

Q. When did you first meet him in the Communist Party?

A. As far as I recall it, it was about a little over six years ago.

Q. That would be what?

A. I would say sometime late in 1945, so far as I recall.

Q. What were the circumstances under which you met this defendant?

A. He was introduced to me as the chairman of the Nationality Commission of the Communist Party of the United States.

Q. Of the United States?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where were his offices at that time?

A. In New York City.

Q. What were you doing at that time in the Communist Party?

A. At that time I was functioning as a member of the Nationality Commission of the Communist Party of the United States.

Q. And under whose instruction and supervision did you do your work?

A. I did it under the supervision of the District organizer of the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania, and, of course, I was under the supervision of Steve Nelson for a period of that time.

Q. And what was the function of the National chairman of the Nationality Commission of the National Committee of the Communist Party, which office this defendant filled?

Mr. Nelson: Objection, your Honor.

[fol. 1437] The Court: Objection overruled, exception noted.

A. The function of the Nationality Commission of the Communist Party of the United States was to make reports to the various Nationality Commissions, to set the Party line for the Nationality groups, to discuss the Party line; its methods; how to be carried into the newspapers by the Communist Party members of this Commission; to hear reports on the changing Party lines, when they came about; to organize the Communist Party recruiting drives amongst nationality groups, and generally conduct the work, or organized work of the Communist Party members, working

in fraternal organizations, mass organizations, on language presses; in trade unions of the Nationality Communists.

Mr. Nelson: I want to move to strike that answer.

The Court: Motion refused, exception.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Now, from August, 1948 until the time you left the Communist Party, did the Communist Party have a district organizer in the Western Pennsylvania area?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And who was that?

A. Steve Nelson.

Q. And when were you first informed that this defendant [fol. 1438] was the District organizer of the Western Pennsylvania area of the Communist Party?

A. At a meeting which was held at the lecture room of the North Side Carnegie Library, in July or August of 1948. There was a meeting of leading Communist Party functionaries in this district, called by the district. Henry Winston, a member of the Board, the National Board of the Party, addressed this meeting and told us—I was present at this meeting.

Q. Was the defendant present?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell us what was told you?

A. Henry Winston told us that the National Board recognizes the importance of this District and the fight for Socialism and Communism, and we are therefore sending two of our best organizers to work in this District. He further stated that the National Board recognizes the importance of this District because of the industries that are located here.

Q. What was that? Say that again.

A. That they recognized the importance of this District because the basic industries are located here; that the United States steel corporation is located here; and for this reason they are sending one of their best organizers, Steve Nelson, to work in this District, and he further stated that we are also sending along with Steve Nelson, Andy Onda to organize the work of our comrades in the steel industry.

[fol. 1439] Mr. Nelson: May we approach the bench?

The Court: Come forward.

(At side bar)

Mr. Nelson: I move for a mistrial on the basis of the witness bringing in Andy Onda in this case. He knew better. He knows that he was convicted in the other case. He knows that there has been publicity in the newspapers, and Mr. Cercone deliberately planted this question, your Honor. I move that you order a withdrawal of a juror and declare a mistrial.

The Court: Your motion is refused and an exception is noted.

Mr. Cercone: The statement of Mr. Nelson, that I deliberately planted this question, is not true.

The Court: The motion is refused and an exception noted.

(End side bar)

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Now, at that meeting, was that announcement made as [fol. 1440] any part of any policy of the Party?

A. Yes, sir, this was an official meeting of the Communist Party District and leading Communist Party functionaries, and it was closed to anyone but members of the Communist Party.

Q. By that, now, by saying that it was closed to anybody but members of the Communist Party, what do you mean?

A. Well, in other words, you have to be a Party member, representing one of the various clubs of the district, or branch, or cells of the Party to be present.

Q. Now then, did this defendant take over his job as District organizer of the Party?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And do you recall when that was?

A. I don't recall the exact day.

Q. Approximately.

A. It was within a couple of days, because I recall within a couple of days Steve Nelson—I met with him and he walked around the corner on Diamond Street, to have a cup of coffee, and Steve said to me, "Well, Mat, I am depending on you a lot to help me because you know the

district here, and you are one of the comrades we trust, and I am going to depend on you a lot to do everything you can.”

