

Copyright Warning and Restrictions

Title 17, United States Code of the copyright law of the United States governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions, the New Jersey Institute of Technology (NJIT), Robert W. Van Houten Library is authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction on the condition that either is not to be "*used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.*" If a person makes a request for or later uses a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use", that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

Fair Use Guidelines

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 106 and 106A, the fair use of a copyrighted work, including such use by reproduction in copies or phonorecords or by any other means specified by that section, for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research, is not an infringement of copyright. In determining whether the use made of a work in any particular case is a fair use the factors to be considered shall include –

- (1) the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit;
- (2) the nature of the copyrighted work;
- (3) the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
- (4) the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.

The fact that a work is unpublished shall not itself bar a finding of fair use if such finding is made upon consideration of all the above factors.

Palmas
1955-1961

Blacklisting

TWO KEY DOCUMENTS

Report on Blacklisting

JOHN COGLEY

lc The Judges and the Judged //

MERLE MILLER

HISTORY OF BROADCASTING: Radio to Television

ADVISORY EDITOR

Dr. Christopher Sterling, Temple University

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. Marvin R. Bensman, Memphis State University

Dr. Joseph Berman, University of Kentucky

Dr. John M. Kittross, Temple University



ARNO PRESS and THE NEW YORK TIMES

New York • 1971

4. THE

BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

JOHN G. KEENAN, IN AN INTERVIEW WITH THE INVESTIGATOR .

"... After the hullabaloo of *Red Channels* and the Korean War following after that and all this hodgepodge and mess, we felt that we had laid an egg that was a bombshell. . . ."

Counterattack

"... The publication of *Red Channels* has already served a very useful purpose."

In the spring of 1950 the three former FBI men who publish *Counterattack* were searching for a crusade. The newsletter, in addition to the usual four single-spaced pages issued weekly, had, on occasion, included a "special report" to its subscribers. There was one in 1948 on the alleged Communist affiliations of leaders in Henry A. Wallace's Progressive ("Commugressive" in *Counterattack*) Party campaign for the presidency; another concerned itself with a detailed and generally favorable analysis of the Mundt-Nixon "Communist-control" bill.

But what next? According to Bierly, it had, early in 1950, "been quite some time since we had any sort of a special report at all. Most of our subscribers had come to expect these occasional things; and we were wondering what perhaps might be desirable or timely."

However, the subject matter had to be very carefully chosen. American Business Consultants had already had one unfortunate experience in working on such a report.

"At one time," Bierly says, "we were interested in getting out a special report on the degree of Communist influence in the American Newspaper Guild. That was about a year or two ago. At that time the most substantial and practically the sole [Communist] influence was in the New York chapter of the guild.

"After we spent considerable effort in our research developing a broad perspective of that, the New York Guild was suddenly won by the right wing, and it knocked that out completely."

Obviously, then, the new "special report" could not be on an organization in which, without the help of ABC, the membership might solve its own political problems.

And so, "after a good deal of soul-searching and thought," the three publishers turned to a subject on which it seemed to them unlikely that there would be much immediate change.

"We had been mentioning [in *Counterattack*] quite frequently various phases of radio and television," Bierly declares. "We found there was quite a good deal of interest in it, and that was the principal reason we felt that it might be a good idea to publish a special report on radio and television.

"Also, it would be fair, I think, to say that we discovered . . . that there was an actual list circulating around the industry . . . which we had absolutely nothing to do with and which seemed to us tremendously unfair if anyone were actually taking it seriously. . . . [This was the mysterious and anonymously prepared list of "undesirables" mentioned in the Introduction.]

"From a combination of these things we felt it might be good to come out with something documented and do it publicly, lay it on the line and sell it over the counter to try to clear the air [emphasis mine—M. M.]."

Thus, on June 22, 1950, *Counterattack* issued what was by far its most ambitious project to date, a 213-page booklet subtitled *The Report of Communist Influence in Radio and Television*.

The booklet, the cover of which graphically pictured a grasping red hand reaching for a microphone, contained the names of 151

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

of many of the most prominent people in the entertainment industry, most of whom had some connection with radio and television. Many of the listings overlap, but there were 44 writers, 28 musicians, 18 directors, 11 commentators, 3 announcers, and 68 actors. In addition there were a music critic, a lawyer, and an accountant whose connection with the industry is slight.

Together with each name was a list of organizations to which the individual concerned was "reported as" belonging—or having once belonged. Individual lists varied greatly in length. One writer was "reported as" having belonged to 41; an actor had only one listing; many had two, some three, the majority about half a dozen.

So far as time was concerned, the listings also varied greatly. Twenty of the organizations listed had been defunct since the late 1930s; at least one, Artists' Front to Win the War, had existed for only one meeting during the Second World War. One actor's most recent listing was 1938; many had no listing after 1941; a sizable minority, none after 1945.

In the introduction, written by a former television "supervisor" at the Phillips Lord agency, Vincent Hartnett, who now calls himself a "package producer," it was pointed out that not all of those whose names followed were "party members or even deliberate collaborators." That, Hartnett wrote, did not matter. "It is sufficient if they advance Communist objectives with complete unconsciousness."

Moreover, the book made no attempt to differentiate between what Kirkpatrick was later to call "the dupers and the duped." Such a distinction, Kenneth Bierly then believed, couldn't be made anyway. "It was immaterial whether they [the 151] were Communists, entirely immaterial to what we were trying to do. It had no bearing on whether they were Communists. *In the first place, we don't know who is a Communist. In the second place, we couldn't find out if we had asked them who were anti-Communists and who were pro-Communists* [emphasis mine—M. M.]."

And so, conscious and unconscious co-operators, dupers and duped, anti-Communists and pro-Communists, 151 names were listed in *Red Channels*. The booklet was sent, free of charge, to

all of the nearly 4000 subscribers to *Counterattack*, and it was sold on newsstands, mainly in Manhattan, and in some bookstores (others refused to handle it) for one dollar a copy. Keenan has since regretted the price. He has said, "We made a mistake in charging only a dollar. . . . We didn't think there'd be such a hefty demand for it. We should have charged two bucks a copy. Now we're smarter than we were then."

Nevertheless, within a week *Red Channels* had more than lived up to the ebullient prediction made by Ed Sullivan, television master of ceremonies and columnist for the New York *Daily News*, who, twenty-four hours before the booklet was issued, had written, "A bombshell¹ will be dropped into the offices of radio-TV networks, advertising agencies and sponsors, this week, with the publication of *Red Channels*."

The impact of the "bombshell" was considerably enhanced by the beginning of the Korean War, which eventually involved tens of thousands of American soldiers, the radio and television industry, perhaps to a greater degree than any other, became acutely aware of the "Communist problem"—both from a public relations and from a security standpoint.

Thus, although many executives in the industry disliked the methods by which *Red Channels* was produced and both distrusted and feared its effects, the majority of them felt they could not ignore it. As one producer has said, "I've got a copy in my desk drawer, and, when I'm thinking about who to use for a show, I find myself taking a look every once in a while. I'm ashamed of myself, but I just can't seem to help it. I guess it's the times. Nobody ever paid much attention to that Mrs. Dilling book. What was it called?"

In that it concentrated on one industry, *Red Channels* was unique; however, the booklet did have at least one famous predecessor—Elizabeth (Mrs. Albert W.) Dilling's *The Red Network, A Who's Who and Handbook of Radicalism for Patriots*.

¹As will be seen (Chapter 5), more than a year later "the bombshell" also was dropped into the lap of Mr. Sullivan's own television show, *Toast of the Town*.

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

Sixteen years earlier, in 1934, Mrs. Dilling's book, which she, like American Business Consultants, had brought out herself, had also created a considerable stir. Within nine months after publication it had gone into four printings. However, Mrs. Dilling, usually a remarkably talkative woman, never divulged the exact number of copies sold—or given away. She did admit that there had been a large free distribution of "this most important book ever issued in this country."

In the more than 350 closely printed pages of *The Red Network*, Mrs. Dilling listed (the technique was very similar to that later used in *Red Channels*) "More than 460 Communist, Anarchist, Socialist, I.W.W. or Radical-Pacifist controlled or infiltrated organizations" plus the names of 1300 persons "who are or have been members of Communist, Anarchist, Socialist, I.W.W. or Pacifist-controlled organizations and who, through these memberships, knowingly or unknowingly, have contributed in some measure to one or more phases of the Red movement in the United States."

