. I think in all fairness the entire issue should be offered not a piece of it.

Senator DODD. We will put all of it in, don't worry.

Mr. FAULKNER. Thank you.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 30" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT NO. 30

*Fidel Interviews the Prisoners, Page 4*  
*FPCC During Invasion, Page 8*

# Fair Play

Vol. 2 No. 14

May 10, 1961



New York

15 cents

## *Danger of Aggression Remains*

The invasion of Cuba was carried out by the Central Intelligence Agency without the consent of the American or the Cuban people and in violation of U.S. law and international treaties. The Cuban people rallied to the defense of their government and smashed this aggression in less than 72 hours. While the dead are being buried, Washington is seeking new ways to overthrow the Cuban government by force and violence.

Having suffered a humiliating defeat by approving the CIA's war-of-conquest-by-proxy, Kennedy, in what *The Nation* (May 6) described as "one of the most belligerent and reckless speeches ever made by an American president," threatened direct armed intervention against the Cuban people, even if the U.S. stands alone. Kennedy concluded: "I am determined upon our system's survival and success, regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril." (April 20)

Goliath is facing Cuba which has a population smaller than New York City and a total annual income smaller than our cosmetics expenditures. As London's respected *Manchester Guardian* commented on April 27, "Hardly anyone outside the U.S. can believe that Cuba is a threat to American security or that there is any 'national necessity' to crush Dr. Castro. . . . All aggressors have always claimed that their transgressions were compelled by 'national necessity.' It was 'national necessity' that led Hitler into Poland." The editorial concludes with Cuba's real challenge—"in" the last resort, "no power on earth can withstand the advance of an idea."

The idea of the Cuban revolution is that the people of Latin America have a right to determine their own future, to use their resources as they see fit, to support a government of their own choice.

An American sociologist Lowry Nelson, observed in 1950: "Cuba presents a paradox on a grand order. Nature is bountiful . . . yet the masses of Cuba's rural population are impoverished, ill-housed, ill-fed, and poorly clothed. The land is very rich, but the people are very poor."

In Greek mythology, Tantalus was tormented in Hades by being placed thirsty in a pool of water up to his chin. When he tried to drink, the water receded. Placed hungry under fruit trees, the wind tossed the branches aside when he tried to pick the fruit.

The Cuban revolution smashed the Batista dictatorship as a symbol of the torturer of Tantalus. It is work-

ing at breakneck speed to utilize the country's resources for the benefit of Cuba's long disinherited millions.

The London *Economist*, earlier this year, stated that the agrarian reform which is "the key to Cuba's social revolution, "is, to use a most reticent adjective, a splendid piece of work." With increased food production, they are eating in Cuba today—and it was rarely so; now there is a proud pioneering spirit, the people have something to live for: "They build their new houses and schools with their own hands, with technical aid and materials provided by the state." The revolution is not only statistics, it is also in the faces of a people: "Most of them also look, it must be said, remarkably unrepressed."

This does not concern the CIA. Cuba has declared its political and economic independence. The revolution has decreed that the economy is to be geared towards meeting human needs instead of private profit—therefore, as an object lesson to other Latin American nations, Cuba must be crushed. Economic and political aggression have been of no avail—only brute force can hope to produce a subservient Cuba.

The Cuban government on April 28 once again recommended a policy of friendly relations with the U.S. It declared its willingness to negotiate with Washington on a "footing of equality." It was rebuffed the next

(continued on page 2)

## An Apology to FAIR PLAY Readers

FAIR PLAY apologizes to its readers for the long delay in getting out this issue. However, we feel that anyone who takes a look at the account of our activities during this period of crisis (see page 8) will understand why the harassed national office was not able to sit and calmly edit a newsletter when more urgent matters had to be attended to. To make up in part for our lengthy silence, this issue is a double one of eight pages instead of our usual four.

## Thieves in the Night

morning by the State Department's arrogant reply: "Communism in this hemisphere is not negotiable." Commented the *N.Y. Times* on April 30: "We have no right to tell the Cubans what form of government they should support."

Walter Lippmann (April 27) raises a pertinent question: "I am astonished at the number of responsible men who want to use the Marines and the American paratroopers all over the world. . . . Have they thought what a little war in Cuba would be like after the Marines had captured Havana and a few cities and had then to govern a revolutionary peasantry? Our people have to fix it in their minds that the world-wide revolution cannot be stopped and settled by the U.S. Marines."

How would Washington liberate the Cuban people? The story of the invasion provides an answer.

Tad Szulc (*N.Y. Times*, April 22) reports: "As has been an open secret in Florida and in Central America for months, the CIA planned, coordinated and directed the operations that ended in the defeat on a beachhead in southern Cuba."

When the chips are down, "rebels" can't quite liberate themselves from the CIA. The CIA shanghaied the six leading members of its own handpicked Cuban Revolutionary Council and held them incommunicado while the invasion got underway. "The Cuban leaders first heard of the invasion from radio news bulletins." They heard communiques on the April 17 landings put out in their name. "The Cuban exiles believe that the CIA's treatment of them during the invasion as so many puppets was a natural outcome of this basically contemptuous, paternalistic approach." (*N.Y. Post*, April 25)

These "liberators" turn out to be mere agents of a foreign power. The *Miami Herald* understated the situation on April 20: "American businessmen hoping to regain some of the billion dollars of property lost to Fidel Castro's government, watched with intense interest the fighting in Cuba. . . . In Boston, a Vice President of the United Fruit Co. said: 'If a new and democratic government succeeds, United Fruit would hope to play a part in the economy.'"

The CIA's Cuban army went on its mission of destruction in "a fleet of invasion ships, painted black and equipped with guns and radar in New Orleans. . . . the attackers went in with artillery, tanks and B-26 air support." (*Time*, April 28)

The *Miami Herald* (April 14) revealed that the mercenaries had weapons "so new in design the GIs in this country haven't seen the equipment as yet." Ranged against them, were Cuba's armed people, there were no MIGs. From Guantanamo Bay, April 22, *The Washington Post*: "No evidence has yet reached this U.S. Naval Base in Eastern Cuba that Castro forces used Russian-made MIG jet fighters against the invaders." On the other hand, Drew Pearson's column of April 24, in a paragraph which most papers deleted, said "American destroyers protected the landings."

The CIA did not consult with its counter-revolutionary allies and it certainly did not consult the Cuban people. George Bryant reporting from Havana in the *Toronto Daily Star* (April 27) says, "not one peasant, not one militiaman went over to them," instead they fought to defend the revolution's achievements. The following day, Bryant wrote: "Certainly it is a land where the leader depends on the support of his people. Every function he attends puts him under the loaded guns of scores or hundreds of citizens."

There were no fortresses to capture—they had been turned into schools. The invaders faced an entire people ready and willing to use their weapons. Workers, farmers, students and even members of the symphony orchestra performed their work with loaded arms at their side. To conquer the Cuban army, the invaders would have to crush 6,000,000 Cubans at war.

"The invasion and U.S. involvement in it came as a surprise to the vast majority of the American public," writes David Wise in the *N.Y. Herald Tribune* (May 2). "185 years ago, the men who signed the Declaration of Independence explained that 'to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.' . . . the invasion of Cuba by forces organized by the U.S. government was undertaken without the consent of the governed."

The CIA operation which carried with it the risk of getting the U.S. involved in war was not debated in Congress either. Ted Lewis (*N.Y. Daily News*, May 1) reports: "Most Senate Democrats were hopping mad that neither they nor their Republican colleagues were given a fill-in in advance of the Cuban invasion. Their advice was certainly not sought ahead of time."

Senator Wayne Morse (D-Ore.), who opposes intervention, sent Dean Rusk a telegram saying "in further reference to the Constitution, attention is called to the fact that under Article 1, section 8, it is still the power of Congress to declare a war." (*York, Pa. Gazette & Daily*, April 25)

William Shannon (*N.Y. Post*, April 9) revealed that in late 1959 Eisenhower decided to apply the "Guatemala solution" to Cuba. Senator Thruston Morton (R-Ky.) expressed the American people's "distaste" for the "lack of candor and straightforwardness on the part of our government." (*N.Y. Times* April 28)

Kennedy disagrees, he believes that people know too much already. He has asked the nation's press to "heed the duty of self-restraint" and henceforth kill any news dispatches which fail to pass this test: "Is this in the national interest?"

The *El Cajon Valley News* (Calif. April 20) in an editorial titled "Why did they lie to us about Cuba?" declares its conviction: "There is no evidence in U.S. history that deception of the American people is sound domestic policy or effective foreign policy."

—by Henry Spira

FAIR PLAY, May 10, 1961

3

## Eastland Tries Again

Apparently, Fair Play's efforts to stem the tide of U.S. aggression against Cuba are being felt in Washington. CIA director Allen Dulles is reported to have made some harsh remarks about FPCC during an off-the-record State Department briefing last month for radio and television newsmen, expressing the hope that the Justice Department would soon see fit to put us out of business. Other and more tangible proof of the anxiety felt by official Washington came in the form of a subpoena to Acting Executive Secretary Richard Gibson to appear before Senator Eastland's Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on April 25th.

The subpoena was delivered to Gibson on April 21, just as he finished addressing some 5,000 persons in New York's Union Square at a "Hands Off Cuba" Rally.

Accompanied by FPCC General Counsel Stanley Faulkner, Gibson dutifully went to Washington on the 25th and spent several hours being grilled in a public session by the witchhunters. Conducting the hearing were Senators Dodd, Keating and Cotton—Eastland himself never appeared.

All the old charges against FPCC came up again, that we were a "Communist operation," financed by "Cuban Gold." In his statement to the subcommittee, Gibson stated frankly that he is not a Communist nor is FPCC a "Communist operation." However, he added the leadership of FPCC has no intention of inquiring into the political or religious beliefs of members. They have no intention of witchhunting or cooperating with witchhunters.

On the subject of "Cuban Gold," while he declined to answer any question concerning the financing and the structure of Fair Play, Gibson clearly indicated that FPCC would be quite able to prove that its funds come from bonafide sources—the more than 7,000 members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. But that proof if needed, will only be produced in the proper court of law and at the appropriate time. However, it became evident from the questioning that the witchhunters themselves are no longer so sure on that score.

The Senators then passed on to Gibson's past employment as a CBS Newsmen. They appeared indignant that such a "subversive" character should have ever been permitted access to American mass media. But they were visibly pleased when Gibson informed them that he and his colleague, Robert Taber, had been fired by CBS because of their FPCC activities. Gibson also recalled a reported letter to CBS from Virginia segregationist Senator Harry Byrd, protesting the presence of Gibson—the only Negro newsmen—on the CBS News staff and complaining about his connections with Negro freedom fighter Robert F. Williams, President of the Union County, N.C., branch of the NAACP and a founding member of FPCC.

Gibson told the Senators, in his statement: "The U.S. Government, through the super-secret Central Intelligence Agency, armed, trained and financed the Cuban counter-revolutionaries and other mercenaries who at-

tacked Cuba a little more than a week ago," Senator Dodd protested, but quickly quieted down when Gibson informed him his source for this charge was the U.S. press itself. He added, "On behalf of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and speaking personally for myself and for many other American Negroes I can only express delight at the utter and dismal defeat of this act of international banditry."

He read them the text of the Declaration of Conscience on Cuba by 31 Afro-Americans, which appeared in the Baltimore *Afro-American* and *N.Y. Post*. He also read Robert F. Williams' biting telegram which Cuban Foreign Minister Raul Roa received and read to the Political Committee of the U.N. General Assembly on the night of April 20: "Please convey to Mr. Adlai Stevenson this message: Now that the United States has proclaimed military support for people willing to rebel against oppression, oppressed Negroes in the South urgently request tanks, artillery, bombs, money, use of American airfields and white mercenaries to crush the racist tyrants who have betrayed the American Revolution and Civil War. We also request prayers for this noble undertaking." The Senators had no comment.

Having failed in all other attacks, the subcommittee has become desperate. Gibson is now under subpoena again, scheduled to return to Washington on May 16th with FPCC records. The FPCC national leadership is considering with our counsel all legal aspects of this latest demand, but they wish to assure all FPCC members and supporters that, no matter what the threat, they will not expose a single one of them to these vicious inquisitors. There should be no doubt on this matter in anyone's mind.

FPCC still has an important job to do, and, with or without the witchhunters, we shall do it. *Venceremos!*

### A Note on Finances

FPCCers have long been aware that it is their hard-earned dollars and cents and not "Cuban gold" that keeps FPCC running. The committee has been running in the red for a good many months now, despite repeated appeals for contributions. Fortunately, during the crisis, friends and supporters turned up at the vital moment with the needed funds for such costly items as ads in the *N.Y. Times*, *Baltimore Afro-American*, *N.Y. Post* and *San Francisco Chronicle*. But we still need financial help, and need it badly, so again we are calling on you to dig down as deeply as you can.

While we are on the subject of finances, we would like to inform members and supporters that our books are now being audited, after our first year of existence. A complete financial statement will be ready in the near future and will be sent to FPCC members and subscribers.

## Fidel Castro Interviews the Prisoners

Never before in history have prisoners been treated with so much humanity as were the counterrevolutionaries and other mercenaries captured recently in Cuba by the armed people of Cuba, determined to defend their country against this latest U.S.-directed aggression. The defeated invaders were even given a chance to state their case before the Cuban people and the world in a spectacular series of interviews with Cuban newsmen and Fidel Castro before Cuban television cameras. Below are some excerpts from these extraordinary interviews:

Prisoner: Dr. Castro, I want to explain to you why we came. It was our sense of an ideal, that we believed was the purest and worthiest ideal conceivable. I, personally came to fight against Communism, and so that there would be a democratic government, and elections in 18 months and the re-establishment of the 1940 Constitution. . . . If our invasion failed, it was because something went wrong in the plan, not because we came over here with any false illusions . . . when I left Cuba I knew that there were 100,000 militiamen.

Dr. Castro: Listen, Sir, I don't know if you've been listening to the opinions of many of your people. You've been giving your interpretation, and maybe others agree with you. But I want to ask you, and you know that people here, and outside of the country, are listening to you, a question. And let's speak honestly. Didn't you believe that they (militiamen) would assassinate you?

\* \* \*

Prisoner (he had been an agricultural worker; his father works on a hennequin cooperative in Matanzas): The last news that I had was that they had gotten raises, and were building houses.

Dr. Castro: Remember the struggles those workers had against the company?

Prisoner: I worked there, Sir.

Dr. C.: Did you have a lot of strikes?

P: We had very many strikes.

Dr. C.: What were the strikes for?

P: Well, because there were no raises, and there was no work.

Dr. C.: No raises? Why didn't the company want to give raises?

"I Don't Know"

P: I don't know why it could have been, because they had business with the Americans, God knows why it was.

Dr. C.: Was that an American company?

P: No, it wasn't.

Dr. C.: Did it do business (with the Americans)?

P: I don't know.

Dr. C.: You know that there is a cooperative there now? and that the agricultural workers, including your father, are owners of that hennequin plantation?