Q. And what kind of work came directly under the supervision and instruction of the District organizer of the Communist Party, that is, when this defendant held the office? [fol. 1441] A. Well, the District organizer had the overall supervision in the District. In other words, he was boss so far as the District was concerned. He was responsible for organizing recruiting drives; for setting up educational discussions; for organizing the infiltration of the steel industries around here by Communist members.

Mr. Nelson: Objection. The interpretation and use of terms as infiltration is entirely out of order and I move that it be stricken.

The Court: Objection overruled, your motion is refused and an exception is noted.

A. He was responsible for the organizing of the sale and distribution of literature of the Communist Party press; the Sunday and Daily Worker, for a Lasting Peace and Democracy, which is the official organ of the Cominform, and also official organ of the Communist Party in this Country.

Mr. Nelson: I move that it be stricken, your Honor. It is an opinion and should be stricken.

The Court: Your objection is noted, overruled and an exception is granted.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Continue?

[fol. 1442] A. He was responsible for making reports to meetings of the District Committee of the Communist Party functionaries, and generally, was overall responsible for the work of the Communist Party for the District of Western Pennsylvania.

Q. Now, in relation to the work that had to be done by the Party in the steel mills, what structure was set up in the Party?

A. In the Party, with reference to the steel mills, the policy of the Communist Party in this district was known

“a steel concentration policy.” The group that was responsible specifically within the Communist Party, of organizing the cell in the steel industry, was known as a “steel commission.” The steel commission, after August, 1948, or when Steve Nelson and Andy Onda came here, was the responsibility of Steve Nelson, together with Andy Onda, who actually carried out the physical part of the work.

Q. And where were the concentration points in the District?

A. Well, the concentration points in this district were the plants of the United States Steel Corporation, up around Duquesne, Braddock, Homestead; the J. & L. Plant in South Side, Pittsburgh; the plant of the Crucible Steel Company; and also the steel areas of Aliquippa and Beaver Valley, and surrounding communities.

Q. Do you know if Nelson, himself, the defendant, undertook any work in this policy of the Party?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did he do?

A. He specifically took the responsibility, after this meeting, [fol. 1443] of organizer, because at that meeting he, himself, stated that he accepted the position and made a little talk; he asked for help of all the comrades—that is what we called one another in the Party—in this District, and from that day on up until I left the Party, to testify in Washington, Steve continued this responsibility, with the exception of a short period, when he went hunting, sometime in November, 1949 and broke his leg.

Q. Where did he concentrate his efforts in this work?

A. Well, Steve himself—I am talking about Steve Nelson—at a meeting, which I attended, assigned himself at one period in the work, to concentrate in the Turtle Creek Valley where the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company is located.

Q. Did he tell you why he was going to do that?

A. This was around the time when they were having an election here—I don't recall the exact day or month when they had elections here, but he, himself, at a meeting said he is assigning himself to the Westinghouse Electric section for a period of these elections.

Q. Now, you said that he supervised the distribution and

sale of literature of the Communist Party. Are you familiar with the headquarters in the Bakewell Building?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was located there?

A. Are you talking about the headquarters of the Communist Party?

Q. Yes. Where are the headquarters of the Communist Party?

[fol. 1444] A. The headquarters, while I was a member, were in the Bakewell Building, on the fourth floor. They had their office for the organizer.

Q. By the organizer, you mean Steve Nelson?

A. From August, 1948 on, it was Steve Nelson.

Q. What room did he occupy in that suite?

A. His room was the room near Diamond Street, and prior to that it was the room of the organizer who was there ahead of Steve.

Q. And did you actually see Steve Nelson in the headquarters?

A. I met with Steve Nelson in the headquarters many times.

Q. And how often would you meet with this defendant in the Communist headquarters?

A. Well, it was either at his request, or I would come in for some particular reason.

Q. What else was located there at the headquarters?

A. Then, there was an office there for the secretary, and for that period of time the secretary was Bill Albertson; that office was adjacent to Steve Nelson's. Next to that was a reception room, and that room for a period of time, a Maxin Matlis, worked as his secretary, and other Communist Party members that were assigned. Adjacent to that was the literature and press room—there was a desk there used by most of us—Andy Onda used it, and I used it. And then there was also the desk there of Jim Dolsen, who is the director of the press, and also distributed literature to the various branches.