Although the present-day House Committee on Un-American Activities and the California Tenney Committee were non-existent at the time, Mrs. Dilling's book was also assembled in approximately the same way as *Red Channels*. She wrote that her information came "principally from the official literature and letterheads of the organizations mentioned . . . from the Report of the Joint Legislative Committee of the State of New York Investigating Seditious Activities (called the Lusk Report) based upon documentary evidence; from U.S. Report 2290 of the Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in the United States, headed by the Hon. Hamilton Fish . . . and from other reliable sources (mainly private organizations). . . ."

However, unlike *Red Channels*, Mrs. Dilling's book was international in scope. It listed, among other world figures, not all of whom were alive, J. Ramsay MacDonald, Bertrand Russell, Sigmund Freud, Mahatma Gandhi, and, of course, Karl Marx. Among the Americans named were William C. Bullitt, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Robert M. Hutchins, Senator George W. Norris, and William Allen White. Many readers felt that Mrs. Dilling had

deliberately chosen a suspiciously large number of Jewish names.

Again like *Red Channels*, Mrs. Dilling's book did not call for any special action against the listees. She simply concluded her dedication to the "Professional Patriots" by declaring: "May 'professional patriots' increase and multiply; may they cease to be lonely voices crying in the wilderness; may their members and activities grow strong enough to avert now threatening Socialism or Fascism, and to prescribe for America, Christianity, the American Constitution, and American liberty."

At the time few people took Mrs. Dilling's book very seriously. Certainly there is no record of anyone losing his job because his name was listed—but the year, of course, was 1934, not 1952.

A CONSIDERATION OF TIME AND MOTIVE

EDMOND TAYLOR IN *Richer by Asia*

"All things have very different meanings, depending upon the meaning you want to put upon them."

LYLE STUART, FREE-LANCE WRITER ON A RADIO PROGRAM ON RADIO STATION WINS

"Here is the text of a telegram sent to the Council of American-Soviet Friendship [during the war years] . . . Would you consider the sending that telegram a subversive act?"

VINCENT HARTNETT, AUTHOR OF THE INTRODUCTION TO *Red Channels*
"Of course I would."

STUART: "The man who sent it is Dwight David Eisenhower."
[The above quotations are paraphrased since a recording of the broadcast was not available at the time this portion of the report was written.]

ALAN BARTH IN *The Loyalty of Free Men*, VIKING PRESS, 1950

"It is a mistake to suppose that any body of men can measure the good faith of a group committed to political purposes in the way that the Federal Trade Commission can, for example, measure the purity of a patent medicine. There are no objective standards for the measurement of motive. Purity of political purpose can be tested only in the competition of the market."

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

Red Channels ignores history; it pays no attention to time; it does not consider the intellectual history of the liberal movement in the United States; it does not consider the possibility that a man who in the thirties or during and after the recent war (or, for that matter, yesterday afternoon) both joined so-called front organizations and supported the Soviet Union may today be a vehement and outspoken enemy of the Communists, domestic and international.

There is in none of the 213 pages of the "report" any recognition of the fact that, as one listee put it, "I joined those organizations because they *said* they stood for the things I'm for and *seemed* to be fighting the things I'm against."

According to a radio writer cited in *Red Channels* (incidentally one whose income has decreased by a third since the booklet was published), "Those fellows seem to judge, if I can use that word in referring to their methods, what an organization was in the thirties by what it might have become in the forties or today. . . . I joined the outfits they list [two committees protesting Japanese aggression, one concerned with the Spanish War, another an American anti-Nazi organization] because I believed in them. And, under the same circumstances, I'd do it all over again."

However, in *Red Channels* the man who in 1939 signed an "Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union" or a petition condemning Nazi atrocities is listed side by side with the one who in 1949 signed a petition protesting the "prosecution of Communist Party leaders"—not that the latter is necessarily a Communist or even a Communist sympathizer.

Since its editors paid no attention to the time factor, neither did most of the readers of *Red Channels*, including, unhappily, most network and advertising executives.

Thus the extensive quotations that follow seem to the investigator a necessary part of this report.

The first quotation is from a letter by a renowned screen writer listed in *Red Channels*. At the time this letter was written he had seemingly been unaffected (financially anyway) by his appearance in the "report." He states:

"During the decade 1930-40 when, to my mind, any young man

who was not a sympathetic student of Marxism was not quite alive, I participated in many groups that were both pro-CP and anti-CP. . . . I did (as charged in *Red Channels*) write about a dozen play reviews for the *Daily Worker*, *New Masses*, and *Sunday Worker* but stopped writing for any of them because of an attempt to politicalize my reviews. . . . The decade was summed up by me and for me in my novel [title and publisher and date of publication], which was viciously reviewed in the *New Masses*, *Daily Worker* and *Sunday Worker* as a slanderous attack on the Communist Party. . . .

"For myself, I am proud to have participated in a small way in the American and world experience of the Thirties, the enormous energy released, some of it misdirected, some of it evilly used, some of it pouring itself out in sterility, but all nonetheless an intricate part of our times. One cannot deal with such a thing as *Red Channels* statistically, in terms of accuracy even. This requires a study in depth. If the most articulate of those listed could join together in a defiant affirmation of all that was good and right in our past, such evil as *Red Channels* would be shaken to its roots.

"It thrives on fear and the evocation of a 'shame' that was not anything of the kind. Such a joint undertaking could well be dedicated not to the God that failed but to the dream for a better America which most of the so-called fellow travelers of the Thirties devoted themselves to. . . . And with such a defiance the whole truth of that decade as it really was should be set down."

The excerpts that follow are from a letter to one of his employers by a well-known screen-radio-television writer who, again unlike many of the others in *Red Channels*, is still regularly employed. His letter expresses the feelings of the majority of those interviewed; it was written when he was asked "to explain why I am in *Red Channels*":

"My first reaction on learning I was listed in the volume was one of anger. I resented both the action taken and the method of taking it—this not alone because I, personally, was affected. My resentment was against the whole idea of any private, non-

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

governmental and non-official organization appropriating unto itself the dual role of prosecutor and judge to conduct a kind of trial-without-jury in which no evidence for the defense is asked for or presented. . . .

" . . . With respect to my membership in organizations which *Red Channels* has listed as 'subversive' or 'front' groups:

"Why did I join or become associated with such organizations? For a very simple reason. I had served for three and a half years in the Army, contributing my efforts to the winning of a coalition war in which different political systems and philosophies worked side by side to insure a victory. After the war I sincerely believed it was also possible to achieve a coalition peace. If you will, I took the doctrine of 'One World' literally and, while I was well aware that within these organizations there were individuals whose basic political ideas were far left of my own, I thought our prime immediate objectives were generally the same and that a better democratic America could be assured by unity of effort. Within those organizations I stood for the principles of true liberalism as I saw them—finding myself often at odds with both extremes of ideology within the groups. (This is a point which, I believe, is all too often overlooked by those who label these organizations as rubber stamp machines operated from the offices of the *Daily Worker* if not directly from Moscow. The truth is that there were broad differences of opinion—on issues, on candidates, and on a great number of subjects which came under discussion.)

"During the year 1947, as you undoubtedly know, there was a definite split in the ranks of American liberals on the issue of Communism. There were those who held—that no liberal political organization in this country could function with maximum effectiveness which included Communists in its membership because the hard core of Marxist philosophy held even by a small minority was almost certain to affect, eventually, the policy of the entire organization—not necessarily dominating it, as is so frequently charged, but limiting and in some cases weakening it. Others contended that as long as the Communist Party was legal in this country and inasmuch as the organizations were non-partisan

. . . it was contrary to the spirit of real democracy to eliminate any individual on party affiliation grounds. At first I was inclined to go along with the latter view. Along with a great many other liberals whose loyalty is also beyond question I still defended the coalition principle.

"And then—I am not certain of the exact date except that it was during 1947—I changed that opinion. There was increasing evidence in many parts of the world that the coalition principle was *not* working. And, finally, the collapse of the free government of Czechoslovakia (which to my way of thinking had been the last, best testing ground of the coalition principle) was for me the *coup de grâce*. If I had had doubts before, now I knew certainly. And since that time—approximately three years ago—I have belonged to no political organization or group save one, which by its constitution and membership pledge automatically excludes anyone who espouses totalitarianism of any sort, Communist or Fascist.

"At this point, I want to re-emphasize the time element in this whole matter, because I believe it to be one of the basic fallacies of the *Red Channels* listing that there was a failure to re-assess the judgment of individuals in respect to the changing times. To say that a man defended the coalition principle three years ago is certainly vastly different from saying that he defends it now. (Not, I submit, that a man is necessarily subversive if he does defend it now. Personally, I think he is wrong, misguided and unwise, but to be mistaken is not necessarily to be a traitor to one's country.) . . . The facts are that since 1947 I have not been active in any of the organizations listed.

