

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain excerpts in connection with the statement I make today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the report made by the committee investigating un-American activities, which was filed with the Seventy-seventh Congress, Union Calendar No. 1, Report No. 1. I do not know how many Members of this House have read this report, and I doubt if many of us know just what is in the report.

The committee saw fit to let the cat leap out of the bag and in the language of the committee, which I quote from page 24:

The committee is very much interested and concerned in this proposition. The com-

mittee believes that it should have at least 2 years in order to formulate and put into effect a long-range program.

Since when is a committee investigating any kind of a proposition authorized by Congress to formulate long-range policies by sleuthing and talking, without presenting a single bill to eradicate the existence of the very evils which they have charged for the last 2½ years?

The committee saw fit to present in its report nine recommendations, and if the committee had taken the trouble to examine the statutes they would have found that at least three or four of them are already on the books today. They are already in the law. So from the very existence of the committee and its report, it appears that they paid no attention to what the law is today, because they have recommended something which is in the law now.

The recommendations of the Dies committee start with a contradiction. Just prior to the statement as to what legislative recommendations are offered to Congress, and I read from the report now, which says—

the committee has shown that there is a way to combat the "fifth column" without creating a Gestapo. It is the way of exposure, a way which conforms to the letter and to the spirit of a democracy, and is at the same time more effective than a Gestapo.

If that is the case and all that is necessary is to expose conditions by implication, why should the committee make such legislative recommendations on page 23 of the report, and two more recommendations on page 24 of the report? If the committee has done its duty by exposing conditions as it says it has done, then, of course, all is well, and we can go on our way rejoicing that nothing further is necessary, and that we have now reached perfection and are approaching a millenium. This, of course, is so obviously ridiculous that nothing further need be said about it.

Now let us go through the legislative recommendations and pass upon them one by one:

1. The enactment of legislation to bring about the immediate mandatory deportation of alien spies and saboteurs.

The laws upon the books today do not prevent the Government from deporting alien spies and saboteurs. Quite the contrary, if such person is subject to deportation immediately after being convicted of the offense in question, and, of course, no one can be deported without a hearing, so that the laws today are wholly adequate to meet this situation.

2. The mandatory deportation of aliens who advocate any basic change in the form of our government.

Aliens who advocate any basic change in our Government are few and far between. As a matter of fact, aliens who are a subject of this inquiry like to cloak themselves into love of Americanism and pretend that they love this country and its institutions. If an alien goes to the trouble of advocating changes in our form of government, he surely will not ever become a citizen and will be deported very promptly.

3. The enactment of legislation requiring that all employees and officials of our Federal Government be American citizens.

All officials of our Government are required to be citizens. Sometime ago we passed a statute requiring all employees of our Government likewise to be citizens. This recommendation is therefore a little bit too late.

4. Withhold all Federal financial support from any educational institution which permits members of its faculty to advocate communism, fascism, or nazi-ism as a substitute for our form of government to the student body of these educational institutions. (This particular recommendation is not concurred in by Mr. VOORHIS, not because of disagreement with the principle involved but on the ground that the administration of such an act is impossible without risking grave injustice being done to people seeking merely to explain the principles involved in totalitarian philosophy.)

I fully agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. We should have learned a lesson by the law we enacted—and had to repeal later—along the same lines in the District of Columbia.

5. The enactment of legislation to outlaw every political organization which is shown to be under the control of a foreign government. As long as these organizations have a legal status in the United States, it will be difficult for any agency of the Government to deal with them. We now know that they furnish the legal apparatus for the operations of saboteurs, and the window dressing for espionage. The committee believes that legislation can be worked out to outlaw such organizations, and that this will in no sense constitute a violation of the Bill of Rights, since such legislation would only affect organizations controlled or directed by foreign countries.

The outlawing of a political organization is a very difficult thing. As a matter of fact, the committee itself makes no special recommendations as to how it should be done. It says "that legislation can be worked out to outlaw such organizations." We have already passed laws forbidding employment by the United States Government of any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi. That is as far as we can possibly go. What other form of action this recommendation should take and how other legislation could be constitutionally enacted without violating our Bill of Rights apparently has not been answered, either by the Dies committee or by anyone else. This recommendation is therefore merely a pious wish and it has no stamina of any kind, nor any intelligent basis upon which it could be promoted.