[fol. 1445] Q. Now, how was the literature distributed?

A. Most of it was distributed either through literature directors in the various branches; through the branch organizers; and some it was sold right there on the premises.

Q. Can you just briefly state what areas the books were sent to?

A. Within my own knowledge, and the time I spent in the Party, I know that I, myself, took literature to the Lawrenceville area; I had seen literature on sale at the meetings of the District committees and Party functionaries at North Side. At the meetings—just about at every Communist meeting I ever attended in the District. I took literature to Johnstown for the Johnstown area of the Party, and other sections of Western Pennsylvania.

Q. When you say other sections of Western Pennsylvania, name some of them?

A. Washington County, Beaver County, and the area from the Ohio line to Johnstown, going east; north up to Erie, and south into West Virginia.

Q. Do you know where some of the literature came from?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where did it come from?

A. Some of it came from the National office of the Communist Party, from the Century Publishers; some came from Moscow, and from other satellite countries.

Mr. Nelson: Objection, your Honor, that is an interpretation. [fol. 1446]

The Court: All right, we will strike out satellite countries. Name the countries, be more specific.

A. It came from Moscow, Bucharest, Belgrade and other countries.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. What was the nature of the literature that came from Belgrade?

Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, if you are going to let him do that without identifying things—

Mr. Cercone: We are going to do that.

The Court: All right.

A. Well, from Belgrade we received publications from the Yugoslav official publishing house, I think it was Tunya, I am not sure. From Bucharest we received the official organ of the Cominform, that is, the Communist Information Bureau, "For Lasting Peace in Democracy,"—"For

a Peoples Peace and Peoples Democracy," it is a little lengthy, and this is the official organ of the Cominform. From Moscow we received publications, that were published by the Soviet Union, glorifying the life in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Nelson: I move to strike.

[fol. 1447] The Court: Motion refused. It is the opinion of the witness, and the interpretation placed on it.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. I show you Commonwealth's Exhibits 158 and 159, and ask you if you know what they are?

A. These are copies of "For a Lasting Peace for a Peoples Democracy," Bucharest organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Party.

The Court:

Q. Are they all in English?

A. Yes.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Now, did you read any books as part of your work as a member of the Communist Party?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What books did you read?

A. Well, I was assigned for reading the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; State and Revolution; Foundations of Leninism; Communist Manifesto; Constitution of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R.; Dictatorship of the Proletariat; and many other books.

Q. Were you asked to read these books?

A. We used some of these books in Party classes, and I [fol. 1448] was asked to read some of them.

Q. Now, you talked about Party classes. Who set up those classes between August, 1948 and the time you left the Party?

A. The classes were set up by the District Board, of which Steve Nelson was a member.

Q. And as District organizer did he have the duty of setting up the classes?

A. Bill Albertson actually had—he was the secretary,—he had what you would call the duty of carrying out the physical set up of the classes, but the actual classes were set up the District Board.

Q. Under whom?

A. Under orders of the National Committee of the Party.

Mr. Nelson: I move to strike.

The Court: Motion refused, exception noted.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. I show you Commonwealth's Exhibit No. 163, entitled "The Program of the Communist International," and ask you if that was part of the literature that was used in the classes, either as a text book, or reference material?

Mr. Nelson: Objection.

The Court: Objection overruled, exception noted.

[fol. 1449] A. This book was before my time in the Communist Party.

Q. Yes, but did you read it, did you see it?

A. I have seen the publication, but I have never recalled using it in any of the classes.

Q. I show you Commonwealth's Exhibit No. 21, entitled "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," and ask you if you know what that is?

A. Yes, this is the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which, at various times, I used in Communist Party classes, and which was assigned as "must reading material" in the Party, and also used in the Party as a guide to action for the revolution in the United States.