"There comes the question of whether, as *Red Channels* implies, many liberals like myself who belonged to organizations now accused were 'misguided dupes.' The answer, of course, is one of opinion. Actually, in 1946 the declared fundamental objectives of these organizations were basically those domestic and international policies which had been laid down by Franklin Roosevelt, and most of us, I am sure, joined in the belief that we could thus best work together to carry on those principles. I further believe that the reason we later had to leave those or-

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

ganizations, as so many of us did in '47 and '48, was because the organizations departed from those original principles and, with the changing international tides of those years, went further to the left than Roosevelt, were he alive, would ever have gone. To put it another way, I don't think we liberals left them; the organizations left us.

"I most certainly do not deny—and have never denied—belonging to organizations in 1946 and 1947 in which there were individuals of very leftist persuasion. Though I was never certain of it at the time it is now evident that some of them were Communists. They were, however, definitely in the minority in such groups and I know of no action taken by any organization while I was a member which was subversive or treasonable in nature.

"And finally, in the overall judgment of this matter, I submit that ultimately a man must be judged by his works. To anyone who shall speak a word of doubt I suggest you refer him to a considerable number of the several hundred scripts which I have turned out in the past fifteen years. . . . The truth is he'll find some 'propaganda' there. . . . For instance, he'll find propaganda for 'Divine Faith' in the several programs I wrote for —; he'll find propaganda for such things as recognizing the dignity of teaching and nursing as professions and of the need to devote new energies to further the work of such organizations as the Community Chest, YMCA, Red Cross, the Sister Kenny Foundation, to name but a few; he'll find a kind of propaganda for many things basically American woven into the fabric of works written primarily for entertainment. The one thing he won't find is anything designed to destroy faith in this nation or its government. There's a very simple reason for that. I don't think this is the best of all possible worlds, but I *do* think it's the best hope of one."

SOME EXAMPLES OF ANTI-COMMUNIST STATEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES OF RED CHANNELS LISTEES

GYPSY ROSE LEE

"If a man (or woman) is to be judged by the company he keeps, he should be judged by *all* the company he keeps."

In the introduction to *Red Channels* the publishers promise that "Where an anti-Communist action or condemnation of Communism has been made by an individual mentioned in the following report, and known to the publishers, it has been noted in the text."

The key words in that sentence are, "and known to the publishers."

As will be seen, a great many such activities by listees were not known to the publishers—possibly because they made no real effort to find out.

For example, entirely aside from the accuracy of Gypsy Rose Lee's² listing, each item of which she has challenged, there is no mention of the fact that she played a benefit for France at the Waldorf-Astoria during the time of the Non-Aggression Pact and took part in a benefit for Finland when that nation was being attacked by Russia; she participated in four benefits for Bundles for Britain, also during the time of the Non-Aggression Pact. No Communist, Communist sympathizer, or fellow traveler is likely to have been involved in any of these activities, and Miss Lee has a record of many other clear "anti-Communist actions," but none is mentioned in *Red Channels*.

Nevertheless, Miss Lee who, until the appearance of *Red Channels*, made guest appearances on radio or television or both as often as two or three times a week has, as this is written, very

²The conservative *Post-Star* of Glens Falls, New York, had this to say about the listing of the versatile dancer-wit-writer: "*Red Channels*' evidence against Miss Lee consists of four items: in 1941, she was reported in a book by Eugene Lyons to have spoken before the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. There was no report of what she said. Last March [1950], the Communist *Daily Worker* reported her attendance at a dinner of the Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. Also in March [1950], the New York *Compass*, a leftwing newspaper, listed her as an entertainer at a carnival stage by the Council of Arts, Sciences and Professions. Miss Lee denies attending. The final item, in the *Worker*, said she attended a book auction by the League of American Writers-International Labor Defense in 1942.

"Thus two of the charges are eight and nine years old; two are reported in the *Daily Worker*, whose reputation for truth is on a par with *Pravda*; and all are based on unsubstantiated information. If we have reached the point where our citizens can be indicted out of the hands of the *Daily Worker*, American Communists should have a field day."

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

little work in either field. Her program, *What Makes You Tick?*, is, at the moment, no longer being broadcast.

Tom Glazer, a well-known folk singer who is also listed in *Red Channels*, has said that in a personal interview with Kirkpatrick the singer pointed out that, among other anti-Communist activities, none of which is mentioned in the booklet, he had: (a) participated in the successful fight to halt Communist infiltration into the American Veterans Committee; (b) been one of the early members of the liberal, anti-Communist Americans for Democratic Action; (c) appeared at many ADA rallies; (d) in 1948, when every fellow-traveling stalwart was drafted into service for Henry Wallace, had performed extensively through New York for the Democratic State Committee and was on record as a supporter of Harry Truman's candidacy; and (e) had made several contributions to the International Rescue Committee, which aids those who have escaped from Communist-dominated countries.

However, according to Glazer, Kirkpatrick was apparently not much impressed with his record. The former FBI man asked only one question. "Can you," he wanted to know, "tell me about any arguments you've had with Communists?" Glazer couldn't think of any.

A few months later the folk singer submitted a written statement to American Business Consultants, and *Counterattack* then carried an item headed, "Folk Singer Tom Glazer Says He Is Anti-Communist." The paragraph quoted Glazer as stating, "I am unalterably opposed to Communist tyranny or any other kind of tyranny or dictatorship, wherever it exists in any country, organization, industry, or union."

At the moment, however, the number of Mr. Glazer's radio and television appearances, which dropped sharply after the publication of *Red Channels*, has not increased much.

As has been mentioned, in eight issues of *Counterattack*, from October 1947 until March 1948, Fredric March and his actress wife, Florence Eldridge, were called "Communist." It was not until December 1949, after more than a year of legal battling, that *Counterattack* conceded that, among other political activities of

the Marches, they had, during the time of the Non-Aggression Pact (a crucial period so far as determining Communist sympathies is concerned, though many then Communist supporters have long since changed their minds), contributed an ambulance to Finland, another to France, had been, along with Wendell Willkie, among the founders of the strongly interventionist Fight for Freedom, and had given substantial sums to Bundles for Britain, American Friends of France, and British War Relief.

A network news commentator has this to say about his *Red Channels* listing and his own anti-Communist activities:

"As a journalist and professional writer, a news correspondent in Moscow, Paris, Vienna, Athens, etc., I have in the past fifteen years sold dozens of articles to numerous American and Canadian magazines of all political complexions. *Red Channels* lists only *New Masses* and *Soviet Russia Today*. It also fails to mention that my two articles in *New Masses* were non-political, although it does say that the two in *Soviet Russia Today* were book reviews.

"*Red Channels* quotes me as casting aspersions on the conduct of the Polk murder trial in Greece. So I did. I cast similar aspersions on the conduct of the Mindzenty and Vogeler trials in Hungary, and on various political trials held in Sofia, Bucharest, Prague, and Warsaw. Yet no mention is made of this, nor does *Red Channels* provide any other quotations from my broadcasts on the Polk trial."

In an appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Hazel Scott, pianist and singer, put it this way:

"One of these listings [there are nine] is for an appearance—by direction of my employer—an appearance of which I am not ashamed—another was ostensibly a series of benefits for orphaned children. When I found out otherwise, I discontinued such activity. Still another involved the use of my name three years after I had played a benefit. The group later merged with one that developed a bad name. The fourth listing advertised that I was a guest of honor at a dinner I never went to or heard of. . . . I did not support Henry Wallace, and I voted for Harry Truman. Again this well-known position seems not to have interested the pub-

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

lishers of *Red Channels*. . . . Anyone who says I played any part in the Civil Rights Congress [*Red Channels* does] is mistaken or a liar. . . . But the document I am about to present may shed some light on this and other false listings. Here, gentlemen, in their own words, is proof of how such groups operate. . . . My husband [Congressman Adam Clayton Powell], more fortunate than I, did find out about his Civil Rights Congress listing . . . by the simple method of opening his mail one morning and reading a notice of the national board's annual meeting. . . . Immediately, he wrote asking what the notice was for, since he had never agreed to any participation with the Congress. . . . I read from the reply sent by the executive secretary [of the Civil Rights Congress], William L. Patterson: ' . . . The names of a number of people were presented . . . as members who had not been consulted. You, it seems, were one of them.'

" . . . I should like to note in passing that all my life I was a regular worshiper in the Roman Catholic Church, until my marriage in 1945 to a Protestant Minister. Since that time I have been an active Baptist."