P: I didn't know that.

Dr. C.: You think that's a good thing?

P: Of course I do.

Dr. C.: That's what the Revolution has done. The electric company has been nationalized. . . . Did they ever cut off your lights?

P: No Sir.

Dr. C.: You always paid for the lights?

P: Yes, Sir.

Dr. C.: Do you know how much that electric company made every year? 20 million dollars.

P: We were going to make a law so that each worker in the electric company would get a share of the profits. . . .

Dr. C.: We've made a better law than that. You said a law giving shares in the profits, for example, what percentage of the profits?

P: Let's say 30 or 40 per cent of the profits.

Dr. C.: 40 per cent for all the workers?

P: Yes, Sir.

Dr. C.: And 60 per cent for whom? For the company? For the American company?

P: For the company, Sir.

Dr. C.: Well, we did something better than that. We gave 100 per cent to the Cuban people.

P: But has it been given to the workers, or has it been seized by the state?

Dr. C.: . . . Those 20 million pesos are now invested in the building of new factories, in the development of agriculture; it's invested in schools, highways, in those houses on the Cooperative where this gentleman's father works. Do you know how much you used to have to pay for a two-room apartment here?

P: Around \$80 a month.

Dr. C.: Do you know that you now pay \$40 for that apartment?

P: Yes, Sir.

Dr. C.: Are you in agreement with that?

P: Completely.

Dr. C.: Besides, do you know that before, a tenant was paying for 40 years, and never was the owner of the house?

P: Of course not, he didn't build it.

Dr. C.: Who built it?

P: The individual who paid for it, and made it.

Dr. C.: No, Sir, the construction workers the carpenters, the masons, built it. The other person was in their house.

P: No, the individuals who went to work on it. . . .

### Whose Houses?

Dr. C.: Who built the houses? The gentleman who asked for a million-dollar loan from a bank to build an apartment house, and then got it back from the tenant? How many workers here in Cuba could pay \$80 rent? Now I ask you: do you really think the housing problem could be solved on the basis of private enterprise? Let's figure out how much it costs here: \$7000 to build a two-room apartment, would you agree with that? How

(continued on page 5)

FAIR PLAY, May 10, 1961

5

**“Who built the houses?”**

much would you have to pay to amortize that over ten years, with interest? How much? Let's see, someone answer.

P: How much interest?

Dr. C.: 10 per cent, more or less. . . . Then, let's imagine a private investor who is going to invest \$100,000 in an apartment building to make \$70,000 on ten apartments. He has to get back his investment in 10 years, with interest. The tenant has to pay \$70. How many tenants in Cuba can pay \$70? Let's suppose about 20%. Who will build houses for the others. . . .

P: Well, I think this depends on the law of supply and demand. If there aren't many houses, they will have to be built.

Dr. C.: Well, the demand has been very great for quite some time.

P: Well, but it's necessary, also, to build different types of houses.

Dr. C.: Well, but where were they?

P: Well, but don't you also have to pay for the workers' houses?

Dr. C.: Yes, we're building houses for them, because the state makes the investment, and it costs the workers 10% of what they earn.

\* \* \*

P: Can I ask you a question Dr. Castro?

Dr. C.: Go ahead.

P: I believe that this thought is something that all of us here are feeling. If Dr. Castro had found himself in the U.S. for a period of twenty months away from his country and family, if he had been reading the press in that country, if he had been a loyal friend of his country's freedom, if he had known that a movement was underway to liberate his country from a series of dangers that the newspapers were saying were threatening it, how would Dr. Castro have proceeded? Would he have joined that expedition or not?

**Fidel in Expedition?**

Dr. C.: Well, there are lots of Cubans in the United States who have been out of Cuba for more than twenty months and didn't join the expedition; they paraded in front of the United Nations supporting the Cuban revolution. . . . They didn't let themselves be poisoned by that lying propaganda. . . . What you're thinking is that I might possibly have been one of those Cubans. But if I had thought a little more, I would have asked who was aiding that expedition and why they were aiding it? I would have asked myself if the United States has ever aided any revolution and I would have analyzed the fact that the United States has supported the most reactionary governments of America, and of the world. . . . I would have asked myself why they didn't aid in the struggle against Batista? Why, when young people were being assassinated on street corners here, when on one afternoon 47 peasants were assassinated why then, instead of giving arms to the revolutionaries there, did they take away their arms and why . . . did

(continued on page 6)

**An Appeal**

Two of FPCC's staunchest members and a loyal friend recently sent the following personal letter to Fidel. While the Fair Play for Cuba Committee does not officially endorse such a stand on the question of punishment for counter-revolutionaries and other mercenaries, we believe that a number of FPCCers do—in all fairness it should be noted that many members take just the opposite view. In any case, we thought it worthwhile to bring this letter to the attention of FAIR PLAY readers:

"New York City

"April 29, 1961

"Dear Fidel Castro,

"We salute you for urging clemency for the prisoners of the invasion force.

"As friends of the Revolution, we would like to appeal to you to take an even bolder step. We are aware that we ask much of you, but we believe that you are a man of whom much can be asked. Our petition is: Would it not be both a noble step and a supremely politic one if you were to abolish the death penalty in Cuba once and for all, even for those who take up arms against the government?

"We know that some would argue that the execution of traitors is necessary to the safety of the state, but to them we put these questions:

"(1) Has the punishment of opposition ever in history served to deter further opposition? Do these executions in fact help to secure the Revolution?

"(2) In the process of exacting vengeance, is not that humane spirit weakened which has given the Revolution its special force? Would not the abolition of the death penalty safeguard what is most precious of all in the new Cuba—its humanity? Has not Fidel Castro himself said that mass executions 'sully the Revolution'?

"(3) For those many people outside Cuba who have a false image of the Revolution, would not the abolition of the death penalty be irresistible evidence of its true nature?

"The new Cuba cannot be preserved by heeding the cry 'To the Wall!' Its security surely lies in its appeal to men's hearts. 'Revolucion es construir.'

BARBARA DEMING  
DAVE DELLINGER  
WALDO FRANK"

## “...in front of the United Nations.”

they send planes and arms to Batista . . . because Batista, instead of lowering the rates and nationalizing the electric company, raised the telephone and electric rates, defended all the interests of the North American monopolies here. Why, on the other hand, did they aid a counterrevolutionary movement in its struggle against a government which has nationalized the North American electric company, the telephone company and the sugar centrales? Because before, they sent arms to the

government who defended those interests—now, they hand over arms to combat the government who fulfilled the laws that people here wanted for a very long time.

\* \* \*

P owned “several small farms and one big one”—of 900 caballerias. One caballeria equals about 33 acres; this prisoner disclosed, later in the questioning, that the agrarian reform had left him 30 caballerias of his 900 caballeria farm; he admitted that it was possible to live “decently” on 30 caballerias. The minimum individual holding established by the agrarian reform law is two caballerias for a family of five.

Mr. Kuchilan (newspaperman): Did the revolutionary laws affect you in any way?

P: Well, yes, somewhat.

K: Those motivations of yours to liberate Cuba, didn't you have any intentions of making amends for the way the agrarian reform affected you?

P: It could seem that way, but I put my country before the economic problem.

K: From what were you going to liberate the country?

P: Well, now I see from nothing, but according to what they told us, there was chaos here, that they were waiting for a military force to come so they could join it . . .

K: You came to liberate Cuba, and you say you were tricked. That's the sort of thing we're hearing from all of you, that you've been fooled. . . . You left here in February, 1961.

### A Question of Mentality?

K: What was your opinion of what the revolution was doing?

P: That there were very constructive things, and things that I didn't like.

K: And between February and March you changed your mind, they fooled you between February and March?

P: Over there they could change anybody's mind in a month.

K: Do they brainwash people in the United States?

P: And over there, if you don't go to a training camp, you're almost considered a coward.

K: Then it's a question of valor?

P: No, it's not a question of valor but of mentality.

K: Of mentality. Then, they changed your February 1961 mentality.

K: No, not completely. But neither was I an ardent fanatic of the revolution.

K: Did you work before?

P: Well, I already told you, my family had some business with farms and things like that . . . now and then I sold cars.

K: Now and then you sold cars. Cadillacs?

P: Whatever, depending on the buyer.

Valdes Vivo, newsman (to same prisoner): We'd like to pinpoint, if possible, what you didn't like about the

(continued on page 7)

## A Voice From Labor

David Livingston, President of District 65, Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, AFL-CIO, representing 30,000 members in the New York area, has completely reversed President Kennedy's call for “self-censorship” on Cuba and other vital issues, and Eisenhower's “Don't go back and rake over the ashes,” by terming it a “patriotic duty” for all union members to carry on discussions at all levels concerning the “tragic setback” in Cuba.

Livingston also stated that, with the reforms under Castro, conceded by the State Department in its White Paper, “no revolt was likely to take place for free elections or against Soviet help.”

Writing in *The 65er*, the official voice of District 65, Livingston, who had been an ardent supporter of Kennedy during the campaign, stated: “But when the District 65 Convention went on record endorsing Senator Kennedy for President, we pledged that we would be the kind of supporters who would differ when we thought he was in the wrong. We should live up to that pledge now.

“Our members should discuss the question among ourselves. Our membership meetings, shop meetings, and other gatherings of our rank and file should come to a consensus of opinion and give expression to that consensus. If our members favor what has been done, so be it. *If, as this writer believes, they come to the conclusion that what has been done is wrong, our members should not hesitate to say so. In that direction lies true patriotism.*”

Livingston added: “These were things that were clear to many Americans before the Cuban disaster. Most of us kept quiet and our country suffered. Would we not have been better patriots to run the risk of some criticism and give expression to our views at that time? This writer believes that it was our patriotic duty then to speak out and it is our patriotic duty now to give expression to these ideas in the hope that they will contribute to a policy that will bring credit to our country.”



FAIR PLAY, May 10, 1961

7

## “...great discipline and courtesy”

Revolution, what made you join the expedition. Didn't you like the agrarian reform?

P: I liked it halfway. . . . I think you should give land to the peasants, and things like that, but I don't think you should completely damage anybody.

V: You'd like an agrarian reform that doesn't divide up 900 *caballeria* farms?

P: No, I like an agrarian reform that divides up farms, because it's a very just thing and gives the owner a decent way of life.

V: Do you like the fact that the Revolution ended racial discrimination?

P: It's a magnificent idea, a constructive work of the Revolution.

V: Do you like the fact the Revolution ended the domination of our country by North American imperialism?

P: I think it's a good thing, too, that public services, and things like that are nationalized.

V: What do you say about sugar mills? Do you like the fact that they're now in the hands of the nation?

P: I see it as a good thing.

V: Your family doesn't have any sugar mills?

P: No, Sir.

V: Do you like the fact that the Revolution is ending illiteracy?

P: It is one of the best measures of the Revolution.

V: Does it seem to you a good thing that the Revolution has given Cuba an independent foreign policy, which responds exclusively to the national interests of our people?

P: I see it as a very good and valiant measure.

V: In the hypothetical case of the expedition taking power, what do you think they would have done with the land now in cooperatives, state farms and given to individual peasants?

P: Well, over there in Miami, they said it was a measure that had to be studied, so as not to affect the peasants and be able to give indemnities to the owners.

### Indemnification

V: Those who had 900 *caballerias*, were they going to be indemnified?

P: According to what I read, yes.

V: What were you going to do with the factories now belonging to the nation?

P: Well, I didn't read anything about that, Sir.

Fidel also spoke with the militiamen who had defeated the invaders. This is what one of them had to say:

Militiaman: Dr. Castro, I want you to know that I, as a militiaman, have treated them with the greatest courtesy, however, there are prisoners here who were in the service of the (Batista) regime. Yesterday there was a disturbance with a prisoner, which I managed with great discipline and courtesy, as you ordered us to do. However, he started insulting me, saying I was an assassin and this, that and the other thing. . . . I ask

### Vigil on the Potomac

The home office of the "Cuban Invasion Agency" was picketed Sunday, May 2, when over 100 protested the recent ill-fated invasions by massing in front of the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters in Washington, D.C. The joint action of pacifists and Fair Play for Cuba Committee members began a two week fast and vigil by representatives of the Non-Violent Committee for Cuban Independence.

Before three days of the vigil had passed, seven of the hunger strikers were arrested on charges of "loitering." All those arrested have stated that they intend to continue their fast while in jail and will return to their posts when released. They are: Dave Dellinger, an editor of *Liberation*, and the organizer of the vigil; Robert Steed, of the *Catholic Worker*; Robert Swann; Dick Zink; Bram Luckom; Ron Jump; Charles Jackson. Five other fasters are continuing their vigil.

The groups composing the Non-Violent Committee for Cuban Independence are: the Catholic Worker, the Committee for Non-Violent Action, the Peacemakers and the War Resisters League. Appealing to the conscience of America, the Committee said it is holding the vigil to "protest the threat to world peace and human survival posed by America's armed interference in Cuba."

The Fair Play Committee is rallying all its chapters to organize local picket lines before Federal Buildings throughout the country on the two Saturdays, May 6 and 13. A mass demonstration of all East Coast Fair Play chapters will be held May 13 in Washington, as a windup to the two-week vigil. They will be joined by the transcontinental Marchers for Peace, who intend to conclude their march at the CIA headquarters the same day. Buses to Washington will leave New York on both Saturdays and reservations can be made at the Fair Play office, OR 4-8295.

you, *Commandante*: there are some prisoners whom I don't believe can be judged with the others who are here. That prisoner was a fugitive from justice. . . . I want you to find out what his name is and investigate him.

Dr. Castro: That isn't very important, *companero*. Did you treat the prisoner well despite his insulting you?

Militiaman: I treated him with great courtesy.

Dr. Castro: You did well, *companero*.

## FPCC During Invasion

FPCC's immediate response in New York to the CIA invasion was to organize mass demonstrations outside the United Nations. The demonstrations started on April 17 with 2000 persons and continued through the week. On April 21, a mass rally of 5000 in Union Square climaxed the daily picketing.

An indoor rally on April 20 called by the newly formed Brooklyn Chapter of the New York FPCC drew an enthusiastic crowd of more than 500 persons.

In a seven-column ad in the New York Times of April 21 titled "An Appeal to Americans", FPCC called for united action against the U.S. government's flouting its own and international laws in aiding the Cuban invasion. This ad was refused by the St. Louis Post Dispatch and by all four Chicago dailies.

Over 500 persons turned out on April 28 for a banquet celebrating the first anniversary of FPCC. Though tickets cost \$7.50 each, numerous guests were satisfied with SRO accommodations.

On April 29, an advertisement released by FPCC and signed by twenty-seven prominent Negroes appeared in the Baltimore Afro-American, the largest Negro newspaper in the United States with a circulation of 160,000. The ad declared, "Today, thanks to a social revolution which they helped make, Afro-Cubans are first-class citizens and are taking their rightful place in the life of the country where all racial barriers crumbled in a matter of weeks following the victory of Fidel Castro."