Mr. Nelson: I move to strike.

The Court: Motion refused, exception noted.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Did Steve Nelson use this book?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you read from the pages which Steve Nelson read in the classes?

A. I recall a meeting we had at the cultural Center, on Forbes Street, and Steve Nelson made a report to the

Communist Party members present there, and as a part of this report he read out of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and if I may, I would like to hunt the pages and read what Steve Nelson read.

[fol. 1450] Mr. Nelson: Objection, your Honor.

The Court: Objection noted, overruled and exception granted.

A. At this reading, which I recall very well, because I received a book from Steve Nelson, a collection of the best stories in the Daily and Sunday Worker for the previous 20 or 25 years, because of my good work in selling the Daily Worker, in previous Daily Worker drives, Steve Nelson read this out of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

“It was not to every kind of war that the Bolsheviks were opposed. They were only opposed to wars of conquest, imperialist wars. The Bolsheviks held that there are two kinds of war:

“(a) Just wars, wars that are not wars of conquest but wars of liberation, waged to defend the people from foreign attack and from attempts to enslave them, or to liberate the people from capitalist slavery, or lastly, to liberate colonies and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialism; and

“(b) Unjust wars, wars of conquest, waged to conquer and enslave foreign countries and foreign nations.

“Wars of the first kind the Bolsheviks supported. As to wars of the second kind, the Bolsheviks main- [fol. 1451] tained that a resolute struggle must be waged against them to the point of revolution and the overthrow of one’s own imperialist government.”

Q. Now, did Steve Nelson make an explanation of that reading?

Mr. Nelson: Objection.

The Court: Objection noted, overruled and exception granted.

A. Steve Nelson, in making his report, in referring to this country, referred to this country as being an imperialist

government, and imperialist aggressor; that this country is planning a world war three, and this was the gist of most of his talks.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. How did he refer to the United States government?

A. Well, not at that meeting, but during the course of the years I was associated with Steve Nelson, I heard him refer to the United States government as the "imperialist aggressors", as "the enemy," as "capitalist enslavers."

Q. And how many times did you hear him refer to the United States as "enemy"?

A. Oh, many times, many times.

Q. Do you recall any specific dates? Do you recall April, 1949?

A. Well, I recall when the news came out that the Soviet [fol. 1452] Union had the atomic bomb—I believe that was later—I think that was in September, sometime around there.

Mr. Nelson: Objection, your Honor.

The Court: Just a moment, come forward, gentlemen.

(At side bar)

Mr. Nelson: I make a motion for a mistrial on the ground that this witness is bringing in things about the atomic bomb. I am not charged with anything like that.

The Court: That is the reason I do not want anything brought in here.

Mr. Nelson: All right, but it has been brought out to the jury. This deprives me of a fair trial, and under the circumstances I move for a mistrial.

The Court: I will instruct the District Attorney to avoid anything implicating you, or connecting you with persons in regard to the atomic bomb. We will limit your questions, Mr. Cercone, in this respect.

Your motion is refused, and an exception noted.

[fol. 1453] (End side bar)

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Now, you were stating about something that happened in September, 1949, will you continue?

The Court: The acquisition of the atomic bomb by the Russian government was announced and you were going to say what the defendant said concerning it.

A. Yes.

Q. Yes, what were you going to say?

A. The news was headlined in the Pittsburgh newspapers that the Soviet Union had the atomic bomb; such an announcement had been made. George Wuchinich, Milo Mamula, Steve Nelson and myself were standing on the corner of Liberty Avenue and Smithfield Street, near, I think it is the Sun Drug Store——

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Since you mention those names, who are George Wuchinich?

A. George Wuchinich was a member of the Communist Party.

Q. And who was Milo Mamula?

Mr. Nelson: That is objected to your Honor, bringing names of people in here.

The Court: Objection overruled, exception noted.