6. The enactment of legislation to stop all immigration from foreign countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals found under American law to be deportable from this country. This legislation is made necessary by the fact that some foreign governments have refused to accept their own citizens who have been ordered deported by the United States Government.

This is a particularly vicious statement of recommendations where, instead of tackling the question of un-American propaganda, the Dies committee takes it upon itself to write legislation dealing with immigration. It seeks to prevent the entry into this country of any person

who could not be deported back to his country of origin. Evidently, if this is the case, then every person who escapes the tyranny of a Hitler, or a Mussolini, or a Stalin will never be able to enter the United States because, under the laws of Germany, Italy, and Russia, no person who has left those countries could ever be deported back to them. In this way we will make every person who lives under an oppressive regime ineligible for entry to the United States. It would be the kind of a law which, if it existed at the time of the French Revolution, would have prevented a man like Albert Gallatin from entering the United States, and, if it existed in 1848, would have prevented Carl Schurz from entering the United States. In fact, our best type of immigration usually came from countries which imposed political restrictions on its citizens and which compelled them to escape the tyranny of their masters. We used to pride ourselves on being the asylum of all the oppressed populations, but instead of becoming the haven of refuge for people who suffer under the yoke of tyrants we will rewrite our immigration laws to bar them automatically from entering the United States. This cannot be done, and I am sure Congress will never authorize this type of legislation.

7. As previously stated in the body of the report, the committee recommends the passage of added legislation to place restrictions on the distribution of totalitarian propaganda, when that distribution involves any cost to the American taxpayers, and when such propaganda emanates and is shipped from foreign sources.

I am in favor of placing restrictions on distribution of totalitarian propaganda, and I have previously introduced a resolution barring from the mails or canceling any contract we may have with foreign countries relating to the distribution of propaganda from abroad at a heavy cost to the American taxpayer. This recommendation therefore is very much in line with recommendations heretofore made by me, and I heartily approve of it, although, of course, I cannot credit the Dies committee with having originated this idea.

8. We recommend that the statutory period during which citizenship papers can be revoked under existing law be extended to at least 10 years.

In this case the Dies committee seeks to impose restrictions although they say that they want to extend the period on which citizenship papers can be revoked. Quite the contrary, the existing law, section 405 of the United States Code, does not place any restrictions on the proceedings for cancellation of improperly acquired citizenship and a limitation of 10 years would not be in the public interest.

9. Due to the fact that the committee has discovered that many members of foreign-controlled organizations have traveled on American passports which have been fraudulently obtained, the committee feels that the statute of limitations should be extended from 3 to 7 years. This is made necessary because of the unusual difficulty in apprehending those who resort to the use of

fraudulent passports within the period of 3 years.

The extension of the limitation statute of some passports from 3 to 7 years is entirely futile. If a passport has been improperly used or obtained it should be the duty of the Government to prosecute the offense promptly. Nothing can be gained by the prosecution of an offense committed many years ago which is no longer of any actual benefit to the public. The tendency in recent years has not been to extend the limitation statute but to limit them. After all, prompt punishment is the important thing, and not future punishment many years after the offense was committed. A 7-year limitation unfortunately would be an anomaly in this Government where the most important offenses are subject only to a 3-year limitation statute.

Now as to the recommendations. The committee recommends that it be continued for 2 years along. If the committee is to have such a long existence why not convert it into a standing committee of the House. After all, if the committee is right in claiming that all it wishes to do is to expose conditions why not maintain a committee which will always be available to expose conditions of the type which the Dies committee claims to be necessary. A standing committee of the House would have the advantage of a permanent organization and a permanent staff. It will not be necessary for it to seek continuous publicity, but on the contrary it could do its work very efficiently with a minimum of public disturbances. If the committee is right in its assertion that it needs more time, let us give it all the time it wants. But not by the appropriation of a large sum of money and 2 years of life, but by becoming a standing committee of the House to do its work day by day in a proper manner, such as other committees of the House have been functioning for 150 years. This will effectively dispose of any such recommendation.