The New York FPCC distributed over 300,000 leaflets including 100,000 "Stop the Attack" leaflets.

On April 20 in Boston, 200 pickets paraded on the historic Common. One sign they carried asked tongue in cheek, "Is the CIA our Peace Corps?"

Philadelphia was the scene of violence against a FPCC picket line by hecklers and plainclothes cops. They arrested four pickets in the scuffle, none of the attackers. The ACLU is aiding FPCC-retained defense lawyers.

Even in Florida, the focus of counter-revolutionary activities of the CIA hirelings, FPCC organized a picket line in Tampa of 100 persons to protest the invasion.

Detroit's federal building was picketed by 150 FPCC supporters on April 20. The demonstration rated back page coverage by the "free" press while a counter-demonstration by 22 anti-Castroites got headline treatment on page one.

Despite inclement weather, a rally in San Francisco's civic center on April 22 ended with mass picketing of the federal building, a march through the downtown area, and picketing at the Hearst Examiner. Longshoremen and other unionists, as well as students, joined the line.

In Los Angeles, Fair Play organized a three-day demonstration at the federal building beginning April 17. Pickets greeted news of the setback to United States imperialism by the Cuban people with a march through the downtown section shouting, "Hands Off Cuba."

Chicago pickets outside the federal building numbered 300 on April 20, despite heavy rain. On Saturday the 22nd, a much longer line carried signs declaring, "We Don't Want to Die for United Fruit Co."

Student chapters of FPCC across the nation were out in force, too. Antioch students traveled to Columbus to picket the state capitol. At Cornell, over 500 students attended a protest meeting. In San Francisco, a Bay Students Committee to Oppose U.S. Intervention in Cuba, representing at least five college campuses, was formed immediately upon news of the invasion. With FPCC support, it staged campus demonstrations on April 18. On April 20, a Union Square rally drew 2000 persons.

Demonstrations and picket lines also took place in Cleveland, Seattle, New Haven, Baltimore, Washington, Oberlin College, the University of Wisconsin, Ann Arbor, and Minneapolis, Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal.

To: The Fair Play for Cuba Committee  
799 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y.

I wish to become a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Enclosed is my check or m.o. for \$5.00 covering dues for one year, including subscription to *Fair Play* .....

I do not wish to be listed as a member,\* but would like to receive *Fair Play* and other free literature. Enclosed is my check or m.o. for \$5.00 to cover handling and mailing costs for one year .....

I would like to have a more active part in supporting the cause of Fair Play for Cuba. Enclosed is my contribution for .....

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

\*Membership does not, of course, imply blanket endorsement of policies of the Committee nor of the opinions expressed in *FAIR PLAY*, nor will the name of any member be used in any policy statement without the permission of the member.

*FAIR PLAY*. Published by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, 799 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y. Richard Gibson, Editor.

Mr. SOURWINE. Next for the record, the next article is "Fidel Castro Interviews the Prisoners." That article continues to the next pages and then on the back page is this "FPCC During Invasion." And I will read that.

FPCC's immediate response in New York to the CIA invasion was to organize mass demonstrations outside the United Nations. The demonstrations started on April 17 with 2,000 persons and continued through the week. On April 21, a mass rally of 5,000 in Union Square climaxed the daily picketing.

Mr. GIBSON, how do you organize those mass demonstrations?

Mr. GIBSON. By calling on people, by simply asking them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Whom did you call?

Mr. GIBSON. I called my friends, people who work with me——

Mr. SOURWINE. How many individuals did you call?

Mr. GIBSON. Personally?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, in order to bring out these 2,000 persons on April 17.

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe I called anyone, except my office did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who your office called?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not make the calls.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that Communist Party organizers in New York City had been busy on the phone directing members of the party to participate in this demonstration?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you do anything to bring it about?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many people did you call to produce this mass rally of 5,000 in Union Square?

Mr. GIBSON. Personally, I don't believe I called any.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know how many people your office called?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many persons are in your office?

Mr. GIBSON. There is Miss Green.

Mr. SOURWINE. Just one?

Mr. GIBSON. And volunteers, but I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many telephone instruments in your office?

Mr. GIBSON. Two. [After pause.] Well tapped.

Mr. SOURWINE. The article further says:

An indoor rally on April 20 called by the newly formed Brooklyn Chapter of the New York FPCC drew an enthusiastic crowd of more than 500 persons.

Did you attend that indoor rally?

Mr. GIBSON. I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where was it held?

Mr. GIBSON. Held in Brooklyn, I don't know where.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where in Brooklyn?

Mr. GIBSON. In a hall in Brooklyn.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you are an intelligent man, Mr. Gibson. Can't you give us a better location?

Mr. GIBSON. I am a very busy person. I don't recall. I went there by cab and I don't any longer have the address. It was downtown Brooklyn.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you been in that hall before?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you been there since?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. This article says:

Over 500 persons turned out on April 28 for a banquet celebrating the first anniversary of FPCC. Though tickets cost \$7.50 each, numerous guests were satisfied with SRO accommodations.

Was that the Brass Rail you told us about?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, it was.

Mr. SOURWINE. You sold standing room only for dinner at the Brass Rail?

Mr. GIBSON. I did not write that, sir. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, I want to know the facts——

Mr. GIBSON. I think there were some people standing.

Mr. SOURWINE. And for this celebration of the first anniversary of FPCC, people were satisfied with standing room only accommodations? That is what it says.

Mr. GIBSON. I think that there probably were some people standing. It certainly looked like it to me. But I don't see the relevancy of this to the legislative purpose of this committee, whether they were standing up or sitting down—which one would be more subversive?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like Mr. Gibson to know that the legislative purpose of this committee is to determine as much as it can of the activities of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee——

Mr. GIBSON. Whether they are standing up or sitting down——  
[Simultaneous discussion.]

Mr. SOURWINE. May we have order, Mr. Chairman?

Senator DODD. Mr. Gibson, will you just be courteous? We will appreciate it.

Mr. SOURWINE (continuing). ——because there is evidence before this committee that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is a foreign-sponsored propaganda organization. There is also evidence that it is supported and encouraged by the Communist Party, U.S.A. We want to know as much as we can about its activities for the purpose of determining the extent that it threatens the security of this country and what, if any, legislative action can be taken to meet that threat.

Senator DODD. Such testimony would be in the interest of Congress and I think in the interest of the American people.

Mr. SOURWINE. What became of the money that was collected, this \$7.50 from those 500 people attending at the Brass Rail?

Mr. GIBSON. It was put in the bank.

Mr. SOURWINE. In your bank account?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where?

Mr. GIBSON. The Chase Manhattan Bank.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have more than one account in that bank?

Mr. GIBSON. Only one account. Actually, we have two accounts; one national account, one chapter account.

Mr. SOURWINE. In which account was this money put?

Mr. GIBSON. I am not certain. I believe it was in the national.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who can sign checks on that bank account?

Mr. GIBSON. I can.

Mr. SOURWINE. Anybody else?

Mr. GIBSON. Robert Taber.

Mr. SOURWINE. Robert Taber can sign checks?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. He can still sign checks?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. If he would sign a check, would it draw money out of that account today?

Mr. GIBSON. It certainly could.

Senator DODD. What was that answer?

(The answer was read.)

Senator DODD. Is he presently an officer of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. What office?

Mr. GIBSON. He is executive secretary. I am only the temporary officer in his absence.

Senator DODD. Do you expect him to come back?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. And that he would relieve you?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. When do you expect him?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know right now. He is recuperating from the wound.

Senator DODD. From what?

Mr. GIBSON. He was wounded in the invasion.

Senator DODD. Who was he fighting?

Mr. GIBSON. He wasn't fighting anybody. He was a war correspondent.

Senator DODD. For whom?

Mr. GIBSON. For *Revolucion*, Cuban newspaper.

Senator DODD. A Castro paper?

Mr. GIBSON. I suppose—it must be.

Senator KEATING. May I be permitted to ask a question?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Senator KEATING. I want to ask whether you and Mr. Taber can sign checks on both of these bank accounts, the national account and the chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. No. No, the other one can only be signed by me.

Senator KEATING. I see.

Mr. GIBSON. My position is president of the New York chapter and every check has to be signed by me and by the treasurer, secretary-treasurer of the New York chapter.

Senator KEATING. And who is that?

Mr. GIBSON. Miss Berta Green.

Senator KEATING. In other words, when you speak of the chapter account, you are talking about the New York chapter account?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes. Each chapter maintains its own finances.

Senator KEATING. Both accounts are in the Chase Manhattan?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. And which would be the larger, the national or the chapter? Would it be the chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I would think, of course.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to be sure I understand correctly. The major account, that you say is the national account, is something that can be checked out by either you or Mr. Taber?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And would not have to be signed by both?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. You can sign or he can sign?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And he can withdraw the entire amount if he should want to——

Mr. GIBSON. I suppose.

Mr. SOURWINE (continuing). ——and you could do the same?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think this is proper safeguarding of the funds of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you aware of Mr. Taber's criminal record?

Mr. GIBSON. Criminal record?

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you aware of Mr. Taber's criminal record?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. What was your answer to that question: Just state whether or not you are aware of it.

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you aware that Mr. Taber has pleaded guilty and has served sentences of imprisonment for armed robbery, auto larceny, and kidnaping?

Mr. GIBSON. I was not aware of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GIBSON. In fact, I would be very interested to know.

Mr. SOURWINE. I would just like to offer for the record the Department of Justice fingerprint record identifying the individual as the same individual in each instance and this shows the complete criminal record of Mr. Taber.

Senator DODD. I think it may be appropriate to admit it in this place for the record at this point.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 31" and is reproduced below:)

EXHIBIT No. 31

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
 WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

4-24-61C

*J. Edgar Hoover*  
 Director.

The following FBI record, NUMBER 1 787 327, is furnished FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

CONTRIBUTOR OF FINGERPRINTS	NAME AND NUMBER	ARRESTED OR RECEIVED	CHARGE	DISPOSITION
State Highway Patrol Findlay, Ohio	Robert Bruce Tabor #--	June 21, 1939	robbery armed auto larceny kidnaping	plead guilty
Sheriff's Office Findlay, Ohio	Robert Bruce Taber #--	June 21, 1939	armed robbery kidnaping operating motor vehicle without owner's consent	
State Reformatory Mansfield, Ohio	Robert Taber #38004	September 27, 1939	robbery kidnaping operating motor vehicle without owner's consent	10 to 25 years plead guilty 5 to 30 years 1 to 20 years currently paroled November 2, 1942; November 22, 1949 released
Captain of the Port New York, New York	Robert Bruce Taber #031-1032853-W	identification card May 24, 1943		
Police Department New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company New Haven, Connecticut	Robert B. Taber #10510	laborer February 18, 1943 (print received) August 20, 1943		
* * *	1926, Detroit, Michigan runaway; released. 1931, Brooklyn, New York, runaway; released. 1932, Edgewater, New Jersey, carrying concealed weapon; 3 weeks Detention House.			

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have a short summary of this record in three paragraphs.

Senator DODD. I think it ought to be read in the record.

Mr. SOURWINE (reading):

Taber, American citizen previously employed as writer by Columbia Broadcasting System, played leading role in organization during early 1960 of Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC) pro-Castro propaganda front which has attracted support of substantial elements among U.S. liberals and which has also been heavily infiltrated by Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and by Communist Party (CP) U.S.A. In public testimony before Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (SISS) Dr. Charles Santos-Buch has admitted that he and Taber accepted \$3,500 in cash to pay cost of FPCC advertisement from a Cuban official in the United States, Raul Roa, Jr.

Taber left United States in January 1961 and he has been residing in Cuba since that time. It appears he is trying to avoid probability he would be subpoenaed to appear before SISS if he returns to this country, especially since SISS may contemplate perjury proceedings against him. In this regard, Taber testified before SISS in May 1960 at which time he denied any knowledge of Cuban Government support of FPCC.

Taber was arrested by State highway patrol in Findlay, Ohio, June 21, 1939, and pleaded guilty to armed robbery charges, auto larceny, and kidnaping. On September 27, 1939, he was sentenced to various prison terms ranging up to 30 years on various counts involved and he was subsequently paroled November 2, 1942, remaining on parole until November 22, 1949.

Mr. GIBSON. May I know the source of that?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. This is a summary, with regard to the criminal record, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation report on Robert Taber.

Mr. GIBSON. Thank you.

Mr. FAULKNER. Did you say 1939 or 1929? What date?

Senator DODD. 1939.

Mr. SOURWINE. His sentence was September 27, 1939.

Mr. FAULKNER. 1939?

Mr. SOURWINE. That is correct.

Senator KEATING. Would you just let me ask a question, Mr. Chairman before we leave the Taber question?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Has Mr. Taber signed any checks since he left the United States?

Mr. GIBSON. Not to my knowledge.

Senator KEATING. Well, you would know, presumably, whether any money has been drawn on the bank account, wouldn't you?

Mr. GIBSON. I feel certain I would.

Senator KEATING. Are you the treasurer also?

Mr. GIBSON. There is no treasurer.

Senator KEATING. The bank account is under your supervision?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. How long have you known that—and I am asking this to complete the record and also to refresh my own memory—how long have you known Taber?

Mr. GIBSON. I met Taber several months—yes, several months or so after I was hired in January 1959, or December, the end of the year—January 1958.

Mr. FAULKNER. 1958.

Mr. GIBSON. December 1958, and I must have met him earlier.



Mr. SOURWINE. Do you use this bank account to pay bills of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that all you use it for?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have never taken any large amounts of cash out of this account?

Mr. GIBSON. Personally?

Senator DODD. Do you draw checks for the expenses or do you pay cash or—

Mr. GIBSON. Oh, we pay cash for expenses—

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever drawn checks for expenses, payable for bills—

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know—you cannot take a check to the post office to buy stamps—

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't do that?

Mr. GIBSON. Excuse me?

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't draw checks, you draw the cash and pay with that?

Mr. GIBSON. In many cases, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you draw large amounts of cash?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever draw \$1,000 cash?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever draw \$5,000 in cash?

Mr. GIBSON. In cash?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. You cannot say "no" to that? You mean you might have?

Mr. GIBSON. I might have. I don't recall. I don't have—

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever withdraw \$10,000 out of this account?

Mr. GIBSON. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever draw \$15,000?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't think there ever was \$15,000 in that account.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you say no you did not?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't recall. It might have been but I doubt it seriously.

Senator DODD. If you know, tell us; if you don't know, say you don't know. You say "might have been."

Mr. GIBSON. I don't have the financial record.

Senator DODD. Are you in the habit of drawing checks for \$5,000, \$10,000, \$15,000?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. How many times in your life have you ever done this?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe I have ever.

Senator DODD. All right. If you ever did draw a large amount, a large check like \$5,000 or \$10,000 wouldn't you remember it?

Mr. GIBSON. I might; might not. I don't know.

Senator DODD. You want us to believe this is your best answer?

Mr. GIBSON. I am telling you. You are asking a hypothetical question, I am giving a hypothetical answer.