Despite the incompleteness of her *Red Channels* listing, shortly after the appearance of ABC's "special report," Miss Scott's program on DuMont television was abruptly dropped. Officially the DuMont action was said to have nothing to do with *Red Channels*: as one official there told this reporter, "It was just that we felt we could more easily sell the time if somebody else was in that spot."

A few months later when Miss Scott was announced for a guest appearance on a network television program, the plan was suddenly changed, allegedly on the demand of the sponsor. According to an official source, when Miss Scott's appearance and statement for the House Committee were pointed out to the sponsor, he said, "She's still listed in that book [*Red Channels*], and we don't want to get involved in any controversy." On the night Miss Scott was to have appeared, the master of ceremonies of the program informed the audience that she was "ill."³

³More recently, however, Miss Scott has been on at least one well-known television show.

The above are only a few of many verifiable examples of clear-cut anti-Communist activity by some of those who have been denounced in *Counterattack* and listed in *Red Channels*.

However, in the booklet itself, of the 151 persons named, only two are credited with such activity—one, Alfred Drake, is listed for "Denial of pro-Communism, New York *World-Telegram*, 2/5/49"; John Garfield is recorded as having stated, "The Marshall Plan is killing Communism in Europe . . . and that's good. *Sunday Mirror*, 9/25/49."

When the investigator pointed out the incompleteness of the *Red Channels* listings, Bierly replied, ". . . If we had known about these various things, we would have put them in."

QUESTION: Did you collect, prior to the publication of *Red Channels* or since, in your research . . . anti-Communist statements of . . . people whom you feel have been anti-Communist?

BIERLY: I would say, yes, but the way we are geared here is on Communist matters, and that is the whole thing. As we are geared to that, *we do not really concentrate on collecting anti-Communist statements as such* [emphasis mine—M. M.].

And in a subsequent interview Bierly said, "We didn't go out and . . . actively try to find out how many Communist statements they [the *Red Channels* listees] made at cocktail parties, nor how many anti-Communist statements they . . . made at cocktail parties or in business, or *anti-Communist organizations they belonged to, nor did we try to find out whether they were Communist, pro-Communist, Fascist, or what have you.* . . . [emphasis mine—M. M.]."

QUESTION: . . . If you had to do it all over again, would you have tried to give a more rounded picture?

BIERLY: . . . In the light of the experience we have had . . . with the business of *Red Channels* . . . we would be much more alert to developing that type of information . . . to give a more balanced picture.

On the other hand, Keenan said, "Let's presume for the sake of discussion there were 25 Communists among the 151. Part of their credo is to lie when the occasion demands. So you [if ABC had questioned the 151 listees prior to publishing their names]

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

would be printing a bunch of lies. So who could draw a conclusion if they wanted to between those who were telling the truth and those who were lying?"

QUESTION: What about the 125 who may not be Communists?

KEENAN: You couldn't tell the difference.

THE PURPOSE OF RED CHANNELS

THEODORE C. KIRKPATRICK, IN A SPEECH BEFORE THE RADIO EXECUTIVES CLUB, OCTOBER 19, 1950

"I don't say you shouldn't hire the performers listed in *Red Channels*. I do say that those who continue to support Communist Party causes since June 23, 1950,⁴ must take the consequences. Anyone who has continued to support a Communist cause since June 23 is just as much . . . an enemy of our country as if he were in Korea passing ammunition to the Communists."

Since not even the publishers of *Red Channels* can distinguish between the "innocent and guilty" as listed in the booklet, or between Communists and non-Communists, it is not surprising that most of the readers were even more confused. What was the purpose of *Red Channels*? What should be done with the list? Should all 151 be discharged, only part (which part?), or none at all?

There is no place to turn for an answer to any of these questions. As for the officials of American Business Consultants, who might be presumed to know, their statements on the subject have varied considerably.

In the introduction to Part II of *Red Channels*, the "Alphabetical Index of Names," three objectives are stated: "One, to show how the Communists have been able to carry out their plan of infiltration of the radio and television industry. Two, to indicate the extent to which many prominent actors and artists have been inveigled to lend their names to organizations espousing Communist causes. *This, regardless of whether they actually believe in, sympathize with, or even recognize the cause advanced.* Three,

⁴June 23 is one day after *Red Channels* was published and two days before the Korean war began; some listeners felt Mr. Kirkpatrick meant to use the latter date.

to discourage artists and writers from naively lending their names to Communist organizations or causes in the future [emphasis mine—M. M.]."

In the September 13, 1950, issue of *Counterattack* it was said that the publishers "hoped that RED CHANNELS, by awakening the American people would lead to the elimination of Communist influence in the sensitive and strategic radio and TV industry. . . ."

But how? On this vital point Messrs. Bierly, Keenan and Kirkpatrick have been discouragingly vague and contradictory.

During one of the interviews with the investigator, Bierly said, "Do we believe that people who are Communists, known Communists . . . should be kept off the air? Our answer is no, so long as the public knows they are Communists. . . . Do we object to people who have been in fronts being on the air? We have pretty well solidified the idea that our objection is based on the fact that it is a fraud on the public not to be aware . . . that individuals taking certain positions on controversial subjects have had certain connections or certain affiliations in the past that would condition what they have to say. . . . [We feel] that it is a fraud not to have these facts made known. . . . Therefore, a person who has been affiliated with front organizations should be identified as such so that there will be no misunderstanding. . . . That would eliminate ninety-nine per cent of the objections to that person appearing. . . ."

QUESTION: You mean where people are giving their own opinions on a talk show.

BIERLY: That is right.

Conversely, however, in the issue of September 13, 1950, the newsletter flatly stated, "It is COUNTERATTACK's stand that no sponsor of any radio or TV program should have a totalitarian of any kind on the air. Quite a few people with continuing records of pro-Communist activity are still associated with a considerable number of programs. They should be dropped even if they are good money-makers for the sponsor."

Perhaps *Counterattack* was referring only to actors, who, in the minds of Bierly and Kirkpatrick, fall into a separate category.

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

BIERLY: . . . Where a person is taking a dramatic part in which in many cases there is no chance to interject the Communist line or Communist position in any way . . . that person [the performer] is a member of Communist front organizations . . . and his income is being used for Communist front organizations . . . there again we feel it is something that the public should know.

QUESTION: Would you think that the entertainer should be taken off the air, in that instance?

KIRKPATRICK: Yes, if he has a significant and continuous record of Communist fronts and other causes.

QUESTION: Do you think by that criteria . . . that people listed in *Red Channels* are people who would be in that category?

KIRKPATRICK: Most of them, yes; some of them, no.

QUESTION: Actually, then, doesn't the entertainer who does not give an opinion suffer more than the one who does?

KIRKPATRICK: No, because in most cases those opinion shows don't carry a salary [emphasis mine—M. M.].

QUESTION: How does one choose between the 151 in casting a show or choosing a writer?

KIRKPATRICK: Well, we have never recommended any action on the basis of *Red Channels* [my emphasis—M. M.].

However, Bierly admits, ". . . People with whom we have been in contact . . . [have said] that they know of their own personal experience that *Red Channels* resulted in people not being hired who otherwise would have been hired. . . .

QUESTION: And you would not condone its [*Red Channels*] being used in that manner?

BIERLY: Absolutely not.

KIRKPATRICK: You asked—What did we think would be the effect of *Red Channels* when we published it? If I were to answer that question very briefly, I would say I expected the average person who picked it up to say, "Gosh, I had no idea the extent of Communist influence was this great," by seeing all of this information together in one place.

QUESTION: And that is all?

KIRKPATRICK: . . . If I were to give one basic reaction that I hoped there would be, that would be it. . . .

WHAT ARE THE SOURCES OF *RED CHANNELS*?

THEODORE C. KIRKPATRICK ON REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, SEPTEMBER 14, 1950

"There is nothing new in the book. It has all been printed or published before. The only thing we did was to bring it together in one place."

THE INTRODUCTION AND ITS AUTHOR

The introduction to *Red Channels* was written by Vincent W. Hartnett, a former naval intelligence officer and television supervisor who now lists himself as a "package producer." In addition, Hartnett gives frequent lectures, most often on the subject of "The Complete Exposé of Communism in Radio."

Hartnett is not now an employee of American Business Consultants. When asked whether ". . . at this moment he has any official connection with ABC," Keenan said, "He never did have."

When it was mentioned that Hartnett is advertised as "The Author of *Red Channels*," Kirkpatrick added, ". . . He is not an employee and has no other connection with us whatsoever except that he did write the introduction."