There is also another recommendation to the effect that employment in the national-defense industries should be denied to any person to be found under the control and guidance of a foreign government. Wherein this differs from the other recommendation which appears under the heading of "legislation" it is hard to see, but I believe that this has been effectively disposed of by previous remarks.

The purpose of the Committee on Un-American Activities is to investigate every known subversive activity. It is very strange that Merwin K. Hart, president of the New York State Economic Council, soon became a close friend of MARTIN DIES. It was this Merwin K. Hart, a Franco Spanish supporter, a friend of Allan Zoll and one J. E. Kelly, another well-known figure supporting Franco Spain, who sponsored Mr. DIES at a meeting in Madison Square Garden. It was also strange that the American Patriots, another well-known subversive group, headed by Allan Zoll, who had made trips to Germany and is now carrying on his un-American activities, also sponsored a meeting at the Biltmore Hotel where Fritz Kuhn was present.

In 1940 Mr. DIES' attention was called to the vicious street activities of the Christian Front and the Christian Mobilizers. He promised action, but his committee then did not furnish it. Later when Joseph McWilliams, the American Destiny Party, carried on its pernicious movement, once again Dies' committee failed to go into action. It was only when private organizations started pressing this committee to do something about Nazi activities that Mr. DIES sent some investigators into New York to take care of only a few of the many subversive groups operating here. These are but a small number of the things this committee has failed to act upon. There is no reason why the entire subversive element should not be cleaned up in 12 months, much less waiting for 2 years and a total appropriation of over \$235,000.

In addition to the regular appropriation, the Government printing bill will be several hundred thousand dollars more. In addition to that, there is the cost of stenographers for hearings held in the District of Columbia, which does not come out of the \$235,000. Yet, lo and behold, the committee, in this report, wants to formulate a long-range program, for what, my colleagues? What are they going to do with this long-range program? What is the plan? If conditions in connection with this so-called un-American activity, as indicated from press releases—not from the evidence collected by the Dies committee—are so terribly bad, why not let us create a standing committee of the House, which will be in a better position to watch out and guard against "fifth columnist" and un-American activities, and give every man or woman who is charged as a "fifth columnist" an opportunity to be heard before a proper congressional committee? I will support that kind of a committee. Then that committee will be an arm of the Department of Justice, to help the Department of Justice, in order to find out who in this country is advocating the overthrow of government, or who are "fifth columnists."

I have taken the trouble to analyze the so-called Dies nine-point program, but the funny thing about this report is that it has been filed in January and not one single bill was presented to any committee to carry out the so-called program which the Dies committee claims is so necessary in this country. They simply use the Dies committee as a means of investigating something which they have no power over. In the No. 6 report they deal exclusively with the quota phase of immigration. That has nothing to do with un-American activities at all. It has no bearing on un-American activities; it has no bearing on "fifth column" activities, but the Dies committee wants to do something indirectly that it cannot do directly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you want to abolish the Dies committee, then, and substitute a standing committee of the House?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I say that they have had enough ballyhoo for two and a half

years. Let us give a standing committee the right and power to look after these so-called un-American activities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You would let the Dies committee expire right now, then?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, certainly. I understand the chairman of that committee wants a million dollars. I say give that to the Department of Justice. They can do a much better job.

Now, what is it that this committee recommends? Let me refer to one of its recommendations. Suppose a young man came here from England about 20 years ago and he committed a felony. He committed another felony within the last 20 or 30 years. The British Government does not want to give him a passport to return, because when he became a criminal it was in this country and not in England. The same thing applies to every other national of the world. Now, the Dies committee says in its report—and I am surprised that some of the members signed it—I quote:

The enactment of legislation to stop all immigration from foreign countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals found under American law to be deportable from this country.

In other words, we have people from all lands subject to deportation. Their countries will not take them back because they have committed crimes in this country. Under this recommendation any solution of the immigration problem is completely stopped and you could not bring anybody into this country because England, France, Germany, or some other country refuses to issue a passport to the deportable person that we have; and we have many.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, no country has refused except Russia. Is not that true?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; it is not.