Senator DODD. It is not a very hypothetical question or answer. If you want to leave the record that way, well that is up to you.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, didn't you on December 30, 1960 withdraw \$19,000 in cash from this account?

Mr. GIBSON. I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you sign a check payable to cash for \$19,000 on that account?

Mr. GIBSON. I did not—I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from the Chase Manhattan Bank regarding the Fair Play for Cuba Committee account dated May 11, 1961, and it contains the information that:

On December 27, 1960, there was withdrawn \$8,613 payable to cash.

On January 17, 1961, there was a check for \$18,580.60 drawn to Cubana De Aviacion.

On January 19, 1961, there was a check for \$440 to A. Nash, marked "Tour Refund."

On January 25, 1961, there was a check for \$600 to Lillian Gruber, marked "Tour Refund."

And on December 30, 1960, there was a cash withdrawal of \$19,000 which the bank has reported to the Federal Reserve as an "unusually large transaction."

Mr. GIBSON. I was not the secretary at that time—

Senator DODD. Wait a minute.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to ask you, Mr. Gibson, who can draw money out of that account except you?

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Taber. Mr. Taber, if that amount of money was withdrawn did it, I had no power at that time to withdraw any money.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, can you tell us right here and now that if this \$19,000 was withdrawn from the account it was withdrawn on Mr. Taber's check?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe so, because I certainly did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are then stating you did not sign a check for \$19,000?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Then who did sign it?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know, but I know that I did not and I assume that was the money used by Mr. Taber to pay for the Christmas tour which we had to Cuba for 340-some persons, to Cuba for 2 weeks.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GIBSON (interrupting). But I did not handle any financial transactions at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, this withdrawal was sufficiently interesting that the bank kept a record of the serial numbers of the bills and I ask that, if we can secure it, this list of the serial numbers be entered in the record—

Senator DODD. What were the denominations?

Mr. SOURWINE. One-hundred-dollar bills.

Senator DODD. Yes; the record should show the serial numbers on those hundred-dollar bills.

(The list of serial numbers had not been received when this record went to press.)

Mr. SOURWINE. How much do you have on deposit in that account now, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON. At the moment?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it \$8,000?

Mr. GIBSON. No. I assume—

Mr. SOURWINE. \$5,000?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I assume it is around \$3,000.

Senator DODD. I am going to ask you what your answer was to the previous question, I am not completely clear in my own mind—

Mr. GIBSON. Concerning the money withdrawn?

Senator DODD. Yes.

My question—I will tell you what it is, if you will just wait. Counsel asked in his previous questioning if you have ever drawn checks for, first, \$5,000; next, \$10,000; next, \$15,000? What was your answer? Have you ever drawn a check of \$5,000?

Mr. GIBSON. You asked me about the \$19,000—

Senator DODD. No. No—

Mr. GIBSON. I said I did not—

Senator DODD. No, no, no. I want to be perfectly sure that you do understand.

Mr. GIBSON. All right.

Senator DODD. Have you ever drawn a check for any purpose at any time in your life for \$5,000?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I think so.

Senator DODD. All right. Have you ever drawn one on the bank account of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I imagine so.

Senator DODD. You what?

Mr. GIBSON. I imagine so.

Senator DODD. Well now, I want you to answer the question. Have you or have you not?

Mr. GIBSON. \$5,000—I am not certain, really. I don't know if there was any check quite that high.

Senator DODD. How about \$10,000; have you ever drawn—

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe so.

Senator DODD. You don't believe so?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Have you ever drawn a check for \$10,000?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe so.

Senator DODD. And you are not sure about the \$5,000?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the most you ever deposited at one time in this account, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON. Several thousand dollars, I suppose.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean by "several thousand dollars"?

Mr. GIBSON. Three, four, five thousand.

Mr. SOURWINE. Three, four, five thousand; and when you deposited that three, four, five thousand where did the money come from?

Mr. GIBSON. Contributions.

Mr. SOURWINE. Contributions?

Mr. GIBSON. Subscriptions; memberships.

Mr. SOURWINE. And what?

Mr. GIBSON. Memberships.

Mr. SOURWINE. Memberships. In other words, the money you deposited was mainly in checks and small bills; is that right?

Mr. GIBSON. Not necessarily.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well now, people won't send large bills in for these subscriptions; would they?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know what sort of bills were sent in. I didn't handle the money.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't make the deposits?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. Who did?

Mr. GIBSON. My office.

Mr. SOURWINE. Let me ask you, what was the largest deposit you ever made yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. My office handled it, the secretary handled it, I did not go to the bank—

Senator DODD. Mr. Gibson, you are very responsive when you want to be. Now, won't you answer this question? Will you tell us and let us see if we cannot clear the record up; who made these deposits?

Mr. GIBSON. You mean, who went to the bank?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Was it the secretary, Miss Green?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Always; or did you come into it?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe I went to the bank only once or twice.

Senator KEATING. So she is the one who would know the correct answer to counsel's question as to whether they are large bills—

Mr. GIBSON. She might.

Senator KEATING. Or what size they were, is that right?

Mr. GIBSON. She might, yes, but I don't know. And, besides, I am not in the office that much, anyway. I don't open the mail.

Senator DODD. I believe counsel had a question pending. Mr. Sourwine, you had a question pending?

Would the reporter read the pending question?

(The question was read.)

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I never made any deposit myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. You never made any deposit yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not make a deposit in April—are you sure of that?

Mr. GIBSON. You mean, I went to the bank with money?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you see the money as it came in?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you see reports of the deposits?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your secretary does let you see the deposit slip, perhaps?

Mr. GIBSON. They are there, I have never looked at them. I just asked: Did any money come in, yes or no.

Mr. SOURWINE. She does not tell you how much?

Mr. GIBSON. If I ask.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ask?

Mr. GIBSON. Generally it was so depressing that I didn't ask.

Senator DODD. Generally what? I can't hear you.

Mr. GIBSON. Generally it was so depressing I never asked.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever get as much as \$5,000 in any one day?

Mr. GIBSON. Probably a couple of days, yes.

Senator DODD. That would not be very depressing, would it?

Mr. GIBSON. No; that's not depressing.

Mr. SOURWINE. This would all be money that came through the mail?

Mr. GIBSON. Not necessarily.

Mr. SOURWINE. But it would be mostly money which came in the mail?

Mr. GIBSON. In most cases; I think most of the people would send it through the mail.

Senator KEATING. Well, let me ask you this. Did anyone ever give you large sums of money?

Mr. GIBSON. Directly to me?

Senator KEATING. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. Indirectly?

Mr. GIBSON. To me, no.

Senator DODD. Any other way you can think of besides directly or indirectly?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, if you could find any other way I would be pleased—

Senator KEATING. Did anybody give large sums of money to Miss Green to your knowledge?

Mr. GIBSON. Persons have given money to Miss Green, not always to my knowledge because I haven't asked.

Senator KEATING. But sometimes—

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I suppose people come in and give money—

Senator KEATING. All right, what people have given large sums of money to her?

Mr. GIBSON. You did not say "large" sums of money.

Senator KEATING. I said large sums of money.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I don't know of any large sums of money.

Senator KEATING. You mean to say that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, so far as you know, has never received large sums of money?

Mr. GIBSON. Oh, I think it has received large sums of money.

Senator KEATING. Well, you would know, wouldn't you?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. If you wouldn't know, who would know?

Mr. GIBSON. Miss Green or the volunteer workers in the office.

Senator KEATING. All right, if large sums of money were received, they would advise you, wouldn't they?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I suppose so—

Senator KEATING. You have been so advised?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; but not where they came from.

Senator KEATING. You mean they did not tell you where that came from?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. Did you ask where that came from?

Mr. GIBSON. I make it a rule never to ask.

Senator KEATING. So that the only one who would know would be Miss Green?

Mr. GIBSON. That is right, and I don't even know that she asks, sometimes.

Senator DODD. Is this a policy, not to ask; is that one of the regular or written rules of the organization?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, that is part of it.

Senator KEATING. Have you any idea, Mr. Gibson, how incredible your testimony is?

Mr. GIBSON. It may be incredible. It is incredible that the committee continues to exist.

Senator KEATING. Here you are, the sole man in charge, receiving large sums of money from certain people or through subsidiaries and you profess to have no knowledge whatever—

Mr. GIBSON. I said I don't know firsthand, and generally I don't know and I am almost inclined to say in all cases I don't know

Senator DODD. You make a positive "don't know"?

Mr. GIBSON. I make a "positive don't know"

Senator DODD. And you were not interested enough to ask who the big donors were?

Mr. GIBSON. Really—would you repeat that?

Senator DODD. Would you read the question?

(The question was read.)

Mr. GIBSON. No. Big donors. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you keep books, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON. Do I keep books?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. And who would keep the books—

Mr. GIBSON. What kind of books?

Mr. SOURWINE. Books showing receipts and expenditures.

Mr. GIBSON. I presume Miss Green.

Mr. SOURWINE. So Miss Green would keep a record of the receipts and expenditures?

Mr. GIBSON. She keeps the receipts.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does she keep a record of the expenditures also?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe—I don't know. Maybe she does.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

Senator KEATING. Does the receipt show from whom these sums come?

Mr. GIBSON. No; it does not.

Senator KEATING. What do you do, just enter "From Mr. X"?

Mr. GIBSON. She just enters the contribution, subscriptions, whatever it may be—memberships.

Senator DODD. You have to keep records to pay tax on the funds—

Mr. GIBSON. We are a nonprofit organization.

Senator DODD. Don't you have to keep a record of your income and expenses?

Mr. GIBSON. We have some records. I have not been advised, I really don't know.

Senator DODD. You have a special exemption with the U.S. Treasury Department—

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe.

Senator DODD. Well, many organizations do.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I don't think we do. All of this was taken care of by Mr. Taber and I don't know very much about it.

Senator DODD. Well, Mr. Taber is not taking care of it now. You are, I suppose, so it is pertinent to ask you.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I will tell you as much as I know.

Senator KEATING. It sounds to me like Miss Green does—

Senator DODD. Is she a salaried employee?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Are you?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. You get your expenses?

Mr. GIBSON. Certain expenses.

Mr. SOURWINE. How is Miss Green paid?

Mr. GIBSON. She is paid from the Fair Play national fund.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you draw checks for her?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. How often?

Mr. GIBSON. Once or twice—once a week or 2 weeks, depending on—

Mr. SOURWINE. Does she cash those checks?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe she does.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would it surprise you to learn that between the middle of March of this year and the end of April this year no checks drawn to Berta Green cleared through your account?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know where they are, then.

Mr. SOURWINE. You signed one every week?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know when we started to pay her but I certainly believe we have been paying her.

Mr. SOURWINE. By check?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, did you pay any other employees by check?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who?

Mr. GIBSON. Edward Shaw.

Mr. SOURWINE. What does he do for the committee?

Mr. GIBSON. He is midwestern representative.

Senator DODD. And how much do you pay him?

Mr. GIBSON. \$90-something a week.

Senator DODD. And how much does Miss Green get?

Mr. GIBSON. The same.

Senator DODD. \$90?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; \$97—\$90-something.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Berta Green has any connection with the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Shaw has any connections with the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I don't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who is Steve Roberts?

Mr. GIBSON. He is the west coast representative.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you pay him?

Mr. GIBSON. No; we don't; only expenses.

Mr. SOURWINE. You pay expenses?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether he has any connection with the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I don't.

Senator DODD. When did you start paying Miss Green a salary?

Mr. GIBSON. I thought it was in February or March, but I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. What date—when did she come to work for you?

Mr. GIBSON. In February, I believe.

Mr. SOURWINE. And do you think you started paying her when she came to work?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe so.

Senator DODD. When did you say you hired her?

Mr. GIBSON. Not I; no. She was hired by Mr. Taber.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, Mr. Taber left when?

Mr. GIBSON. In January.

Mr. SOURWINE. And he hired her in February?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; he hired her in January, but I don't believe she began work until February.

Senator DODD. And when did Taber depart for Cuba?

Mr. GIBSON. The exact date—I don't know whether it was after New Year's or before—I know it was before that.

Senator DODD. You do know that?

Mr. GIBSON. Because I was with Mr. Taber at the time, and Mr. Taber was in Havana, where he had to come with the \$19,000, or with a certain amount of money you had mentioned, because he had to pay for the tour, and the only reason he took that money in cash was because it was impossible to find a bank that would transfer U.S. currency to Cuba.

Senator DODD. He took the \$19,000 in January; is that right?

Mr. GIBSON. December or January. The tour began in December but Mr. Taber didn't go to Cuba until after, or I—

Senator DODD. You went in January as I understood you?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. Taber went to Cuba in January?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe it was the beginning of January, it may have been December. I am not certain but it was at that time of the year.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you drawn any checks to Carl Braden?

Mr. GIBSON. Perhaps for expenses.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is his connection with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe he is a member.

Mr. SOURWINE. A member?

Mr. GIBSON. He may be. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you draw expense checks for all your members?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is special about Carl Braden that you are paying his expense?

Mr. GIBSON. He came to New York for our banquet, to speak.



Mr. SOURWINE. To speak?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. How much did you pay him?

Mr. GIBSON. We didn't pay him anything. We paid his expenses.

Senator DODD. How much did you pay him?

Mr. GIBSON. We didn't pay anything, we pay expenses.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, do you remember receiving a draft in the amount of \$750 payable to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee from William Worthy, Jr.?

Mr. GIBSON. A draft from William Worthy?

Mr. SOURWINE. From him.

Mr. GIBSON. I did not accept such a check. I presume if you have copies of the check that it must be there, but I did not accept it personally.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know about that check from Mr. Worthy?

Mr. GIBSON. I am aware Mr. Worthy made a contribution.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know what it was for?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was it for?

Mr. GIBSON. It was for the Afro-American ad.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was——

Mr. GIBSON. The ad, the declaration of conscience of 31 Afro-Americans, 31 Negroes who were along at the CIA-directed intervention in Cuba and the ad was placed in the Afro-American chain of newspapers and we reprinted it in the New York Post and I read to this committee the text on April 25, I believe.

Senator DODD. And have you heard that that contribution by William Worthy was to be used for paying for the ad? Have you heard that?

Mr. GIBSON. I heard all sorts of things said.

Senator DODD. Have you heard that?

Mr. GIBSON. I heard it said, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, you say that Mr. Worthy's contribution of \$750——

Mr. GIBSON. By the way, I am not certain his contribution came directly from Mr. Worthy. I understood Mr. Worthy was going to raise the funds. I don't know where Mr. Worthy got the money from.

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't know where he got it from?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. All you know, he produced a draft for \$750?

Mr. GIBSON. I never saw the draft but since you say there is one——

Mr. SOURWINE. But you do know he produced \$750?

Mr. GIBSON. I know he produced money. I don't know where from.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was that to pay for?

Mr. GIBSON. These ads.

Mr. SOURWINE. These ads that appeared in several papers——was it to pay for the printing in the Afro-American or the New York Post?