And Mr. Bierly continued, ". . . Both past and present [he] . . . has had no affiliation with this organization, either as an employee or otherwise."

QUESTION: . . . But he did write the introduction. How did you happen to choose him for that?

KIRKPATRICK: At the time we were discussing doing this report, in a discussion with Vince on one occasion he mentioned the fact that he had been thinking of the same sort of thing himself . . . and he had already jotted down something that he had in mind. After some discussion it was agreed that instead of both of us going ahead and doing this thing, if we liked what he had written, perhaps we could work it out jointly.

(Hartnett has his own considerable files on "who is and who isn't a Communist," to use his own words. "For years now I've made it my business to keep an eye on those babies and get them when I could.")

QUESTION: He did this on a paid basis . . . or on a volunteer basis?

BIERLY: He did it on the basis of us paying him royalties on the sale

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

of the book. [N.B. Despite its considerable impact, *Red Channels* has by no means been a best seller. Of an original printing of "not quite 17,500" there were, in October 1951, "only a few" unsold. However, as stated above, each of the nearly 4000 subscribers to *Counterattack* received a free copy. "We didn't make any money on it," Kirkpatrick has said.]

On October 15, 1950, Hartnett made what has been perhaps his most widely publicized speech. He appeared in Peoria, Illinois, at the All-Peoria Conference to Combat Communism, sponsored by the American Legion. The meeting was one of a series of "anti-subversive seminars" the Legion Americanism group had been sponsoring throughout Illinois.

S. Paul Ferrin, a part-time member of American Business Consultants and also a practicing lawyer in Peoria, had, according to Kirkpatrick, "nothing to do with arranging that [Hartnett's] speaking engagement."

According to the Peoria *Journal Star*, Hartnett told his audience, "You hold the purse strings for most entertainers. Big corporations and radio stations will listen to you. Wire, phone or write your protests."

He was also quoted as saying that, since the publication of *Red Channels*, many of those listed had denied association or knowledge of the groups their names had been associated with. "I have dared them time and time again to sue me, so we could take the matter to court where they will be subject to the laws of perjury, but they refuse." (Since that time five *Red Channels* listees have sued not Hartnett but American Business Consultants. None of the cases has yet come to court.)

Then, the *Journal Star* continues, "Hartnett led off a scathing attack on Red-front tools by reiterating charges against Jean Muir." He "pointed to the sympathies" of fourteen entertainers, five of whom are not listed in *Red Channels*. He named three radio shows "which support Communist sympathizers"; perhaps coincidentally, at the time of writing two of the programs are off the air; the third is only on television.

Moreover, Hartnett is quoted as saying, "*Red Channels* tells only half the story on them; if they get tough, just wait until you

see the second edition." (At the moment American Business Consultants has no plans for a second edition.)

The Peoria paper reported that Hartnett also "blasted Attorney General J. Howard McGrath for his defense in New York City of entertainers like Miss Muir." In the speech to which Hartnett referred, McGrath had not mentioned Miss Muir or any other entertainers. He had simply attacked what he called "Vigilante groups who intimidate radio personalities."

"Surely, Mr. McGrath's files on Miss Muir are as full of proof as mine," Hartnett is quoted as saying.

Finally, the newspaper reported, Hartnett said he had just seen an announcement that the road company of Arthur Miller's Pulitzer prize play, *Death of a Salesman*, was scheduled to appear in Peoria. He called it "a Communist-dominated play," said that Miller is a Communist-fronter, that the Broadway producer, Kermit Bloomgarden (who was not associated with the road company), was also a Party-fronter as was Lee J. Cobb, the original star, and Albert Dekker, who headed the road company production.

"You have your choice of supporting or denying support to any entertainer, playwright or artist," Hartnett is quoted as having told his listeners. "Why should you patronize such a performance?" What's more, he added, a great part of the income from the Peoria appearance of the company would go direct to the Communist Party or to Party fronts.

Miller, Bloomgarden, and Dekker (Cobb was in Hollywood) wired the local newspaper, "Any allegation that any part of the income of the play has gone, is going, or will go to the Communist Party or its affiliates is an outright and preposterous lie. Nor is the producer, author, or star a 'front' for any political theory or organization." The non-political Authors League of America telegraphed the Peoria press that *Death of a Salesman* had, in addition to the Pulitzer prize, won many other national and international awards and asked that Peoria remain a city "which can receive and appreciate a serious work without further prejudice or hindrance."

Nevertheless, the Peoria Junior Chamber of Commerce and the

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

Peoria Post No. 2 of the American Legion put pressure on Bernard C. Worley, city manager of the Publix-Great States Theatres, to have the performances canceled. Explaining that the contract had been signed nine months earlier, Worley refused. At that point the local Junior Chamber of Commerce announced a boycott.

According to an Illinois representative of the American Civil Liberties Union, "The play went on as scheduled, but the attendance was extremely small due to the boycott."

In January 1952, Hartnett ran an advertisement in the Brooklyn *Tablet* with the headline, "*Red Channels* Was a Piker." The book for which he wrote the introduction "only scratched the surface of Communist influence in Radio and TV.

"Now hear the full, documented exposé of Communists and Communist fronters in TV, Radio, the Stage, and your daily Newspaper! A must for every Holy Name Society, K. of C. Council, C. W. V. Post."

What's more, the copy went on, Hartnett is "the nation's top authority on Communism and Communications." Then the advertisement urged readers to "wire, phone or write now to insure early booking." In the New York area, the former naval intelligence officer has said, his fee is "usually around fifty dollars a lecture." Out of town, his rates go up.

In the same issue of the *Tablet*, the official paper of the Catholic diocese of Brooklyn, Hartnett also complained in a letter to the editor that "calendars feature pictures of scantily clad women" on the tobacco and candy counter of his neighborhood drugstore. He had, he wrote, taken his business elsewhere.

More important, however, Hartnett has recently published and circulated his own *Confidential Notebook (File #13)*; the loose-leaf book, bound in black, is mimeographed and sells for five dollars a copy. Each is numbered in ink, but the author-publisher refuses to say how many copies are in circulation.

The technique used in assembling the material is approximately the same as that used in *Red Channels*, and most of the more than a hundred names in Hartnett's book also appear in the earlier

publication, sometimes with more organizations to which those involved allegedly belonged. In addition, however, there are the names of several playwrights, musicians, book and magazine publishers and editors, newspaper columnists, and well-known lawyers not included in *Red Channels*.

In some cases, again as in *Red Channels*, Hartnett uses the *Daily Worker*, a letterhead, or a report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as the source for his allegations. In others, he credits only "a private source."

As usual, no one either on the networks or with a single exception in the advertising agencies would discuss the *Confidential Notebook (File #13)*. No one would say if or how it is used. No one would discuss its accuracy or authority. No one would admit having seen it.

However, one executive, part of whose job is to approve or disapprove on a political basis performers for his agency's programs, did say, "It hasn't replaced *Red Channels* yet, and I doubt if it will. It's just too irresponsible." For instance, he pointed out that the names of such long-time anti-Communists as Oscar Hammerstein and John Crosby are listed in the Hartnett book.

"Why," said the executive, "we've used Hammerstein in one of our shows."

Nevertheless, he keeps a copy of Hartnett's book in his desk, in the same drawer as *Red Channels*.

Hartnett, whose business office and files are in his East Twentieth Street apartment in New York City, will, he says, "make my files available to a few qualified persons. By qualified I mean not everybody would understand them and be able to weigh the information properly."

However, such a service is not given gratuitously—even to those so qualified. "The price," the onetime intelligence officer went on, "varies, but you might say it's frequently in the neighborhood of five hundred dollars."

Hartnett is at this writing at work on still another publication which he has described to possible subscribers as "an encyclopedia of Communism and Communists in the United States." The new book will, he is quoted as saying, "contain several thousand

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

names, some of which will be a complete surprise to everybody, and there will be a lot of textual material, too." He has said that owning the book "is essential to anyone in a position of authority who is a true anti-Communist."

The publisher-author, who has written several magazine articles and short stories under one pseudonym or another, told this investigator that the encyclopedia "isn't quite finished, but it will be on the presses soon." He would not say how much he expected to receive for a copy of the book, but he did add that it would be available only in a limited edition.

However, in a talk to the advertising agency official quoted above he did mention a price for the book.

He said it would sell for five hundred dollars a copy.