Mr. MICHENER. Name the others.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Italy, Russia, Hungary, Germany, and other countries have refused to take their nationals back if they have been away from their native land more than 10 years. But the people about whom I am talking came here in their infancy, and by some misfortune have made themselves subject to deportation. Their country of origin refuses to let them back. Under this provision the whole quota of that country is automatically suspended. Now, I ask the gentleman as a good lawyer what has such a recommendation to do with the Committee on Un-American Activities, through which we are seeking to find those who are trying to undermine our Government or destroy it?

Mr. MICHENER. In answer, I assume that that committee had in mind Russia. I recall very well in Harry Bridges' case when hearings were on before the Judiciary Committee it was stated at that time by immigration officers that Russia was the one country refusing to take back the people whom we attempted to deport. In other words, if Russia sent her Communists here they would serve Russia's purpose, but if we

tried to send them back Russia would not take them back.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want the gentleman to know that by my testimony here I am not seeking to give a medal to the Communists, the Fascists, or the Nazis. Harry Bridges, by the way, is not a Russian, and could not be deported to Russia. He is a citizen of Australia. I am trying to call to the attention of Congress the fact that if it is so dangerous as we read in the newspapers—not in the reports of the committee—then why not let us call a spade a spade? If the Communist Party has no business here let us outlaw it. If the Nazis have no business here, let us do the same thing with them. Why not have some laws in place of talk, talk, and more talk by a one-man committee?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do I understand the gentleman correctly to say that he would abolish the Dies committee and turn the \$1,000,000 over to the Department of Justice for the investigation of un-American activities?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman heard me say that. I would take that million and a couple of more millions and turn them over to the Department of Justice.

Mr. HINSHAW. All right. Now I want to ask the gentleman if he was not one of those who last year so heartily condemned the Christian Front, of which the Department of Justice arrested 17 members who were held in jail for months and ultimately acquitted of any un-American activity?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not quite follow the gentleman's question.

Mr. HINSHAW. Was not the gentleman from New York one of those who condemned the Christian Front on the floor of the House?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have condemned all of them. I have condemned the Christian Front, the Christian Mobilizers, the Nazis, the Fascists, the Communists, and every one of them.

Mr. HINSHAW. Seventeen members of that organization were arrested but later acquitted.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But the Dies committee never attempted to investigate the Christian Front.

Mr. HINSHAW. The court acquitted them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But that was under peculiar circumstances.

Mr. HINSHAW. What were the circumstances behind that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I wanted the committee to investigate the Christian Front. They were just as un-American as the others.

Mr. HINSHAW. Were they not acquitted by the court?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But the Dies committee would not investigate them. I called the committee's attention to the Christian Front, the Christian Mobilizers, the White Shirts, the Black Shirts, the Dirty Shirts, and so forth. They accused a few Communists and issued 10,000 press releases without a single

piece of evidence to substantiate any of them.

Mr. HINSHAW. Has the gentleman submitted any evidence to substantiate his denunciation of them?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Dies does not want my evidence; it might be too good.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not mean Dies. I mean to the Attorney General.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have submitted plenty of it. I see the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], a member of the committee, on his feet. Does the gentleman wish to ask me a question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There are a good many things about this matter that I think require discussion, more than present time permits. I feel, however, that the gentleman's last statement is too broad; that there was the most important evidence regarding the military character of the German-American funds, for example, submitted by the committee. There has been a good deal of substantial evidence about some of these organizations that has been presented. I do not want to enter into any further controversy with the gentleman except just to say that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to say, just to my good friend and colleague from California, that you fellows have squandered more money, you employ the highest-paid investigators I ever heard of, and I would not employ some of them as office boys anywhere, giving them \$400 and \$450 a month.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not that I know of.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, go down and look at the records. It will startle the gentleman to see some of the figures showing how the gentleman's committee disposed of the \$235,000. Let me relate just one of the instances. The gentleman's committee had a witness in California, I believe. Apparently because you could not make a good press showing there so you did not use him as originally intended. You brought him into Washington—not the gentleman, but I mean some of the investigators—and you were going to expose to the country the greatest spy system in the West. Then you found out that the "exposé" would not work in Washington because I knew too much about this witness. I charged on the floor of this House that he was nothing but a phoney. Then you took him to Chicago. You dragged him from California to Washington, and then you gave him another subpoena from here to Chicago, where he was taken by plane. You notified all of the press to be there and 15 members of the press, with cameras, were there. Then you set this witness up in a nice hotel—the Stevens Hotel. The witness was simply a horse trader. He was a deportable alien and he is subject to deportation. He made a deal so that he would not be deported, and he just sold you short, he sold the committee short, and you were afraid to expose that witness here because I would expose him as a fraud.