Mr. GIBSON. Both.

Mr. SOURWINE. Both?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. With \$750?

Mr. GIBSON. I assume so.

Mr. SOURWINE. How big was this ad?

Mr. GIBSON. Quarter page in one case and one-half page in the other.

Mr. SOURWINE. Which is which?

Mr. GIBSON. Quarter page in the Afro-American and one-half page in the case of the Post.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know what a half-page ad in the New York Post costs?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. It must cost at least \$750—

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know, I cannot estimate.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, as a matter of fact, Mr. Worthy's draft was to pay for the ad in the New York Post?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer to be entered in the record this list of 55 \$100 bills, all Federal Reserve notes, deposited to the account of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee on April 21, 1961.

Senator DODD. It may be admitted. Where did that list come from?

Mr. SOURWINE. This list was obtained by the committee from the bank.

Senator DODD. From the bank?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator DODD. It may be admitted.

(The list referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 23-A" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 23-A

ALL FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

B04486305A, series 1950A	B08647501A, series 1950B
B17841043A, series 1934A	B04217580A, series 1950A
G02041221A, series 1950	F04873478A, series 1934D
B02402655A, series 1950	F01096300A, series 1950
B10937174A, series 1934A	E04982446A, series 1950A
K02389081A, series 1950B	H00680032A, series 1950
B09584575A, series 1950B	H00887459A, series 1934
B04564440A, series 1950A	B05160967A, series 1950A
A00138330A, series 1950	B09609400A, series 1950B
B04492459A, series 1950A	B14084052A, series 1934A
C01557677A, series 1950A	G04042574A, series 1950
L02855336A, series 1950A	B05948726A, series 1950A
B02476619A, series 1950	E07014584A, series 1950B
B07143946A, series 1950B	B15111030A, series 1934A
C01064163A, series 1950	F00096978A, series 1950
A01506191A, series 1950A	B15010002A, series 1934A
A03347504A, series 1934	B02574985A, series 1950
B08472611A, series 1950B	B07961393A, series 1950B
L02729640A, series 1950A	E03952146A, series 1950
A01766521A, series 1950A	B07273310A, series 1950B
B00868763A, series 1950	B00672410A, series 1950
G03097373A, series 1950	B05729988A, series 1950A
G004011515A, series 1950	B09609305A, series 1950B
B07837960A, series 1950B	B10940289A, series 1934A
A01804999A, series 1934	B02348851A, series 1950
A01724095A, series 1950A	A01959551A, series 1950B
B18268128A, series 1934A	B09486725A, series 1950B
B08484805A, series 1950B	

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with that \$5,500?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know about it at the time?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who made that deposit?

Mr. GIBSON. Berta Green.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any idea where the money came from?

Mr. GIBSON. It came from contributions.

Mr. SOURWINE. Contributions—in hundred dollar bills?

Mr. GIBSON. That is all——

Mr. SOURWINE. Fifty-five of them?

Mr. GIBSON. That is all I know. I don't know from whom the money came and I did not ask.

Senator DODD. You did not ask?

Mr. GIBSON. I did not.

Senator KEATING. You were not interested in where——

Mr. GIBSON. Well, the policy is not to be too interested.

Senator KEATING. In other words, your policy is not to know too much?

Mr. GIBSON. That might be.

Senator KEATING. So that you would not know?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know.

Senator KEATING. Your policy was not to know too much so that when you were asked by a congressional committee or a law enforcement agency you would be able to say you don't know?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know.

Senator KEATING. Well, that is not an answer to the question.

Mr. GIBSON. I have never dealt with the financial side of this. I never handled this. It was either Mr. Taber or the office.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Gibson, you are the acting head of this entire organization. You say you have a policy not to know where the money came from?

Mr. GIBSON. I did not ask any questions, that is quite true.

Senator KEATING. All right. Was that policy actuated by a desire not to know in order that congressional committees or law enforcement agencies could not force you to tell them?

(Mr. Gibson consults with Mr. Faulkner.)

Senator DODD. Let the record show the witness is conferring with counsel for a length of time.

Mr. GIBSON. As I said before concerning the list of names, if I made it my business to know, these people would be subject to harassment and attack, and so I don't keep any records, I don't ask employees to keep any records and I don't bother with them.

Senator KEATING. In other words, the answer to the question is in the affirmative, is it not, that the reason for you not wanting to know——

Mr. GIBSON. Is to protect——

Senator KEATING (continuing). ——is so that congressional committees or law enforcement agencies could not force you to tell them?

Mr. GIBSON. And to protect the persons involved.

Senator KEATING. So your answer is yes, is that correct?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING (addressing the reporter). Did you get his answer?

(Reporter replied in the affirmative.)

Mr. SOURWINE. You have said, I believe, you are the president of the New York Chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who is secretary of the New York Chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Miss Berta Green.

Mr. SOURWINE. What position does Joanne Grant hold?

Mr. GIBSON. No position.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did she cease to be secretary of the New York Chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. She never was secretary of the New York Chapter.

Mr. SOURWINE. I show you a photostat of a mailing sheet which the Fair Play for Cuba Committee mailed out. It carries the signature of Robert Taber and Richard Gibson. I ask you if you recognize it.

Mr. GIBSON. I do.

Senator DODD. Wait until you see it before you answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you authorize your signature on that, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Taber wrote this.

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked if you authorized your signature.

Mr. GIBSON. That is right. It is incorrect also.

Senator DODD. Did you sign it?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not. Mr. Taber put my name to it.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is incorrect on it?

Mr. GIBSON. Miss Grant was never secretary of the chapter. She was secretary of the temporary organizing committee and I believe correction was made later of that.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know that this mailing sheet does list her as secretary?

Mr. GIBSON. I see. This is incorrect.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are there any other errors in this mailing sheet you know of?

Mr. GIBSON (after consulting with Mr. Faulkner). No, I don't see any offhand. I would have to study it.

It says I was president of the chapter. At that time I was not president of the chapter, I was just a member of the temporary—the chapter was not formed until—I don't know when—that was not issued until August 5, the chapter actually was not formed until September.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may the record have entered at this point this article I have shown Mr. Gibson, "A Note To Fair Play Readers," showing the name of Joanne Grant as secretary; this is a photoprint.

Senator DODD. Yes, it can be admitted.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 32" and reads as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 32

## A NOTE TO FAIR PLAY READERS

On August 5, the editors of Fair Play took off for Cuba, confident that, during their absence, our readers would receive the special issue of the Nation, containing Carleton Beals' excellent "Report From Havana" and Stanley Meisler's inside story of "The Politics of Sugar." We had also hoped that, in place of our own newsletter, our readers would be sent copies of I. F. Stone's newsletter containing the account of his recent Cuban tour. Unfortunately, communications broke down somewhere along the line and both pieces of literature did not go out as we had planned. Hence our apologies for the lengthy silence. However, most readers should have received their copies of the Nation by now, and this note accompanies I. F. Stone's newsletter.

And while we're in an apologetic mood, we would like to correct two errors in past issues of Fair Play. An incorrect address was given for Joanne Grant, secretary of the New York chapter of FPCC. Members in the metropolitan area who would like to take part in the activities of the chapter are urged to contact Miss Grant at 410 Central Park West or Richard Gibson, president of the chapter, at 788 Columbus Avenue. We also owe apologies to Mr. M. S. Arnoni, publisher and editor of the Minority of One. Subscriptions may be obtained by writing to Post Office Box 6594, Richmond 38, Va.

Fair Play, which has been published more or less biweekly during the summer, will return shortly to regular weekly publication. We are looking forward to a firsthand report on the present situation in Cuba and the OAS meeting in Costa Rica by Bob Taber, our editor in chief and FPCC executive secretary, in the next issue. Taber, by the way, has just completed a tour of the interior of Cuba with the noted sociologist, C. Wright Mills. A Columbia University professor and a member of FPCC, Mills is well known for his penetrating studies of American social realities, "White Collar" and "The Power Elite." He is now finishing a new book, a study of the Cuban revolution and the worldwide revolution of hungry peoples seeking not only bread, but also freedom and human dignity.

ROBERT TABER.  
RICHARD GIBSON.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I offer to be entered for the record this item, a transcript of a broadcast in English on the 22d of April—

Senator DODD. It may be admitted. Where did you obtain this?

Mr. SOURWINE. This is from Government sources, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FAULKNER. May we see that, Mr. Senator?

Senator DODD. Well, it is in the record.

Mr. FAULKNER. Well—

Senator DODD. You want it right now?

Mr. FAULKNER. I would like to see it right now. I assume it is written in English.

Senator DODD. Sure. Do you read Spanish?

Mr. FAULKNER. No; I don't.

Mr. SOURWINE. I may state this is an intercepted broadcast.

(The document was handed to Mr. Gibson and Mr. Faulkner.)

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 33" and reads as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 33

## ANTI-INVASION PROTESTS IN THE UNITED STATES

(Peking NCNA in English to Asia 0843 GMT Apr. 22, 1961—B)

(Text) PEKING, Apr. 22.—Demonstrations and protest meetings against U.S. intervention in Cuba are increasing in the United States, according to a TASS New York report.

Demonstrators marched for hours in front of the United Nations on Thursday, shouting protests and carrying posters with slogans calling for an end to the aggressive actions against Cuba. In the evening, more than 800 persons attended a meeting in Brooklyn, demanding "Hands off Cuba." It was sponsored by the newly set up local branch of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Among the initiators of the new branch is noted Negro historian Dr. William Dubois, who told the press: "The same world forces which murdered Patrice Lumumba \* \* \* [NCNA ellipsis] would kill Fidel Castro tomorrow if they could."

The Fair Play for Cuba Committee has published a large advertisement in which 27 Negro leaders and professional workers pledged themselves to resist armed intervention in Cuba. "Because we have known oppression," the advertisement says, "because we have suffered more than other Americans, because we are still fighting for our own liberation from tyranny, we Afro-Americans have the right and duty to raise our voices in protest against the forces of oppression that now seek to crush a free people linked to us by bonds of blood and a common heritage.

"One-third of Cuba's people are Afro-Cubans, of the same African descent as we. Today, thanks to a social revolution which they helped make, Afro-Cubans are first-class citizens and are taking their rightful place in the life of their country, where all racial barriers crumbled in a matter of weeks following the victory of Fidel Castro.

"Now our brothers are threatened again by mercenaries armed, trained, and financed by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency."

The advertisement stresses: "We are determined to do all we possibly can to hinder the success of this crime." It declares: "Afro-Americans, do not be fooled. The enemies of the Cubans are our enemies, the Jim Crow bosses of this land, where we are still denied our rights. The Cubans are our friends."

The signatories of the advertisement include Dr. Dubois; Dr. Lonnie Cross, professor of mathematics at Atlanta University; Daniel H. Watts, chairman of the Liberation Committee for Africa; Conrad Lynn, New York attorney; film producer John A. Singleton; musician Walter Bowe; biochemist Emmett Bassett; and secretary of the Fair Play Committee Richard T. Gibson.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, are you connected with the Liberation Committee for Africa?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I am.

Mr. SOURWINE. I show you an advertisement of the Liberation Committee for Africa and ask you if you caused this advertisement to be placed.

Mr. GIBSON. I did not cause it to be placed, but the committee did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with the ad?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did you have to do with it?

Mr. GIBSON. I wrote it.

Mr. SOURWINE. You wrote it.

Mr. Chairman, may this ad which the witness says he wrote be entered in the record at this point?

Senator DODD. Yes.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 34" and reads as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 34

## What Africa Means to Americans

FOR 20 MILLION AMERICANS of African descent, Africa means the homeland of their ancestors, a rediscovered cultural heritage, a renewed pride in their history and a new sense of dignity as black men who see Africa's struggle for freedom as part of their own struggle for freedom and equality in the United States.

FOR MANY OTHER AMERICANS, Africa is the crucial test for the United States, which will determine whether the ideals of independence and freedom which this country has long proclaimed are to be concrete in our foreign policy, and indeed even within our own borders.

Although 20 African countries have won their independence from colonial rule in less than a decade, elsewhere in Africa millions of African freedom fighters are being murdered, tortured and imprisoned. It is the duty of all men who care for liberty to give all possible aid to these freedom fighters in

**Algeria  
Angola  
Congo  
Mozambique**

**Rhodesia and Nyasaland  
Ruanda-Urundi  
South West Africa  
South Africa**

On February 15th, 1961, following Premier Lumumba's foul murder, some 60 Afro-Americans demonstrated their passionate concern for Africa's freedom in the U.N. Security Council. They were bodily ejected from the Security Council chambers, but continued their demonstration for several days before the U.N. Building, where their ranks were swollen by hundreds of Americans of all races.

The Liberation Committee for Africa, organized in June 1960, includes Americans of all races, took part in that demonstration and now seeks to make permanent that unity of purpose and effort. The Committee seeks to give Africans a voice here in the United States, it tries to give concrete aid and assistance to those who are battling overwhelming odds in Africa, it seeks to inform all Americans of Africa's proud heritage, long obscured by racist myths. It calls on all Americans to join it in making real the ideals of freedom, justice and equality, which have long been proclaimed in this country but not yet made tangible to many millions of Americans of African descent.

### THE LIBERATION COMMITTEE FOR AFRICA NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT

Would you like to help? Fill out the form below.

Daniel H. Watts, Chairman

Richard Gibson, Executive Secretary

Lowell P. Beveridge, Research Secretary

.....  
To: LIBERATION COMMITTEE FOR AFRICA  
P.O. Box 303, Cathedral Station, New York 25, N.Y.

Enclosed please find check or money order for \$5.00 to cover handling and mailing costs for one year for the MONTHLY NEWSLETTER and any other informational material that may become available to the Committee.

I would like to have a more active part in supporting the work of the Liberation Committee for Africa. Enclosed is my contribution  \$10  \$25  \$50

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_ ZONE \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. FAULKNER. May the record show that is a page of a publication; would the record disclose what publication that ad appears in?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, in what publication or publications did you place this ad?

Mr. GIBSON. I did not place the ad but the committee placed it on the back cover, I believe, of last week's issue of Nation magazine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have here another intercepted broadcast—

Mr. KEATING. Would you permit a question?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Referring to the Liberation Committee for Africa, are you the active head of this or the executive head?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I am not the head at all. I am just one of the officers.

Senator KEATING. You are the executive secretary?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; the executive secretary and not the head of the organization.

Senator DODD. He is executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Mr. GIBSON. I know, but this is not the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Senator KEATING. But you are familiar with what goes on in the Liberation for Africa Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. And this also calls for \$5 contributions to cover handling and mailing costs for 1 year for the monthly newsletter, and then there are blanks and there are places for \$10, \$25, and \$50 to be checked on this. Are you familiar with the money which comes in as to this organization?

Mr. GIBSON. Excuse me?

Senator KEATING. Are you familiar with what money comes in?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I am not.

Senator KEATING. Do you make it a point as you did with the other organization not to know—

Mr. GIBSON. I do.