[fol. 1454] Mr. Cercone:

Q. All right.

A. And Milo Mamula was a member of the Communist Party.

Q. All right.

A. So, we had a copy of the Pittsburgh Press, which headlined this news—we were commenting on it. Steve Nelson made this statement, commenting on this headline: “We have the atom bomb now and the enemy will not be in such a God damned hurry to start war now,” and in the course of the day, and succeeding days, this was the theme in the Party—“we have it, the enemy . . .”—meaning the United States—“does not have it,” over a period of quite some time.

Q. Now, do you recall the month of April, 1949?

A. Yes.

Q. In regard to that——

The Court: Wasn't that the date, or the month of this incident?

A. I think it was sometime later, your Honor. It seems to me it was in September. It seems it was in the fall, when the announcement was made. The date this was headlined for the first time in the newspapers is the date he said that.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Now, when Nelson, this defendant, said, "Now we have the bomb" who did he mean?

[fol. 1455] A. He was referring to the Pittsburgh Press article—

Q. Who did he mean?

A. The Soviet Union.

Q. The Soviet Union?

A. That is right.

Q. And in connection with that, were you, as a Party member, instructed who your leader was?

A. In connection with—

Q. With your Party work?

A. In my Party work—

Q. Who was your leader?

A. Well, I attended many Party meetings; our leader was "Comrade Stalin."

Q. And how was that brought forth in your meetings and in your activities?

A. Well, for example, if we had a meeting, or a Party class, perhaps Steven Nelson, Bill Albertson, or myself, if we were referring to Stalin, or something that he wrote, we would say that "I agree with Comrade Stalin," or we had songs in the Party where we would sing "Comrade Stalin is our leader"; and at all times he was "Comrade Stalin," our leader, and we were part of the International Soviet.

Q. Now, as a member of the Communist Party, in carrying out the aims and policies of the Party, were you instructed specifically what to do if you were ever called by a government agency, as a member of the Communist [fol. 1456] Party, to tell what the purposes of the Party were, during this period that Steve Nelson was District organizer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was that instruction?

A. The instruction was to refuse to answer on the grounds of the first and fifth Amendments of the Constitution.

Q. Now, do you recall the month of April, 1949?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What occurred at that time, with regard to this instruction?

A. Steve Nelson was subpoenaed to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities. He made the trip to Washington. He stopped in the office of the American Slav Congress when he returned. George Wuchinich was in the office, and I was in the office, and Steve was very jubilant and making remarks like, he was laughing, and he says, "Well, I guess I didn't tell those bastards anything down there." He was laughing about it.

Q. By saying "bastards down there", who did he mean?

A. He meant the Congressional Committee in Washington.

Mr. Nelson: Objection.

The Court: Objection overruled. Exception noted.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. He meant?

A. The Committee we were discussing, that was the [fol. 1457] subject of the conversation.

Q. All right.

A. And then George Wuchinich made a remark, "We should get the machine guns and mow those bastards down," and Steve Nelson said——

Mr. Nelson: Objection, your Honor.

The Court: Objection noted, overruled, exception noted.

A. And Steve Nelson commented, "Not yet George, we are not ready for the machine guns yet."

Q. Now, did you, or the Party members of the Western Pennsylvania Communist Party carry any symbols?

A. We had a Hammer and Sickle as a symbol, yes, and we had our song.

Q. Were you told how you were to consider the United States, in regards to your work as Communist members?

A. Yes, sir. The United States was always referred to

as "An imperialistic government;" "an imperialist aggressor"; in conversation, and debate, that the Soviet Union—and at all times look upon the Soviet Union as our mother country, and the United States was the enemy. This was absolute in the Party, except whenever we had that alliance during World War II when we were supposedly allies—or rather, the Soviet Union was allies with the United States.

Q. After that did you revert back?

A. Yes, sir.

[fol. 1458] Q. Now, in the Party work, and in the discussions in the meetings was the possibility of a war between the United States and the Soviet Union discussed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And when that was discussed what was said about it?

A. This was handed down on the basis of this particular excerpt I read, the passage which was reprinted in reports that were issued, and used as a guide to the American Communists in case of a war with the Soviet Union.

Q. What were you going to do?

A. In case of a war with the Soviet Union we were to oppose our government, even to a point of revolution.

Q. Now, did you discuss, as a member of the Party, during Nelson's term as District organizer of this District, the matter of the propaganda of Peace?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And how was that to be done?