In the introduction to *Red Channels*, Hartnett declares, "A few documentary programs produced by one network in particular have faithfully followed the Party line. Several commercially sponsored dramatic series are used as sounding boards, particularly with reference to current issues in which the Party is critically interested: 'academic freedom,' 'civil rights,' 'peace,' 'the H-Bomb, etc.' These and other subjects, perfectly legitimate in themselves, are cleverly exploited in dramatic treatments which point up current Communist goals." At no point in the introduction does Hartnett give specific examples of such programs, and several months later in his interview with *Sponsor* magazine, one of Hartnett's publishers, Mr. Keenan, appeared to disagree. When asked, "Can you name one instance when a piece of subversive literature was ever heard over the air?" the former FBI man, after a pause, replied, "No."

As for the way in which Communists work, Mr. Hartnett wrote that "... No cause which seems calculated to arouse support among people in show business is ignored: the overthrow of the Franco dictatorship, the fight against anti-Semitism and Jimcrow [Hartnett's spelling], the outlawing of the H-Bomb, all are used. Around such pretended objectives, the hard core of Party organizers gather a swarm of 'reliables' and well-intentioned 'liberals' to exploit their names and their energies."

What's more, Hartnett writes, "Our so-called 'intellectual' classes—members of the arts, the sciences, and the professions—have furnished the Communist Party USA with the greatest number in these classifications. The reliables, dupes or innocents who, for one reason or another, will support its fronts."

Despite Mr. Kirkpatrick's assurance that "There is nothing new in the book," with the exception of a few scattered quotations from J. Edgar Hoover, Stalin, Louis Budenz, and a few unnamed sources, almost none of Mr. Hartnett's introduction had ever been printed or published before its appearance in *Red Channels*.

Nearly all of it is original with the author.

RED CHANNELS, PART II, ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF NAMES

HARRY GOLD, AT THE TRIAL OF ABRAHAM BROTHMAN, NOVEMBER 20, 1950

"I was told by my Soviet superiors never to read *The Daily Worker* or any liberal publication, or to express any liberal thoughts, or give any thought to liberal ideas myself."

The full responsibility for selecting the 151 names listed in *Red Channels* has been accepted by Messrs. Bierly, Keenan, and Kirkpatrick. Moreover, no matter what some of their readers may have concluded, the three former FBI men insist that they did not think they were "putting out a list of honest-to-God Communists in radio and television."

According to Kirkpatrick, "... If we felt it could have been done accurately, we probably would have tried it. ... I don't think it would be possible for any private organization to do it."

QUESTION: Did you feel that you had to give consideration ... to the importance of keeping what you were doing within the bounds of what are generally considered due process of law or civil liberties?

BIERLY: I do not recall any specific deliberation on civil rights except certainly to stay within the laws of libel, No. 1, and, No. 2, to do it on a factual, unemotional, objective basis rather than editorializing, and that type of thing. ... That is my personal

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

reaction, no specific discussion of civil rights⁵ of people who might lose their positions because of something that we might say about them in a publication.

KIRKPATRICK: That is essentially my recollection, too.

QUESTION: Did you . . . [feel] that there were some people whose names are listed who might be innocents?

KIRKPATRICK: Well, innocents. You mean people who may not have completely understood that the thing was a front? . . . The thing we tried to do was look at the significance of the information more than anything else. . . .

QUESTION: How about a person who had a very long list . . . would other factors enter into leaving his . . . or her name out?

BIERLY: A fact such as personal knowledge? [Yes] . . . I would say in a limited degree in this respect. There are many people who have affiliated themselves with an organization at one time or another in their lives that were either Communist at that time or later on were Communist. . . . One such person, for instance, is Father Cronin [of the National Catholic Welfare Conference] down in Washington, and there are others. . . . Another such . . . would be Eddie Cantor. *It is in a sense like a court taking judicial notice of the fact that we don't know personally Eddie Cantor, but we know what he does stand for. We happen to know Father Cronin personally, and we know what he stands for* [emphasis mine—M. M.; neither Father Cronin nor Eddie Cantor is listed in *Red Channels*].

QUESTION: Let's take Eleanor Roosevelt. . . . As far as organizations are concerned, she has [belonged] to many at one time or another. She is also on television and every day on the radio. Why not Eleanor Roosevelt?

BIERLY: Eleanor Roosevelt and Paul Robeson, for instance, are two that might have been in *Red Channels*. Robeson is not [either]. The same rule, practically, applies to both.

Her [Mrs. Roosevelt's] activities are a matter of general knowledge. She has very vigorously condemned the Communists, but

⁵According to the October 22, 1951, issue of *Sponsor* magazine, in an interview with one of the trade publication's editors, Mr. Keenan "spoke mockingly of the civil liberties line and all that stuff."

at the same time I think it is pretty generally known that she has acted as a sponsor of many Communist organizations or causes.

Applying the same thing to Paul Robeson . . . he could be classified as just as much of a radio personality as Mrs. Roosevelt could. . . . Here is a fellow who is well known, whose actions are well known and pretty well understood, the subject of a special report and inquiry in Washington before the Un-American Activities Committee and all the press throughout the land.

Just as a jurist would, I think, take judicial notice of who Mrs. Roosevelt is, I think in a sense he would take judicial notice of who Paul Robeson is, if his name should happen to come up in a trial. We did not feel that any useful purpose would be served by including their names because of that [emphasis mine—M. M.].

QUESTION: How about the less well-known persons, the ones about whom you didn't know?

BIERLY: In some cases, as you know from *Red Channels*, we have indicated that they have done some specific anti-Communist thing.

QUESTION: Am I wrong in thinking only two, Alfred Drake and John Garfield?

BIERLY: That's right.

Among those of whom the editors did not take "judicial notice" and the listing of whose names apparently did, in the minds of the publishers of *Red Channels*, "serve some useful purpose" are writers, actors, producers, and others in radio and television publicly branded in *The Report of Communist Influence in Radio and Television* because:

They publicly backed Loyalist Spain more than ten years ago, protested anti-Semitism in Germany, contributed to Russian War Relief, opposed Jim Crow in baseball, lent their names to the campaign against Republican Congressman Frederic Coudert of Manhattan, sponsored or attended a dinner in support of Mead and Lehman in the 1946 elections, signed petitions against the Dies Committee and its successors in the investigation of un-American activities, wrote a book which was selected by or even favorably mentioned by the Book Find Club, asked that no more

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

scrap iron or oil be sent to Japan before the Second World War, wrote for, spoke, or entertained at a rally applauded by the *Daily Worker*, the *People's World* (West Coast Communist-sponsored newspaper), or the now defunct *New Masses*, or even wrote or appeared on a radio or television program which happened to be praised in a Communist publication.

One writer is listed because, in addition to writing a skit for a rally on the H-bomb, he refused to create a documentary "exposing Communism in the schools and churches." At the time, the writer reports, he had just returned from Germany, and the news of the Peekskill riots, which had occurred during his absence, shocked him. He wanted to do a documentary on Peekskill instead.

Here again Mr. Kirkpatrick is mistaken about *Red Channels*. The writer's refusal to expose "Communism in the schools and churches" had never been "printed or published before." It was made on what was presumably a private telephone conversation with the program chairman of the organization sponsoring the proposed broadcast.

WHAT ABOUT CHECKING?

None of the information in *Red Channels* was checked with the persons involved. "As a matter of fact," according to Bierly, "we have felt that in that particular respect we have been more like a magazine than a newspaper. Whereas it is a common practice in the newspaper field to get statements from both sides on any controversial matter, in magazine writing, such as in *Plain Talk*, that is not the custom nor the routine, and it hasn't been with us at *Counterattack*."

This reporter was never a contributor to *Plain Talk* but he has, for some time now, made a major part of his income by writing for magazines; he has never yet been told by a magazine editor to report only one side of any controversial matter.

However, as Kirkpatrick put it in an interview with Ted Poston, a reporter for the *New York Post*:

"We made no effort to talk to any of these people before we published the book. . . . But any of these people can feel free

to come here to me and my associates and convince us that a mistake has been made or give us reasons why they should not be listed *after* they have read *Red Channels* [emphasis Poston's]."

On the other hand, in complaining that the *New York Herald Tribune* had misquoted him in an editorial, Kirkpatrick declared, "It is deplorable that a respectable newspaper such as the *Herald Tribune* based its editorial on an inaccurate interpretation of an article without interviewing *me* on this particular subject [emphasis again Poston's]."

RED CHANNELS, PART III, ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS

LEE MORTIMER, COLUMNIST, *Sunday Mirror*, OCTOBER 15, 1950

"The beauty of these publications [reports of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, popularly known as the Tenney Committee—M. M.] is that the citations may be repeated or republished without fear of civil or criminal action, because they are the official reports of a legislative body, issued under the imprint of the State, and thus are privileged."