Senator KEATING. —where the money comes from?

Mr. GIBSON. I do.

Senator DODD. What was the answer? I couldn't hear you.

Mr. GIBSON. Excuse me. I do not know.

Senator KEATING. You do not know for the same reason; is that right?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know what the reasons are, except personally I don't do it. Now, the organization, what they do with their—

Senator KEATING. I understand, Mr. Gibson, that you are a very intelligent man and you know what the question means and you know what the responsive answer is. And do you purposely refrain from knowing—

Mr. GIBSON. For all the reasons—

Senator KEATING (continuing). —where the money comes from, for the same reasons that you give for refraining from knowing where the money comes from for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. For all the reasons previously stated, yes, that is correct.



Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have here an intercept—this is Moscow, in English, to North America, May 8, 1961, about pressure brought to bear on the Fair Play Committee in the United States and I ask that this may be entered in the record at this point.

Senator DODD. This is an interception of a broadcast—

Mr. SOURWINE. Moscow.

Senator DODD. Yes; it may be admitted in the record.

Mr. FAULKNER. May I see that?

Senator DODD. Yes. It is in English, too.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 35" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 35

INVESTIGATION OF CUBAN SYMPATHIZERS

(Moscow in English to Eastern North America 2325 GMT 8 May 1961—L)

(TASS report on pressure brought to bear on the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in the United States.)

(Text): In an obvious attempt to prevent Americans from campaigning against further acts of aggression against Cuba, the Senate Subcommittee for Internal Security has demanded the Fair Play for Cuba Committee submit lists of its members, branches, and student councils. However, the acting national secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Richard Gibson, has informed the Senate Subcommittee that it will not give anyone away to the organizers of witch hunts.

In a memorandum to 25 branches and more than 40 student councils, Gibson stated that he had declared at a meeting of the Senate Subcommittee for Internal Security that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was certainly not a communist organization. The memorandum further pointed out that the Senate Subcommittee was making persistent efforts to suppress freedom of speech in the United States. In a statement at the meeting of the Senate Subcommittee, Gibson pointed out that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was deeply disturbed by the hatred shown by U.S. leaders toward the Cuban people and government. Asserting that the Cuban people has shown that they could quickly do away with political tyranny, economic exploitation, and racial discrimination, Gibson suggested that the U.S. leaders should show that they could do the same.

Referring to the invasion of Cuba carried out by the United States, Richard Gibson said that he, like many other U.S. Negroes, could only rejoice at the complete collapse of that act of international banditry. "I am proud," he said, "that such a large number of U.S. Negroes are active in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. It is terrible to think," he said, "that so few white politicians in our country understand the feelings of U.S. Negroes who are filled with indignation at the continued racial oppression which has permeated every field of life. It is a disgrace that the members of the Senate subcommittee dare to defend segregation and all the terrible things it brings to my people. Instead of making an inquiry into the activities of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, I would recommend that you investigate the activities of the Council of White Citizens and the Ku Klux Klan which are manifestly contrary to the interests of the United States. Why not also conduct an inquiry into the activities of the Mississippi State police who last month set their dogs on Negro students in Jackson? In Cuba," Gibson added, "they do not set their dogs on Negroes."

Senator DODD. By the way, Mr. Gibson, do you solicit funds from these young people in these colleges?

Mr. GIBSON. By general mailings, yes, we call on them—call on everyone.

Senator DODD. Do they know the way you handle the funds—

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe there has been any great secret.

Senator DODD. That is not what I am asking you. These young people, I suppose most of whom are supported by their parents, do they know what this money is used for, these thousands of dollars, and how they are handled?

Mr. GIBSON. No; if they asked they would have found out.

Senator DODD. What?

Mr. GIBSON. If they had asked they would have found out.

Senator DODD. You would have told them Mr. Taber took \$19,000 to Cuba?

Mr. GIBSON. He paid for a tour, yes, for 340 people.

Senator KEATING. Let me ask a question. Are you a member of the Columbia University chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I am not.

Senator KEATING. Just the New York chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Were you helpful in the formation of the Columbia University chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. My help consisted of attending one meeting which was their first meeting.

Senator KEATING. And you have not attended any meetings since the first meeting?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. As acting national executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, tell us what literature is available for distribution by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee to the Columbia University chapter.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, first of all, the very brilliant book by a Columbia University professor, "Listen, Yankee," by C. Wright Mills. That is one of the books that is available——

Senator DODD. Right there I would like to ask you, How much money did you spend on copies of that book?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know.

Senator DODD. Well, you must have bought some——

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; we bought some but I don't have any record. I believe we sold somewhere between 3,000 or 4,000 copies of that book.

Senator KEATING. Did you sell some of those to Columbia, too?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; and they are available at the Columbia Book Shop as well.

Senator KEATING. And do you make available other material to the Columbia University chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Senator KEATING. Like your publication, "Fair Play"?

Mr. GIBSON. That goes by mail, that goes by mail throughout the——

Senator KEATING. How often does that chapter meet out there?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know, sir.

Senator KEATING. When was the first meeting you attended?

Mr. GIBSON. Last October, I suppose.

Senator KEATING. And you have never attended a meeting since then?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. How many members are there in the Columbia University chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know.

Senator KEATING. Do you have a record in your headquarters of the membership in numbers of any of the other chapters?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. Who is the head of the Columbia University chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. The head of the—I believe now, I may be mistaken, that it is Lawrence Ireland, graduate student.

Senator KEATING. How is that name spelled?

Mr. GIBSON. I-r-e-l-a-n-d, like the country.

Senator KEATING. As far as you know he is still the head of it?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe so. I am not certain. They may have had an election, but I don't know.

Senator KEATING. Do you see Mr. Ireland from time to time?

Mr. GIBSON. Rarely.

Senator KEATING. He is a graduate student in what school?

Mr. GIBSON. Economics.

Senator KEATING. And you are a graduate student in what school?

Mr. GIBSON. African studies.

Senator KEATING. Do you meet with other officers of the Columbia chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. Other members of the Columbia chapter?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. Do they discuss their problems with you?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in Columbia University because these very fine young students from Columbia came to see me expressing the fact that they were greatly disturbed about these meetings that were held there and the things that were said at them, two of them had attended such meetings and that is the reason for these questions.

Senator DODD. Yes; I can well understand.

You have a chapter at Yale?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I suppose.

Senator DODD. Do you know who heads up the chapter at Yale?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. Or Trinity or Harvard?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator KEATING. You are at Columbia on a fellowship?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; the Columbia Broadcasting System, CBS Foundation.

Senator KEATING. When was that granted?

Mr. GIBSON. Last April—May.

Senator KEATING. How long does it run?

Mr. GIBSON. It finishes at the end of this month.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, reference has been made to your being a college man. I think it may be well to have our record show: You attended what colleges and received what degrees?

Mr. GIBSON. I have received no degrees, but I have been to a lot of colleges.

Mr. SOURWINE. What colleges have you been to?

Mr. GIBSON. I attended Kenyon College in Ohio.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where in Ohio?

Mr. GIBSON. Gambier, Ohio.

Mr. SOURWINE. And how long did you attend at that college?

Mr. GIBSON. A year.

Mr. SOURWINE. A full year or one semester?

Mr. GIBSON. Full year.

Mr. SOURWINE. A full year. What year was that?

Mr. GIBSON. 1949.

Mr. SOURWINE. 1949?

Mr. GIBSON. And 1950, I suppose.

Mr. SOURWINE. And 1950?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And then where did you go?

Mr. GIBSON. I went briefly to the university in Rome, in 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. In Italy?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, in Italy.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you speak Italian at that time?

Mr. GIBSON. I learned Italian, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many semesters did you spend there?

Mr. GIBSON. Just 1 year.

Mr. SOURWINE. One?

Mr. GIBSON. One year. I followed a course of—

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you go then?

Mr. GIBSON. The University of Paris, the Sorbonne.

Mr. SOURWINE. How long were you at the Sorbonne?

Mr. GIBSON. About 1 year, again, or little less than a year.

Mr. SOURWINE. What year was that?

Mr. GIBSON. 1955.

Mr. SOURWINE. So in 1949 and 1950 you were at Kenyon College; 1951 in Rome; and 1955 at the Sorbonne in Paris?

Mr. GIBSON. And then Columbia University.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you go to Columbia?

Mr. GIBSON. Last September.

Mr. SOURWINE. So then before you went to Columbia you had a year in Kenyon College, a year in Rome, and a year in Paris at the Sorbonne?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You said you had been to a "lot of colleges." And that is what you mean—Kenyon, Rome, Paris?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And how many academic credits did you get at Kenyon College?

Mr. GIBSON. Not very much.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you get any?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, some.

Mr. SOURWINE. How much?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know. I didn't get a degree. I don't know how many points.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many academic credits from the university at Rome?

Mr. GIBSON. None.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many academic credits at the Sorbonne in Paris?

Mr. GIBSON. None.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many courses did you complete at Kenyon College?

Mr. GIBSON. Four or five.

MR. SOURWINE. How many courses did you complete at Rome?

MR. GIBSON. Two, I believe.

MR. SOURWINE. In what?

MR. GIBSON. In Italian literature and the language.

MR. SOURWINE. And how many courses did you complete at the Sorbonne?

MR. GIBSON. I took a course in French, French literature and language there. I didn't really complete——

MR. SOURWINE. So you were learning Italian in Italy and you were learning to speak French at the Sorbonne?

MR. GIBSON. Yes.

MR. SOURWINE. When did you leave Kenyon College?

MR. GIBSON. In 1950.

MR. SOURWINE. 1950?

MR. GIBSON. Yes, 1949 or 1950?

MR. SOURWINE. What time in 1950?

MR. GIBSON. June, I suppose.

MR. SOURWINE. Don't you know?

MR. GIBSON. I don't have a record. I think it was June, at the end of the year.

MR. SOURWINE. You studied until the end of the year?

MR. GIBSON. Practically to the end.

MR. SOURWINE. You did not leave in the middle of the semester?

MR. GIBSON. No. I left before the end of the semester.

MR. SOURWINE. Did you complete the course?

MR. GIBSON. No.

MR. SOURWINE. Did you complete any of your studies?

MR. GIBSON. Not that semester.

MR. SOURWINE. You did complete——

MR. GIBSON. Yes.

MR. SOURWINE. Who paid for your schooling at the Sorbonne?

MR. GIBSON. The Government of the United States, under the GI bill.

MR. SOURWINE. And who paid for your schooling at Rome?

MR. GIBSON. The John H. Whitney Scholarship.

MR. SOURWINE. And who paid for your schooling at Kenyon College?

MR. GIBSON. It was paid for, or at least part was supposed to be paid by my father, who did not pay for it.

MR. SOURWINE. Who paid for it?

MR. GIBSON. Who paid for it?

MR. SOURWINE. Yes.

MR. GIBSON. I don't know who paid for it.

MR. SOURWINE. You mean, it has not been paid?

MR. GIBSON. May not have been paid.

MR. SOURWINE. You mean you still owe Kenyon College?

MR. GIBSON. I don't owe anything——

MR. SOURWINE. You don't?

MR. GIBSON. My father may owe.

MR. SOURWINE. You attended there a year?

MR. GIBSON. Yes.

MR. SOURWINE. And you don't think you owe them anything?

MR. GIBSON. I don't believe I owe anything.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not pay them anything?

Mr. GIBSON. I did not personally pay anything, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever agree to pay anything?

Mr. GIBSON. No. My father agreed to pay.

Mr. SOURWINE. You think you could register at a college without agreeing to pay?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe—I was a minor at that time and it certainly was my family—

Mr. SOURWINE. Oh, I see. What you signed was not binding on you because you were a minor—

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe I signed—and I don't see the relevancy—

Mr. SOURWINE. How old were you in 1949?

Mr. GIBSON. 1949?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. What relevancy does that have to do with the legislative purpose of this committee?

Senator DODD. Will you please answer the question?

Mr. GIBSON. In 1949 I was 18.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know that your tuition at Kenyon College was \$579 and not one nickel has been paid, and don't you know that you went to the treasurer's office to make arrangements for paying that because you were withdrawing before the end of the term—

Mr. GIBSON. I never—

Mr. SOURWINE. And don't you know that when you left, when you agreed to meet the dean there to complete the deal and to sign the papers, after the noon hour, you never went back, you went off the campus and were gone—

Mr. GIBSON. I had no money to pay anyone—

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know this is what happened at that college in 1950?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't understand the relevance—

Senator DODD. Never mind. Just answer the questions.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, Senator, would you want to tell me what the relevance is to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, what happened in 1949?

(Simultaneous discussion.)

Senator DODD. There is a question pending and I would want it answered.

Mr. FAULKNER. I assume that this committee would pass legislation on paying first at a college—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, that is a contemptuous remark and it has nothing to do with—

Mr. FAULKNER. It has as much to do with it as your question has to do with this proceeding.

Senator DODD. Mr. Counsel, you will remain courteous and if you don't, if you disrupt the proceedings—

Mr. FAULKNER. I have no intention of disrupting the proceedings or being discourteous. I understand that under the law this committee is to serve a legislative purpose and it is not in these questions that are asked—

Senator DODD. There is a pending question and the witness will answer the question.

Mr. GIBSON. May I have the question repeated?

Senator DODD. Read it.

(The question was read.)

Senator DODD. That is a question you could answer in very simple language and I order you to answer it.

Mr. GIBSON. I did not pay because my father was supposed to pay this college bill for me. My father declined to do so and therefore I had to withdraw—lack of funds.

Senator DODD. Was this why you walked out?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, it is.

Senator DODD. All right. That is an answer.

Now, I think since your counsel has registered a question and a comment I will ask if committee counsel at this point in record will state the legislative purpose for this questioning.

Mr. SOURWINE. The purpose of this questioning, Mr. Chairman, stems from the fact that the committee is here investigating the activities of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, especially its financing.

This committee has developed that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has thousands of dollars of finances in deposits and withdrawals of large amounts have been made subject only to the control of this witness and Mr. Taber; that American citizens, including college youth are being asked to contribute to this organization.

It is a perfectly proper legislative purpose for the committee to consider whether there is a situation here which could be met by recommendations for legislation to govern such organizations so as to give assurances of a sounder or at least a tighter financial control in cases where the public is involved, as they are here.

Senator DODD. Go ahead.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, do you know Juan René Betancourt?

Mr. GIBSON. I know the name but I don't know him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who he is?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who is he?

Mr. GIBSON. Betancourt is a wealthy Cuban who came to the United States among other disaffected persons and I don't know where he came from.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the magazine "The Crisis" which is the official organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People which contains an article by Betancourt on Castro and the Cuban Negroes.

And since we already have in our records the assertion of Mr. Gibson and the Fair Play For Cuba Committee about the situation in Cuba I would respectfully suggest we put this in the record also as something from an authoritative source.