A. The Peace movement that was ordered by the National Board of the Communist Party was to be organized by Communists by going to various mass organizations, clergy, trade unions, and building a peace drive by means of resolutions.

Q. What was the purpose of that?

A. The real purpose of the drive was to lull the people of the United States into a sense of security, because all the time we are talking about peace, we would always attack the United States; talk about destroying the atom bombs here; about disarming the United States—should [fol. 1459] throw our arms away, but we would never say anything about the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact we opposed universal military training here, but we never said anything about universal military training in the Soviet

Union, where it had had it since 1917, which every Communist knows.

Q. As a member of the Communist Party, under assignment by the F.B.I., from February 1943 to February 1950, in all your discussions and meetings and Party work, in your reading of books of the Communist Party literature, magazines, pamphlets and other paraphernalia, what were the aims and purposes of the Communist Party?

A. The aims and purposes of the Communist Party was to overthrow——

Mr. Nelson: This is objected to, your Honor. This man has not been qualified as an expert. On his previous testimony he admitted he did not know anything about these books, he hardly ever read them, or didn't understand, or didn't know about them.

The Court: Objection overruled, exception noted.

(Answer read.)

A. —I have attended some, just roughly, over 2000 Party meetings in the years I was in the Party. I listened to [fol. 1460] members of the Communist Party of the Eastern European countries who, in meetings—I attended a meeting in New York City with Steve Nelson, and the great Dr. Zoar, of one of the Eastern European countries, made a report—Steve heard this report. He agreed with it. He said, “Remember, Comrades, you are Communists first, and Americans second. You are part of——”

Mr. Nelson: Objection.

The Court: Objection overruled. Exception noted.

A. —on the basis of all the things I have heard in the Party, I know the purposes and the aims of the Party to be the overthrow of the United States government by force and violence; plan, set up a dictatorship in this country, and have heard many comrades discuss the ultimate liquidation of one third of the population of this country, if they are successful.

Mr. Nelson: Objection, your Honor, that is a plain lie.
The Court: Objection overruled. Exception noted.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Was that the policy while this defendant was District organizer of the Communist Party of Western Penn-
[fol. 1461] sylvania?

A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Cercone: You may cross-examine.

Mr. Nelson: Your Honor, I am not prepared at this time to cross-examine this witness.

The Court: I think you may proceed to some extent.

Mr. Nelson: Well, it might result in my going over the same questions tomorrow morning. I think it would be better if you recessed now. There would only be a loss of three quarters of an hour. I have no way of knowing who the next witness was going to be. I didn't bring any material with me that would enable me to handle this cross-examination properly.

The Court: Very well, we will recess until tomorrow morning at 9:30 o'clock.

[fol. 1462] Wednesday, January 9, 1952. Morning Session.

Met pursuant to adjournment and the taking of testimony continues:

Matt Cvetic, recalled, resumed his testimony as follows:

Direct examination (continued).

Mr. Cercone:

Q. Mr. Cvetic, before we recessed yesterday, I omitted to ask you whether or not the defendant was paid by the Party for his work in the organization?

A. Yes, sir, he was.

Q. How do you know that?

A. Because he was—he was referred to as a paid functionary of the Communist Party.

Q. Now, yesterday you also testified regarding these books, Commonwealth's Exhibit No. 50 being the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Commonwealth's Exhibit No. 169 being State and Revolution, Commonwealth's Exhibit No. 167 being Foundations of Leninism, Commonwealth's Exhibit 15 being the Communist Manifesto, and Commonwealth's Exhibit No. 168 being the

Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Now, I ask you, at that time whether these books were read during the period of August 1948 to 1950?

[fol. 1463] A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what was taught out of these books in that——

Mr. Nelson: Objection——

Q. —in your two-year term?

Mr. Nelson: Wait a minute. I think it ought to be stated where and who was present.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. During the classes you spoke of yesterday?

Mr. Nelson: Well, as I recall, your Honor, he spoke about one class with which I was not connected, according to his testimony.

The Court: Well, now, be more specific.