Of the 319 citations (labeling organizations and publications "Communist or Communist fronts") on pages 161 through 213 of *Red Channels*, 124 are originally from the reports of the California Committee on Un-American Activities. There is, of course, considerable overlapping; many of the organizations cited have been named by several investigative bodies and by successive Attorney Generals.

Curiously, however, in eight cases the newsletter published by American Business Consultants, *Counterattack*, is the only source given for listing the organization. For instance, the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy and the Committee of One Thousand are "reported as" front groups. Why? *Counterattack* said they were.⁶ Conversely, when *Counterattack* now denounces a person, often the sole reason given for the condemnation is that, as is explained in a footnote, he is "Listed in *Red Channels*." It is as if the *Daily Worker* labeled a group as "Fascist" and used as

⁶The Attorney General has listed the former group as "subversive," but this is not mentioned in *Red Channels*.

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

its only proof the fact that the organization had been called "Fascist" in, say, *Mainstream and Masses*. The practice is not common in reputable publications.

In four cases in *Red Channels* no reason at all is given for listing the groups involved.

The complete breakdown of sources is as follows:

In addition to the California Committee's citations, the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, 66; former Attorney General Clark's list of "subversive organizations," 36; the Massachusetts Committee on Un-American Activities, 21; former Attorney General Biddle's report on "subversive groups" as printed in the Congressional Record (1942), 18; the Thomas Committee (one of the successors to the Dies group), 13; the Pennsylvania Commonwealth Counsel report before the reviewing board of the Philadelphia County Board of Assistance, 9; a special subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, 9; the New York City Council Committee investigating the Municipal Civil Service Commission, 9; *Counterattack*, 8; the Rapp-Coudert Committee Report (1942), 6.

It must not be supposed, however, that the editors of *Red Channels* went in each case to the primary source for the citations involved. In the introduction to Part III the editors note that, "Unless otherwise indicated," the organizations and publications mentioned "are listed in 'Citations by Official Government Agencies of Organizations and Publications Found to be Communist or Communist Fronts' prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, U. S. House of Representatives, December 18, 1948."

Moreover, with the exception of the eight citations from *Counterattack* itself, all of the material printed on pages 161 through 213 of the report also appears in the Fifth Report of the Un-American Activities Committee in California—1949; in the 124 citations mentioned above, the California group has simply quoted its own earlier reports.

In other words, fifty-two pages of *Red Channels*, almost a fourth of the whole, comes from a report issued in 1949 by the California Committee. In several instances, errors in punctuation

and spelling in the California report are repeated in *Red Channels*. And those four organizations listed in *Red Channels* without documentation to show why they are considered "un-American" are listed only by name in the California report, too. In a few cases *Red Channels* has dropped a sentence or two from the California Committee's documentation, but that may have been for reasons of space.

WHAT ABOUT THE TENNEY COMMITTEE?

Since the editors of *Red Channels* have relied so extensively on the reports of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, it seems appropriate to examine the reputation of that group, which is not well known outside the state in which it has operated.

A few of the published comments on its activities follow:

SAN FRANCISCO *Chronicle*, A REPUBLICAN NEWSPAPER

A Communist is any
Who disagrees with Tenney.

After Tenney's resignation from the committee chairmanship the *Chronicle* commented:

"Anyone who was in favor of overthrowing Tenney, as distinguished from overthrowing the government, was likely to be hauled up and smeared by inquisition and innuendo. His methods have done more damage to the cause of intelligently combating Communism than almost any other influence in California."

LOS ANGELES *Daily News*

"... This newspaper's objections to Jack B. Tenney's 'Operation Un-American' is that it knits together signs, symbols and good progressive citizens to form a wholly erroneous public conception—a conception that every organization working for reform or change or betterment is honeycombed with disciples of Karl Marx.

"The effect of producing such an image in the public mind is two fold: (1) It brings disrepute to the forces of progressivism and (2) It frightens many progressive citizens who are not Communists but who don't like to be branded and ostracized and

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

thereby discourages them from joining organizations working for the public good."

Of the 1948 Tenney Committee report, the *Daily News* added:

"... While naming a number of Communists in various parts of the state—characters who are obviously up to no good—State Senator Jack B. Tenney seems to have taken pains to bracket with these known Reds a great number of well-meaning, well-intentioned and certainly non-Communist citizens."

Of the 1949 Tenney Committee report (so heavily relied on by *Red Channels*), John A. Despol, secretary-treasurer of the California-National CIO-PAC, said in a telegram to the then committee chairman:

"As one who has fought the reactionary Communist Party for the last sixteen years, I resent your attempts to publicly link such eminent patriotic citizens as Frank Sinatra, Congressman Helen Gahagan Douglas and others who have fought to correct conditions that Communists feed upon with those persons such as Philip Connelly and his wife, Dorothy Hanley, an admitted Communist Party official, who actually move in the Communist orbit. . . . When you stop mixing anti-Communist liberals with fellow travelers and secret members of the Communist Party we shall be able to successfully expose and isolate the Communist Party from the American political scene. . . ."

Even *Counterattack* has, on at least one occasion, criticized the Tenney Committee. In the issue of March 5, 1948, the newsletter declared:

"DO YOU WANT TO HELP THE COMMUNISTS? There's one sure way of doing so. It is to call people Communists who aren't. If you're a member of an investigating committee, this is a perfect recipe for DISCREDITING your work and making enemies for it instead of friends [emphasis that of *Counterattack*]."

"Calif Un-American Activities Committee has done a lot of good, especially in its Hollywood investigation. But lately it got off the beam when it gave the impression that the National Farm Labor Union is Communist-controlled. This is a small A.F.L.

union that has been conducting a long strike at the big DiGeorgio farm, near Bakersfield. . . . This union is strongly ANTI-Communist. It bars Communists, Fascists and Kluxers from membership. It not only says this but DOES it.

"Another organization that has been MISLABELED is National Sharecroppers Fund. . . . Its sec-treas. and main officer, Alfred Baker Lewis, is one of the most tireless anti-Communists in the country. *Tenney plays into Communists' hands when he makes wrong charges* [emphasis here is mine—M. M.]."

In one of the interviews with the American Civil Liberties Union, Kirkpatrick was asked: "Do you consider the Tenney Committee an accurate source generally?"

"Our answer to that," Kirkpatrick replied, "would have to be certainly not one hundred per cent accurate because in *Counterattack* we criticized the Tenney Committee on at least one or two instances for citing an organization as a front which we knew was not. I personally have spoken to Tenney himself about fighting the ACLU as a front. *But, needless to say, we would not have used the Tenney Committee as a source or as a citation if we ourselves felt that in those particular instances Tenney was in error.*"

Jack Tenney, the long-time head of the California Committee, was first elected to the state legislature in 1936 on the Democratic ticket.⁷

At the time, Tenney, a former professional piano player and song writer ("Mexicali Rose" was his most popular composition), accepted left-wing support and was openly critical of "so-called investigations into un-American Activities." In August 1938, at a meeting of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, he opened his speech by saying, "Fellow subversive elements, I have just heard that Mickey Mouse is conspiring with Shirley Temple to overthrow the government and that there is a witness who has seen the 'red' card of Donald Duck. . . . When the Dies Committee

⁷Most of the information in this section comes from a book, *The Tenney Committee, Legislative Investigation of Subversive Activities in California*, by Edward L. Barrett, Jr., published by the Cornell University Press.

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

stoops to calling President Roosevelt a Communist and says that Mrs. Roosevelt is a front for subversive elements, then I think the rest of us should be flattered to be put in that category." However, Tenney's point of view soon changed (some say because of a dispute with left-wingers in his local of the American Federation of Musicians). In early 1941 when the Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities in California (once known as the "Little Dies Committee") was set up, Tenney gladly became its first chairman.

The committee was continued every two years until 1947. That year there was considerable opposition in the lower house, partly because of a report in which the committee had accused two assemblymen of links with Communist fronts. Thus, in 1947 Tenney introduced a resolution to continue the committee only in the upper house, which was done. However, the opposition to the group and its methods increased both in the legislature and in the press throughout the state. The Fresno Bee, which at one time had supported the committee, said, "It has shouted wolf so often and so long when no wolves could be seen that people have lost confidence in its warning cries."

In 1949, Tenney and two other members of the committee were allowed to resign. According to the New York Times, Tenney then said that the Communist Party had used him as "a target to obscure factual and shocking findings."