Mr. GIBSON. Senator, may I say in regards to the article you are referring to, that Mr. Sourwine is referring to, that I have written a lengthy reply to it which I understand may appear in the next issue of The Crisis magazine along with other letters and I respectfully ask if I may to submit my reply to you.

Senator DODD. We will certainly look forward to it.

Mr. GIBSON. Thank you very much.

Senator DODD. It may be admitted.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 36" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 36

[Crisis, May 1961, pp. 270-274]

CASTRO AND THE CUBAN NEGRO

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE CUBAN NEGRO UNDER FIDEL CASTRO

(By Juan René Betancourt<sup>1</sup>)

In Cuba, as in most parts of the New World, there are differences in the treatment of Negro and white citizens. And the differences are so great that they may be correctly labeled "racial discrimination." This is an evil which I have fought in my native country for the last 25 years and, as a consequence, I have had firsthand experience with it. Cuban Negroes have fought for their rights by grouping themselves into societies. There are one or two in each town and these local groups are integrated in provincial federations and the National Federation. It is the National Federation which spearheads the fight against racial discrimination.

The day after Castro's victory the Revolutionary Government made me a delegate-intervenor in the National Federation of Negro societies, the island's main Negro organization. This was done because all previous leaders of the Federation had been involved in the Batista dictatorship, where they had occupied ministerial and senatorial posts. When Castro came to power these individuals were obliged to flee the country. And I was also the founder of the National Organization for Economic Rehabilitation of the Negro, an organization which opposed those who had delivered the National Federation to dictator Batista.

My job was to reorganize the provincial federations and to prepare for the Seventh National Convention of Negro Societies. My purpose was to reactivate the normal activities of the Negro movement and to present the Castro government with a specific program designed to make the Cuban Negro a first-class rather than a fifth-class citizen. I began by reorganizing the province of Pinar del Río. There were twenty-seven societies in this province, but at the time only four of them were in Communist hands. Because of the opposition of Communist delegates, I had to issue three different meeting notices before I could convene the congress.

The Communists said I wanted to become a government minister and that I had no authority to call the meeting. They even threatened to show up with armed groups as representatives of certain organizations which actually did not exist. When I refused them admittance, they created a disturbance, and even insulted me. Meanwhile, the Communist organ, *Hoy*, began to attack me with daily calumnies. These attacks, plus those of hypocritical Salvador García Aguero in "The Outpost of Ideas," a Communist party radio program, created confusion and bewilderment.

I had to exclude the Communists before I could successfully reorganize the Federation of Negro Societies in Pinar del Río, and I had to place a disciplinary squad at the doors to bar them from meetings, as was the case with the *Sociedad Luz de Occidente* of San Cristóbal, Pinar del Río. Sole purpose of the Communists was to create disorder and to break up the organizations. Similar disturbances took place in the other provinces. We did not want to exclude anyone; our desire was to welcome the delegates from all societies, whatever their political or social ideology; but we always found it impossible to come to an understanding with the Communists. They had only one objective: to prevent reorganization of the provincial federations and the holding of a National Congress.

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Juan René Betancourt is a lawyer by profession and was secretary-general of the *Sociedad "Victoria"* in Camagüey and cultural secretary of the *Federación Provincial de Sociedades Negras de Camagüey*. Castro made him a supervising-delegate of the *Federación de Sociedades Negras de Cuba*. Dr. Betancourt is the author of many books, among which are "Mi Opinión y Mi Raza" (1945) and "Doctrina Negra" (1955).



## COMMUNISTS IN POWER

Although I was accustomed to seeing the Communists working to get control of various movements and organizations (workers, women, peasants, and Negroes), I was somewhat disconcerted when I discovered that their real objective was to destroy. When the Communists are out of power, they are opportunistic and work to occupy key positions in organizations and movements. Once they obtain power, as in Cuba today, they reveal their real colors: to suppress all opposition, dissident opinions, and rival organizations. Cuban labor unions, for example, have been emasculated; they have no power nor functions as labor unions; they are under government control. On Labor Day they did not make a single demand and Sr. David Salvador, leader of the national federation of labor unions, was jailed when he opposed usurpation of power by the Ministry of Labor.

This is why the Communists opposed my reorganization of Negro organizations. After I had overcome these obstacles, I visited the President to inform him that the Seventh National Convention would be held November 26-28, 1959. To my surprise, while I was visiting the Society of El Fenix in Trinidad, Las Villas, it was broadcast that I had "resigned" from my post because of the pressure of other duties.

Nobody in Cuba believed Castro a Communist and he has emphatically denied being one although the membership and the policies of his first cabinet suggested Communist connections despite the fact that none was a Communist. But Castro eliminated all non-Communist ministers within a few months, replacing them with anonymous Communists. He made, however, few replacements in the lower echelons because these had been controlled by the Communists from the day Castro seized power. Since Communist theory is that they are the proletariat and that class conflict has been eliminated, non-Communist organizations are not needed. This dogma naturally brought the Negro organizations into collision with the government.

The Negro societies in Cuba are very poor associations. Traditionally, it has been the policy of the Cuban Government to flatter the Negroes by giving them contributions for the establishment of Negro organizations. I was always opposed to this policy because it attacked effects and not causes. Now, under Castro, the situation has worsened: instead of giving the societies money, the societies must contribute to the government. They are obliged to hold public dances and then to turn over the proceeds to the government for agrarian reform and, more recently, for arms, planes, and industrialization. Administrations before Castro were made up of competing political parties and as a consequence they were obliged to appoint Negroes to important government posts. But since continuance of the present Cuban Government does not depend upon free elections, and since much of its power is derived from a formidable police and military apparatus, there has been no need to appoint Negroes to important governmental posts. The Cuban Negro is today further removed than ever from the government payroll. Nor is that all.

## RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN CUBA

In order to exploit human weakness, while giving play to flamboyant demagoguery, this master of deceit that is Sr. Fidel Castro has decreed that dances must be held every Saturday and Sunday in select places which had previously barred Negroes. Such action, coupled with an intensive governmental propaganda campaign, has led many Negroes to believe that in this way they are taking reprisals against their discriminators and achieving racial equality by being allowed to patronize previously "all-white" places. These same Negroes do not patronize their own organizations, which are impoverished and closing their doors. Yet Sr. Castro and the Communists are receiving thousands of dollars weekly from Negroes at government-sponsored dances.

The Communist regime in Cuba has declared over and over again, with typical insistence and boring emphasis, that racial discrimination has been eliminated on the island. Public announcements of the Castro regime would make it appear that racial discrimination is something to be established or eliminated on the basis of a governmental decree. Castro's regime ignores the historical, economic, and social factors which are the genesis of discrimination and which continue to perpetuate it. Nor does the government seem aware of the truth that a government may, by its policies and practices, create an ambiance favorable to racial equality. A mere governmental fiat, however, does not meet the problem.

Hence Sr. Castro's assertion that his government has eradicated racial discrimination in Cuba is not only false but is bleating demagoguery.

The Communists kept the offices of the National Federation of Negro Societies open for two or three months after they had decided that I had "resigned." Then they distributed the furniture among themselves and abolished the local. Provincial federations had no better luck; they have all disappeared. Of the 256 Negro societies in Cuba, many have had to close their doors and others are in death agony. One can truthfully say, and this is without the slightest exaggeration, that the Negro movement in Cuba died at the hands of Sr. Fidel Castro.

#### CASTRO CYNICISM

Yet this is the man who had the cynical impudence to visit the United States in 1960 for the purpose of censuring American racial discrimination. Although this evil quite obviously exists in the United States, Castro is not precisely the man to offer American solutions, nor even to pass judgment. Here is a man with the total powers of a dictator, yet he has not eliminated the racial evil in his own country, Cuba. What he has done is to heighten it in a most scandalous way. He has merely brought added hunger, misery, and misfortune to the lot of the Cuban Negro.

When Fidel Castro returned to Cuba from New York, he had us to understand that he had won over the American Negro and that he was going to bring 300 of them to Cuba to view the "terrestrial paradise." Cuban Negro leaders merely looked at each other when they heard this announcement. They asked: "What's he going to show them?" Consider one fact. Whereas Castro could stay at a Negro-owned hotel in Harlem, Cuban Negroes do not own a single hotel, or commercial establishment, or industry. And Castro has done nothing to remedy this situation; what he has done is to reduce all Cuban citizens to the same miserable standard of living by his assaults upon the country's economy.

I am convinced that communism gets a toehold in countries not because of the magic of its Utopian doctrines, but because of the ignorance and the poor tactics of capitalists and democratic leaders with their pig-headed resistance to even the minimal demands of the people.

This, I believe, is the genesis of those dissatisfied and resentful masses which nourish the Communist Party. I do not understand why intelligent businessmen do not see the advantage in lowering their profits by 20 or 30 percent, and thus to keep their compatriots happy, rather than to have international communism take over their country as in Cuba. Now they have lost all their property and their earnings—and in some cases their lives.

Cubans are a good example of this shortsightedness. They have formed many organizations of exiled Cubans to work for the dethrow of Castro and his Communist regime. All are controlled by white Cubans, members of the upper or middle-middle class, who have refused to accept Castro's pattern of sub-human living. Yet they do not exhibit the slightest interest in the fate of the Cuban Negro. They seem not to care that he lived a miserable and unhappy life before Castro and that he is continuing to live the same way under Castro. Nor do they seem worried that Cuban Negroes may continue to live as pariahs even after Castro has gone—even though the future government might be a so-called democratic government. None of these exile-groups has committed itself to a nondiscrimination program should they get in power.

The Cuban Negro is never mentioned in their programs or pronouncements. Whenever this omission is brought to their attention, their reply is that they are such good democratic souls that race does not exist for them. White and black Cubans are all Cubans. It is a shame that these organizations which would rescue Cuba from the clutches of communism and which are working to bring freedom and the rule of law to Cuba do not wish to strike off the chains of racial prejudice. They show no generosity toward the Cuban Negro, who has given his blood and brawn to make Cuba.

An exception to this general attitude is exemplified by the Christian Democratic Party in exile. It is, to date, the only one that has shown itself ready to consider and to even discuss a serious program for bettering the lot of the Cuban Negro: A program to be put into effect after the fall of the present Communist regime in Cuba.

For my part I am here fulfilling a historic mission for my country and for my race. I quote that great Cuban Negro, Don Juan Gualberto Gomez: "I hope that the former will never ask me to do anything that will prejudice the latter." I

insist that the Negroes have specific rights to defend and that none of the revolutions, neither those for independence, nor the Communist, nor this one for democratic restoration, has had nor will have automatic effects against racial discrimination. Those who affirm that the condemnation of the ills of the Negro and the demand for their elimination divides Cubans and creates racial problems are either naive or unconsciously anti-Negro. As everyone knows, a sickness which is never treated can hardly be cured. The fact that we disregard the existence of an object does not, by any means, eliminate its presence.

(Translated from the Spanish by Brandon Robinson.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, you told us that Carl Braden, the field secretary of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, had been one of the main speakers at the Fair Play for Cuba Committee affair in New York on April 28.

Now, was Rowland Watts, the national legal director of the American Civil Liberties Union also a speaker?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And was Mr. William Worthy, correspondent for the Afro-American newspaper, also a speaker?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, he was.

Mr. SOURWINE. And was Mr. James Higgins the toastmaster on that occasion?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, he was.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many people were there—500 people?

Mr. GIBSON. 500.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who handled the organization of the affair?

Mr. GIBSON. The social committee of the New York chapter.

Mr. SOURWINE. And who are the persons on that committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Who are the persons—I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who was the chairman?

Mr. GIBSON. Of the New York chapter?

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the social committee of the New York chapter.

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who was in charge of this?

Mr. GIBSON. Miss Berta Green was in charge of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. She was in charge of it?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, she organized it.

Mr. SOURWINE. And did she handle the reservation and—

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I believe so. I didn't anyway.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does Mr. Joe Barry have any connection with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. GIBSON. None.

Mr. SOURWINE. He has contributed a column—

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does that indicate the Fair Play for Cuba Committee adopted and supported the position taken in that column?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, at your last appearance before this committee you were asked about the formation of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee Chapter in Denver and Boulder, Colo. Do you know if that committee has been formed and is now in existence?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe so. If it is on the list there. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Oh, you don't know whether it is on the list?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I am not certain it is on the list but I believe it is and I believe it has been formed. I don't know if we have the address or anything yet.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you received any communications from the head of that committee?

Mr. GIBSON. Did I personally?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. No, not yet.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who the head of the Denver committee is?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, Harry Nier.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you spell that?

Mr. GIBSON. N-i-e-r, Harry Nier.

Mr. SOURWINE. He is in Denver?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Attending the university there?

Mr. GIBSON. No, no; he is a lawyer.

Senator DODD. He is a lawyer in Denver?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Gibson, you left the United States April 29 and flew to Montreal and returned May 1. This was for the purposes of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, wasn't it?

Mr. GIBSON. I returned May 2—

Mr. SOURWINE. Your trip was for the purposes of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, wasn't it?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. In connection with organizing a chapter in Canada?

Mr. GIBSON. I was invited to speak there at a meeting in Montreal.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know how many chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee there are in Canada?

Mr. GIBSON. In Canada? More than four, but I don't know the names of the chapters—that is a different organization, actually. We have a fraternal connection, but—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have no more questions of this witness.

Senator KEATING. Mr. Chairman?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Senator KEATING. I reviewed the testimony of your last hearing, Mr. Gibson, and I want to read some of it to you and ask you to explain it. The question was:

Are you a resident of New York?

You said:

I am.

The question was:

You are a citizen of the United States?

The answer is:

I am.

The question was:

A native-born American?

The answer:

Yes, I am an American Negro and I have lived here quite too long in the United States.

What do you mean by your statement that you lived here quite too long?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I must say in view of the present situation, in view of the situation in the South, I think—I felt, sometimes one feels it is too long, really; but then on the other hand you feel you got to stay here, you got to do something to try to change this nightmare for my people.

Senator KEATING. Don't you wish to remain in the United States?

Mr. GIBSON. Personally in the United States, I would rather not, but I feel morally that I have to.

Senator KEATING. Do you desire to retain your U.S. citizenship?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I do.

Senator KEATING. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me significant to note at this point in the record that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been invited to appear here and it has been given a full opportunity to present its case in open hearing, open meeting where members of the press are present, including the Soviet press—they are in attendance.

This, to my mind, raises the interesting question, and I do not think this could happen, but if there were in Cuba today a Fair Play for United States Committee, and if this committee were formed and it sought to press and defend the concerns of and the treatment accorded to American nationals and the systematic expatriation of American property in Cuba—and I cannot conceive of that committee being established there, nor if it were established can I foresee the holding of a public hearing with all the members of the press present at an open meeting like this, in which the voice of the Fair Play for the United States Committee could be heard.

Mr. GIBSON. I thought the—

Senator KEATING. That is an example of the type of freedom which we enjoy in this country.