Mr. Cercone:

Q. How many classes did you have with regard to these books and general classes of the Communist Party?

A. Well, I, myself, conducted classes in the Lawrenceville Club of the Party, in instructions of the district.

Q. And about how many classes did you hold?

A. Well, we had—we always had discussions with classes. As a matter of fact it was one of the—part of the Communist program to have discussions at every [fol. 1464] meeting.

Q. On these books?

A. On the basis of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, and these were books that were used in some of these discussions.

Q. And how many classes—were these classes under the supervision of this defendant?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And how many classes—was there a special class held at any time under the supervision of this defendant?

A. Yes, there was.

Q. And where was that held?

A. At 440 Wood Street.

Q. And how long did that last, that school?

A. Three months, approximately.

Q. And how often would you meet there?

A. Well, we would meet sometimes once a week, maybe miss a week, but it was a weekly class.

Q. In regard to that professional school, what was taught out of these books?

A. Basically the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

Q. All right. Now, one more question: Did Nelson attend those classes?

A. No, sir.

Q. But they were under the supervision of the defendant?
[fol. 1465] A. Yes, sir, the classes were——

Mr. Nelson: Object.

The Court: Well, it's repetition of what he said before.

Mr. Cercone: All right. Cross examine.

Cross examination.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. I think you testified that you attended St. Vincent's College, did you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. For how long a period?

A. Two years.

Q. Where was that school?

A. Latrobe, Pennsylvania.

Q. I think you testified that you took a course in a business college—right?

A. That's right.

Q. How long?

A. Oh, I think that took about 16 or 18 months, I graduated.

Q. And when did you graduate from that school?

A. I think it was '26 or '27.

Q. After you graduated where did you go to work?
[fol. 1466] What was your first job?

A. I. W. Scott Company.

Q. Where was that?

A. 500 Liberty Avenue.

Q. And how long did you work there?

A. I guess about three years.

Q. And what did you do there?

A. I was a billing clerk.

Q. I see. How much did you make on that job?

Mr. Cercone: That is objected to, your Honor, as being irrelevant.

Objection overruled.

A. I think I started around \$12.00 a week; I think I was making around \$18.00 or \$20.00 when I quit.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Then I believe you testified you took a course in criminology, didn't you?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And where was that?

A. It was a correspondence course. I don't know—I don't recall the exact name but it was an International School of Criminology.

Q. And what was that—you had to write——

[fol. 1467] A. That's right.

Q. And send the stuff back every week?

A. Yes.

Q. Once a week or so?

A. I think it was once a week.

Q. And how long did that course last?

A. Oh, ten, twelve months.

Q. And where was that school located?

A. Seattle, Washington, as far as I recall.

Q. You aren't sure?

A. I think it was Seattle, Washington. That was about 18 years ago, Seattle, Washington.

Q. But you wrote a letter approximately once a week?

A. Yes.

Q. But you forget where it was?

A. I didn't forget. I said Seattle, Washington, as far as I recall.

Q. As far as you recall?

A. That's right.

Q. And what did you do after you left the job you previously testified to?

A. I went to work for Etna Furniture Company.

Q. How long did you work there?

A. About a year.

Q. And where did you go from there?

A. General Motors, Radio Corporation.

[fol. 1468] Where is that at?

A. They were located in East Liberty.

Q. And what was your work there?

A. I was a salesman.

Q. And how long did that last, did you say? A year?

A. About a—about ten months, I think.

Q. And where did you go after that? What was your next job?

A. Well, then I went to work for my dad in the service station business. Then I went—

Q. What year was that?

A. Oh, I don't recall the year; must have been around '31 or '32.

Q. What was the job you had after that?

A. Well, I worked—did the service station work for about three or four years; I operated a station on my own in Wilksburg. After that I went to work on the WPA.

Q. That was around what year?

A. Oh, around '35.

Q. What kind of work did you do on the WPA?

A. I worked for the Weather Bureau for a while.

Q. A clerk?

A. A statistician. I worked at the Western Penitentiary in Woods Run for the Department of Justice on a crime survey; that lasted about a year or more.