I repeat, I would expose that witness as a fraud. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] made big capital out of it and took the monkey to Chicago. They brought him into a big room, the

newspapermen were there, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] walked in. I can relate the whole thing that happened, and I think my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] was there.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Well, I was not there. I was nowhere near there.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am glad the gentleman was not, because there is something here which I have that I did not want to put into the RECORD until the gentleman asked me a question. Then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] came down and wanted to know if this particular man was the Gestapo of the Nazi government. The "important witness" was about 22 years of age; he was hungry and starving. He would have sold his mother for a dollar or a good meal. This was the great Gestapo man that the press all over the country had representing the German Government. What happened? They then turned around and finally brought this man back to Washington—and by plane, no less. It is like the story they tell of a new policeman in New York who killed a horse on Kosciusko Street and had to make out a report to the police department. He could not spell Kosciusko, so he dragged the horse around to Broadway, so he did not have to spell Kosciusko Street in his report. The committee dragged this man from California to Washington, from Washington to Chicago, and back to Washington. They were afraid to have him give evidence here because I would pin him down as a fraud. They gave him another subpoena and took him to Chicago, because they could put it over in Chicago. They could not spell Washington—so it had to be Chicago.

Out there they made a great fuss, and I would like to show you some of the press clippings. Every paper in the country called the man Dies "discovered" spy No. 1. But he had nothing to say. He was not a spy. He did not know anything. He was selling Mr. Dies and his committee down the river because he did not want to be deported. That is the kind of bunk you got.

Now, Mr. VOORHIS, go down and get your vouchers. Some of this money that we gave the Dies committee has been labeled "a secret fund." Some information you cannot get. Now, this little operation I related cost the taxpayers and the Government hundreds of dollars, this operation to take this horse from California to Washington, and then drag the horse to Chicago and back to Washington. He was just a poor, weak horse anyway. He knew nothing. He was trying to make a bargain so as not to be deported. He said to the Dies committee, "I will give you some information," and he turned over to the Dies committee a little report. May I say further that when this witness was brought into the Stevens House in Chicago they had six investigators there. They all came in to watch this man. Why, he would not have run away if you shot at him. They all went into a huddle to discuss this great spy. Then they declared an executive session because the fellow had nothing.

He handed them a manuscript that was as old as my grandfather's whiskers. And there are other similar instances. The individual members of this committee should pay attention to what is going on. Now, I have nothing personal against any Member of this House or against Mr. DIES, but I do say he could have done a better job with the amount of money he got. Mr. McCORMACK only got \$30,000 and what a job he did.

Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. VOORHIS of California rose.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I was talking about a man named Heinrich Fassbender. Do you know him, Mr. VOORHIS?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No. Why does the gentleman ask me that question?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There was a statement that the gentleman was present in this huddle conference in the Stevens House at Chicago.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It so happens that I was not anywhere near there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How did the publicity and the expense of the incident which the gentleman has so dramatically related here compare with the arrest and prosecution of these Christian Front fellows, one of whom was acquitted and the cases against the others dismissed? Has the gentleman the figures on that cost?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Trials in any court have nothing to do with this problem here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was that any bigger farce?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am not interested in that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I guess not.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, I do not want you to say that in a sarcastic way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am not. I was greatly entertained.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Every court of law has its own budget. They are working according to statute, but here is a Congress that created a committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the F. B. I. are the folks back of this.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We created a committee for what? For the purpose of making a study and investigation to determine what laws we need to remedy this situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is finding fault with the amount of money they spent and he wants to give another department millions, yet he will not tell me how the costs of the two compare.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, it is not so much the amount of money spent that I object to but the way it was spent. If it would have been spent in a constructive way, for the benefit of the country as a whole instead of a publicity campaign for the committee, no one would have any objections. Under the circumstances, I honestly believe that the Department of Justice could accomplish more if it would receive an

additional appropriation. [Here the gavel fell.]