Senator DODD. Yes; I think it is.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman—

Senator DODD. I think it might be—just one moment, Mr. Gibson, if you will—I think it might be well to comment that when it comes to “fair play,” there might be fair play to the American correspondents down there, some of who are locked up right now, try to give them a little fair play. I think there is an Associated Press man in confinement as far as I know, and that is the “fair play” they are getting in Cuba.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Fair Play for America Committee came with the aid of the CIA and was successfully repulsed by the Cuban people themselves.

And speaking of that, I would like, since you raised the press, I would like to give you a copy of this file which I prepared for you of pertinent clippings from the U.S. press since our last meeting. You seemed to doubt my sources—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, let the record speak clearly on this point. The witness was down here last for the purpose of establishing the source of the information he may have had with respect to the charges his committee had made against the United States and the witness testified, then and there, he had no information excepting what he had received from the newspapers.

Mr. GIBSON. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any information today except what you have received from newspapers?

Mr. GIBSON. Except a telephone call of Mr. Robert Taber.

Mr. SOURWINE. And what you are offering the committee is newspaper clippings?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I think they are very pertinent ones.

Senator DODD. Well, we will receive them, if that is the best you can do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you receiving those, Mr. Chairman?

Senator DODD. If that is the best he can do.

(The clippings referred to were marked "Exhibit No. 37" and were ordered placed in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. GIBSON. These clippings were given to Mr. John Conlik, Chief of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department, yesterday, for possible investigation of violations of title 18, United States Code, sections 959 and 960 by Allen Dulles, Chief of the U.S. Central Intelligence—

Senator KEATING. Allen Dulles—I think it is noteworthy, the great research you have done in this compared to the research you have done as to where the money came from for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee—of which this witness has no information to help this committee whatever.

Senator DODD. Well, I hope that every member of Congress, when this record is printed, will read this testimony and the testimony you have given on the previous occasion, not only the Congress but the executive branch as well, and that this testimony will be widely distributed so that they will know the whole story about organizations like yours, operated on a wide scale among young people on university campuses, headed up by a man with a criminal record, and where the financial situation is chaotic.

Your own testimony here is shocking and I hope that we can get some legislation, I feel we need it, so that this country will be in a position to properly cope with this situation.

It is a year now since this committee has been trying to get facts about your organization. And there was a slanderous attempt to deceive the public about its purpose, the article by Tynan, which I suppose is believed by vast numbers of people who never took the time to read the record here—

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe Mr. Tynan had the record available.

Senator DODD. He had the record, but he never spoke the truth about it. But the Congress will have this information—and I speak of it in this hearing and in this record so that perhaps we may get some action.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, as an aid to the committee, may I ask one or two more questions?

Senator DODD. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who prepared this exhibit [holding up a document in board covers] that you just gave us?

Mr. GIBSON. I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did this personally?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Miss Berta Green did not?

Mr. GIBSON. Miss Green did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you type the letters yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you get these clippings?

Mr. GIBSON. From the press of the United States.

Mr. SOURWINE. You composed this letter yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And the list of persons whom you suggested be subpoenaed, you compiled that list?

Mr. GIBSON. From the press clippings.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, how did you make your selection of press clippings for this?

Mr. GIBSON. I went to the files of clippings that I had and picked out everything I thought pertinent.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not consult particular publications?

Mr. GIBSON. No. I used the New York Times.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was this file, everything written about the committee, or—

Mr. GIBSON. No. It was a file on Cuba and most of the things had nothing to do with the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one article from the Saturday Review, May 13. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you have one from the New York Mirror, May 18. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't believe I clipped it, but someone gave it to me.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one, the New York Times, May 3. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one, New York Herald Tribune, May 2, a story by David White, did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe.

Mr. SOURWINE. And one from the New York Daily News, a story by Kent Lewis. Did you clip that?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you have one from the I. F. Stone's Weekly, May 1. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one, New York Times, April 30. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And one, Washington Post, April 26. Did you clip this yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one from the New York Post, April 25. Did you clip this yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one from the New York Times, April 24, and one from the New York Times, April 22, an editorial from the New York Times, April 22. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one, Washington Post, April 22. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you have one from I. F. Stone's Weekly, April 17, 1961. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you read I. F. Stone's Weekly each week?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one from I. F. Stone's Weekly, April 10, 1961. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one not marked, we don't know where it is from. It carries the byline of Charles—staff writer—I presume the Denver Post?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe from the Denver Post.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you clip this yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you read the Denver Post?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you get this?

Mr. GIBSON. It was sent from Denver.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who sent it?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe Mr. Nier.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one from the Baltimore Sun. Did you clip that?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you read that newspaper?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I have not read—

Mr. SOURWINE. You have one, the New York Post, January 26, 1961. Did you clip that yourself?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you read the New York Post?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I do.

Senator DODD. Well, counsel—

Mr. SOURWINE. Just one more question, Mr. Chairman.

Do you have any legal education at all?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Senator DODD. I think that we will look at your offer and then the Chair will decide whether or not—

Senator KEATING. Well, this is the documentary evidence to back up the claims on Mr. Dulles; is it not?

Senator DODD. I do not know what the purpose is.

Mr. GIBSON. The original purpose was to back up my statement made up here the last time; upon completing it, I thought it might be a good idea to get—

Senator DODD. I do not know what it is, but I will accept it. We will take a look at it.

Mr. FAULKNER. It is being formally offered as an exhibit.

Senator DODD. We will not rule on it now, but we will accept it temporarily.

Mr. GIBSON. It is offered as an exhibit.

Senator DODD. What?

Mr. GIBSON. It is offered as an exhibit.



Senator DODD. I know you are offering it. I am stating how it is being viewed.

Is there anything further?

(No response.)

Senator DODD. All right.

The hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m., the committee adjourned.)



# INDEX

---

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

## A

	Page
Advance (organization)-----	130, 147
"Africa's March to Freedom" (address)-----	158
Afro-American (newspaper)-----	211, 212
Agence France-Presse-----	162
Alien Registration Act-----	188
American Civil Liberties Union-----	229
Anthony Bland, Ltd. (publishers)-----	147
Arnoni, Mr. M. S.-----	215
Atlanta University-----	216

## B

Baltimore Afro-American-----	160
Baltimore, Md-----	181
Baltimore Sun-----	234
Barry, Joseph-----	151, 229
Bassett, Emmett-----	216
Beals, Carleton-----	215
Betancourt, Juan Rene-----	225, 226
Bon Viano (Italian publishers)-----	147
Bowe, Walter-----	216
Bowen, Howard R-----	182
Braden, Carl-----	210, 229
Brass Rail Restaurant-----	179, 198
Byrd, Senator-----	165

## C

Castro, Fidel-----	146, 164, 169, 170, 184, 216, 227, 228
Castro government-----	226
CBS fellow-----	143
CBS Foundation-----	144, 221
CBS News-----	166, 186
Central Intelligence Agency-----	168, 169, 171, 197, 216, 231
"Charles"-----	234
Chase Manhattan Bank (14th and Broadway branch)-----	138, 198, 199, 204
Chicago, Ill-----	181
Clark, Miss-----	139
Columbia Book Shop-----	220
Columbia Broadcasting System-----	144, 145, 160, 162, 164, 165, 167, 168, 202, 221
Columbia Broadcasting System fellowships-----	144
Columbia University-----	167, 168, 220-222
Columbia University Graduate School in African Studies-----	143
Communist Party, U.S.A-----	147-150, 167, 198, 202, 209, 210
Council of White Citizens-----	219
"The Crisis" (magazine)-----	225
Cross, Dr. Lonnie-----	216
<i>Crusader</i> -----	160
"Cuba—A Declaration of Conscience by Afro-Americans" April 25, 1961, issue of New York Post-----	170
"Cuba and the Fight for Equal Rights"-----	160
Cubana De Aviacion-----	204

D		Page
Day, John	-----	162, 163, 165
Denver Post	-----	234
Detroit, Mich	-----	181
"Doctrina Negra" (book)	-----	226
Driscoll, David E	-----	163
Dubois, Dr. William	-----	216
Dunham, Barrows	-----	158

E		
"Eastland Tries Again" (article)	-----	188
Exhibit No. 22. "An Appeal to Americans * * *" (New York Times, Apr. 21, 1961)	-----	133
Exhibit No. 23. Photostat of check used to pay New York Times advertisement	-----	135
Exhibit No. 23-A. "All Federal Reserve Notes"	-----	212
Exhibit No. 24. Certified Voucher	-----	137
Exhibit No. 25. Mimeographed letter dated April 7, 1961	-----	152
Exhibit No. 25-A. April 1, 1961, issue of Fair Play	-----	153-156
Exhibit No. 25-B. Reproduction of column from New York Post of January 25, 1961	-----	157
Exhibit No. 26. Three ads from National Guardian, March 6, 1961	-----	159
Exhibit No. 27. "The Cuban Revolution Uncensored" (by William Worthy)	-----	161
Exhibit No. 28. Resolution dated March 29, 1955, of Standing Rules of Senate	-----	176
Exhibit No. 28-A. Resolution dated April 20, 1955, of Standing Rules of Senate	-----	176
Exhibit No. 30. "Danger of Aggression Remains" (document)	-----	189-196
Exhibit No. 31. Criminal record of Mr. Taber	-----	201
Exhibit No. 32. "A Note to Fair Play Readers"	-----	215
Exhibit No. 33. "Anti-Invasion Protests in the United States"	-----	216
Exhibit No. 34. "What Africa Means to Americans"	-----	217
Exhibit No. 35. "Investigation of Cuban Sympathizers"	-----	219
Exhibit No. 36. "Castro and the Cuban Negro" (The Crisis, May 1961)	-----	181, 182, 226, 229

F		
Fair Play for Cuba Chapter List	-----	181, 182
Fair Play for Cuba Committee student councils	-----	182
"Fair Play" (publication)	-----	220
Faulkner, Stanley (counsel for Richard Gibson)	-----	130 142, 173-177, 182, 188, 214, 215, 218, 224
Federal Bureau of Investigation	-----	145, 165, 202
"Fidel Castro Interviews the Prisoners"	-----	197
Fifth amendment	-----	131, 132, 134, 138-141, 143, 146, 147, 149-151, 158, 160, 165, 166, 168-170
First amendment	-----	131, 132, 134, 138-141, 143, 146, 147, 149-151, 158, 160, 165, 166, 168-170
Foreign Agents Registration Act	-----	139, 143, 185
"FPCC During Invasion"	-----	188, 197
FPCC Student Council Newsletter	-----	158
Frank, Waldo	-----	150

G		
Garcia Agnero, Salvador	-----	226
Gibson, Richard Thomas, 788 Columbus Avenue, New York, N.Y., testimony of	-----	129-235
Gomez, Don Juan Gualberto	-----	228
Grant, Joanne	-----	214, 215
Green, Berta	-----	180, 199, 209, 213, 214, 229, 232
Green, Miss	-----	139, 197, 205, 208, 210
Grinnell College	-----	182

	Page
<b>H</b>	
Harrington, Donald.....	150
"Hear the Truth About Cuba" (rally).....	158
Higgins, James.....	158, 229
<b>I</b>	
I. F. Stone's Weekly.....	215, 233, 234
Institute for Improvement of Inter-American Relations, Inc.....	138
Ireland, Lawrence.....	221
<b>J</b>	
John H. Whitney Scholarship.....	223
Justice Department.....	188, 200, 232
<b>K</b>	
Kenyon College.....	221-223
"Kissing case".....	160
Ku Klux Klan.....	169, 219
<b>L</b>	
Letter from Howard R. Bowen, president, Grinnell College, to Senator Eastland.....	182
Liberation Committee for Africa.....	158, 169, 216, 218
List of Fair Play Chapters.....	181
"Listen, Yankee" (book).....	220
Los Angeles, Calif.....	181
Lumumba, Premier Patrice.....	167, 169, 216
Lynn, Conrad.....	216
<b>M</b>	
Markman, Marvin.....	158
Meisler, Stanley.....	215
Mills, C. Wright.....	215, 220
Minority of One.....	215
"Mi Opinion y Mi Raza" (book).....	226
"A Mirror for Magistrates" (novel).....	147
<b>N</b>	
Nakashima, Wendy.....	150
Nash, A.....	204
Nation (magazine).....	147, 168, 215, 218
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.....	171, 225
National Guardian.....	158
National Organization for Economic Rehabilitation of the Negro.....	226
Negro Societies, Seventh National Convention of.....	226
Nehru, Prime Minister.....	167
Newman, Joseph.....	169
New York Daily News.....	233
New York FPCC, Brooklyn Chapter of.....	197
New York Herald Tribune.....	169, 233
New York Mirror.....	223
New York Post.....	151, 170, 211, 212, 233, 234
New York Times.....	139, 141, 143, 146, 147, 150, 165, 166, 168, 233
New York Times advertisement, April 21, 1961.....	131, 132, 134, 136
Nier, Harry.....	230, 234
"A Note to Fair Play Readers" (photostat of paper).....	158
<b>O</b>	
Oregon 4-8295 (telephone number).....	139
"The Outpost of Ideas" (Communist Party radio program).....	226
<b>P</b>	
Palo Alto, Calif.....	181
Paris, University of.....	222
Philadelphia, Pa.....	181
Pinar del Rio.....	226
"The Politics of Sugar" (article).....	215

	Page
R	
"Report From Havana" (articles)-----	215
Reston, James-----	168
Revolucion (Cuban newspaper)-----	199
Roa, Raul, Jr-----	146, 202
Roach, Mr-----	136
Roberts, Steve-----	209
Rosen, Jake-----	149, 150
S	
Salvador, Sr. David-----	227
San Francisco, Calif-----	181
Santos-Buch, Dr. Charles-----	150, 202
Saturday Review-----	233
799 Broadway, New York-----	181
New York Chapter of FPCC-----	214
Shaw, Edward-----	209
Singleton, John A-----	216
Sorbonne-----	222, 223
Southern Conference Educational Fund-----	229
Soviet Union-----	167
Stevenson, Adlai-----	170
T	
Taber, Mr. Robert-----	140,
141, 144, 146, 158, 162, 185, 187, 199, 200, 202, 204, 209, 210, 214,	215, 220, 225 232
Tampa Fla-----	181
Time Inc-----	160
Time magazine-----	168
"Tour Refund"-----	204
Treasury, U.S. Government of-----	209
Trinity-----	221
Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party-----	202
Tynan, Mr-----	232
U	
Union Square-----	131, 197
United Nations-----	197, 216
United Nations General Assembly, Political Committee of the-----	170
United Nations Security Council-----	169
Urban League of Greater New York-----	163
W	
Wainer, Bert-----	158
Washington Post-----	233
Waterman and Getz Agency-----	134, 139
Watts, Daniel H-----	216
Watts, Rowland-----	229
WCBS Radio News/Television-----	146
White Citizens Council-----	169
White, David-----	233
Williams, Robert-----	160, 165, 171
Worthy, William-----	160, 163, 164, 229
Worthy, William, Jr-----	211
Writers Guild of America East-----	146, 164
Y	
Yale-----	221
York, Pa., Gazette and Daily-----	158