"The new committee under new leadership" would, he predicted, "confuse them [the Communists]. They will have to re-aim their smear artillery." In 1949, Tenney also had been a candidate for mayor of the city of Los Angeles; he finished fourth in a field of nine candidates, despite the vehement support of, among others, Ed Gibbons, editor of Alert, a West Coast anti-Communist newsletter strikingly similar to Counterattack. Gibbons, who often quotes his sister newsletter, in one issue of Alert declared that only those who accepted and supported the (Tenney) Committee's methods of fighting Communism were themselves "free from the Communist taint." (N.B. Gibbons is authoritatively reported to have written part of the 1948 committee report and all of the one issued in 1949; both jobs are said to have been

done for substantial fees. However, this allegation could not be verified.)

As for the techniques used by the committee during Tenney's chairmanship, Mr. Barrett has this to say in his book: "'Friendly' witnesses were led by committee counsel through their stories. Individuals named by such witnesses or their counsel were not permitted to cross-examine the witnesses or otherwise test their credibility and the sources of their information. The committee itself did not supply a substitute for cross-examination by close questioning of the 'friendly' witnesses. Instead of being asked embarrassing questions such witnesses were treated as great patriots and friends of their country and encouraged to 'tell all.' Testimony presented under such circumstances, as every lawyer knows, provides a highly unreliable basis for any rational finding of facts."

In all, the committee published five formal reports totaling 2241 pages. The sources of its information included data from its own investigators, information from the House Un-American Activities Committee and other state and federal investigative groups, its own files, and letterheads, circulars, pamphlets, and left-wing publications such as the Daily Worker, New Masses, and the West Coast Party-line newspaper, People's Daily World.

According to Mr. Barrett, "Private anti-Communist publications, such as Alert and Counterattack have made extensive use of the material in the reports as have veterans and other patriotic and service organizations. All such private organizations have quoted from the reports in the belief, not yet finally tested, that the legislative immunity from liability extends to those who quote the legislative documents."

THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JUSTICE ROBERT H. JACKSON, AS QUOTED IN *The Loyalty of Free Men*,
BY ALAN BARTH

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

As their second most important source of information on organizations and publications that are "Communist or Communist fronts," the editors of *Red Channels* have relied on the reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

By now, almost every literate American is surely familiar with the techniques used by that committee; before the present group, which, by comparison, has been strikingly unhysterical, the committee was never notably judicious in its methods.

There are those who consider the methods justifiable, and even many who formerly were inclined to be critical of the committee now believe that its exposure of certain subversive activities, particularly in the now famous case involving Whittaker Chambers and Alger Hiss, more than make up for occasional excesses.

Others, particularly those concerned with civil liberties, feel that the House Committee has done considerably more harm than good, that its sixty-odd reports and its files (used both by government and by private employers), containing more than a million names of Americans, constitute a serious threat to this country's democracy despite the considerably more judicious methods used by the current committee.

In his book *The Loyalty of Free Men*, Alan Barth, an editorial writer for the *Washington Post*, has this to say:

"The members of this body [the committee], like the men who conducted the medieval inquisition, were chosen as judges to determine the existence of heresy and to extirpate it. They identified loyalty with orthodoxy and perfected techniques for the extra-legal punishment of all who questioned their dogma.

"No committee in the history of the United States Congress has ever been accorded so vague an assignment and so elastic a definition of its domain. Nothing is foreign to it, nothing is deemed beyond its competence. . . .

"A great deal has been said and written about the manner in which the committee . . . conducts its business. Numerous attempts have been made to correct its commonly acknowledged excesses by reforming its procedures. But the real defect lies deeper than this. It is an incurable debt. It is rooted in the purpose

for which the committee was created and in the concept that Congress may properly punish, by publicity, activities which it cannot constitutionally declare criminal."

The officers of American Business Consultants do not agree. "We," Kirkpatrick says, "have always been friendly with the House Committee on Un-American Activities." What's more, both in *Counterattack* and in *Red Channels* the three former FBI agents have used the House group's reports without question.

THE DAILY WORKER

ROBERT LAUTER, RADIO COLUMNIST, *Daily Worker*

"Now here is a sentence I'm inserting in *The Daily Worker*. The editors of *Counterattack* have done inestimable service to the Communist Party and to the cause of Socialism.

"This is, of course rot—but just suppose some unprincipled publishing rival were to extract this sentence from this column and send it to all the NAM subscribers to *Counterattack*."

AT THE RADIO EXECUTIVES CLUB, OCTOBER 19, 1950

QUESTION: Doesn't the *Daily Worker* sometimes use people's names without their permission?

KIRKPATRICK: I have never known this to happen.

JACK TURCOTT OF THE NEW YORK *Daily News*

QUESTION: Mr. Kirkpatrick, I have tried to subscribe to *Counterattack*. I file all its issues. I read it very carefully, and for more than three years I have been reading in *Counterattack* that Communists cannot be trusted, that they are devious, that they are full of intrigue and so forth. And yet you can sit there and tell us that you take things out of the *Daily Worker* and do not check them and print them?

ON THE RADIO PROGRAM, REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, SEPTEMBER 14, 1950

KIRKPATRICK: When names are printed in the *Daily Worker*, it's presumed that those names are checked before they're printed; otherwise, that person has recourse to the *Daily Worker* [emphasis mine—M. M.].

THE BIRTH OF A "BIBLE"

Ireene Wicker, quoting Kirkpatrick: "He said to me, 'The *Daily Worker* is very accurate. They never make a mistake.'"

Red Channels, PAGE 209

"*Daily Worker* 1. The chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party . . . founded in response to direct instructions from the Communist International in Moscow. . . . The first issue of The *Daily Worker* appeared on January 13, 1924. . . . No other paper or publication of any kind in all American history has ever been loaded with such a volume of subversive, seditious, and treasonable utterances as has this organ of the American Communists.

"(Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report, March 29, 1944; pp. 59 and 60; also cited in Reports, January 3, 1939, p. 30; January 3, 1940, p. 7; January 8, 1941, p. 14; and June 25, 1942, p. 4.)"

In more than fifty instances in *Red Channels*, the *Daily Worker* is used as a source when a listee is "reported as" having attended a rally, signed a petition, supported a candidate for office, written a book which the Party apparently thought (or was ordered to think) commendable, or having made or produced a broadcast or television program praised in the Communist Party daily.

Although this investigator checked only about half of the citations, he is inclined to think that, in most cases, the person involved was indeed mentioned in the *Worker*.

As for a program or a piece of writing praised by the Party newspaper, there is nothing a writer or performer can do about that—disastrous as such praise may prove to be.

However, five *Red Channels* listees did say that they had not attended the particular meeting mentioned in the *Worker* in two cases, had not signed the petition cited, had not sponsored the cause listed. In each case the reporter checked the issue of the *Daily Worker* mentioned in *Red Channels*. In each the person was named "as reported." None of the five listees would protest the error made, deliberately or otherwise, by the *Worker* either to the Communist publication or, despite his standing and urgent invitation, to Mr. Kirkpatrick. One of the five said, half seriously,

"That would just give some more promotion to the *Worker* and American Business Consultants." Another will probably bring a libel suit against the latter.

Thus, in these five cases at least, the *Worker* was not, as Kirkpatrick insists it invariably is, "meticulously accurate when it records names of people belonging to its 'front' groups." (*Sponsor*, October 22, 1951.)

As for forcing a retraction from the *Worker*, that is difficult if not impossible. One listee tried it; after five telephone calls over a six-week period, the error remained uncorrected. It was only when the performer's attorney threatened legal action that the Communist daily printed a one-line correction.

Besides, many persons named in the Party newspaper at one time or another are not necessarily among its regular readers. Thus they often don't even know they have been so named. Ireene Wicker, for example, has said that she was not aware that her name had been listed in the *Worker* as being a sponsor of the Committee for the Re-election of Benjamin J. Davis until the appearance of her name in *Red Channels*; when her attorney failed to uncover her name on the lengthy list of some 30,000 nominating Mr Davis for office, he forced a retraction from the *Daily Worker*. Miss Wicker's name will not be included in any future editions of *Red Channels*, if any. But, so far as "The Singing Lady's" career is concerned, that may not matter. Despite her official "clearance" in *Counterattack*, Miss Wicker, a veteran of more than twenty-five years, is no longer seen on television or heard on the air.

In the case that follows, not involving a *Red Channels* listee, the entertainer involved discovered that his name had been used in the Communist newspaper through an in-law, one of the editors of the anti-Communist weekly, the *New Leader*, in the offices of which the *Worker* is regularly read—and as often attacked.

The entertainer is the jazz orchestra leader and composer, Duke Ellington.

In its issue of May 27, 1950, the *Daily Worker* reported that