Q. Was that while you were on WPA?

A. Yes, sir.

[fol. 1469] Q. Have you got a—is there any record of that crime survey you conducted anywhere?

A. Oh, I presume it would be in the hands of the Department of Justice. I don't know.

Q. Then where did you go—what was your next job that you had after you had the job on the WPA?

A. Then in—my next job in December 1937, I went to work for the Pennsylvania State Employment Service.

Q. That was when?

A. December of '37.

Q. And how long did you work with the U.S.E.S.?

A. About eight years.

Q. Eight years?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And it was while you were working on the U.S.E.S. job I believe you testified that you were approached by the FBI to work for them; is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And was that when you first went to work on that job with the U.S.E.S.?

A. How's that?

Q. Strike that. I'll rephrase it. Were you approached by the FBI to go to work for them about the same time you went to work on the U.S.E.S. job?

[fol. 1470] Mr. Cercone: I think the witness said the Pennsylvania State Employment Service——

A. That's what I said.

Mr. Cercone: What's this U.S.E.S.?

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, do you understand that question?

A. Yes. I was approached by the FBI in April of 1941.

Q. I see. And what did they ask you to do when they approached you?

A. They asked me to join the Communist Party and supply them with information on the activities of the Communist Party and its membership.

Q. Were they interested in any activities of the Union that was being organized amongst the employees then on that job that you were working on?

A. No, they were interested in the activities of the Communist Party members working in the United States Employment Service.

Q. And——

A. And their activities.

Q. And I believe you testified you joined the Communist Party about two years after that, didn't you?

A. I joined the Communist Party, as far as I can recall, it was on Lincoln's Birthday in 1943.

Q. So that would be about two years after you got the [fol. 1471] job on the U.S.E.S?

A. That's right——

Q. Or I mean the Pennsylvania Employment Service?

A. No, I got a job with the Pennsylvania State Employment Service in 1937, so it was about four or five years after I went to work——

Q. Oh, I see. It is true, is it not, that there was an organizer trying to organize workers on the job at the time when you were working there; that is, organizing workers into a Union at the time when you worked there?

A. Yes, we had—as a matter of fact there were two Unions in the Employment Service; one of them was the State, County and Municipal Workers of America, a CIO Union; then there was an A. F. of L. Union, I don't recall it's exact——

Q. Which Union were you a member of?

A. Well, first I was a member of the A. F. of L., later I became a member of the CIO.

Q. Did you make any reports to the FBI on the activities of the Union and Union workers, active workers in that Union?

A. No, sir. I made reports to the FBI on the activities of the Communist Party members working in the United States Employment Service, no matter whether they were Union members or not.

Q. Did the Communist Party members carry badges around so you could tell who they were before you were a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Cvetic?

[fol. 1472] A. I knew who the Communist Party members were in the United States Employment Service.

Q. You knew who they were, how? You knew because they were active Union members, is that it?

A. No, sir, because they would invite me to Communist Party meetings, or would sell Communist Party literature, or would invite me to Communist gatherings.

Q. But didn't you testify that you weren't in the Party, you had quite a little time before you got acquainted with them? Didn't you testify to that?

A. Oh, I knew these people before. I knew Sid Horovitz, and Ollie Sloan——

Q. Did they carry badges around?

A. No, but they advertised their Party membership quite frankly.

Q. So they weren't so secret as you claim, were they, that the Communists operated in secret, were they?

A. Some were and some were not.

Q. All right. Who are you working for at the present time?

A. At the present time I'm a consultant with the United States Department of Justice, and I'm employed with the Ziv Corporation of Cincinnati, Ohio.

Q. Which?

A. Ziv, Z-i-v.

Q. What kind of a corporation is that?

A. It's a radio and television producing company.

[fol. 1473] Q. Oh! And how long have you been working for the Department of Justice?

A. Since May of 1950.

Q. Have you got a contract with the Department of Justice?

A. No, sir, I'm only on call when they need me.

Q. You're not on full——

A. No, sir.

Q. —staff?

A. No, sir.

Q. And since May 1950 when you went to work for the Department of Justice, how much time did you put in there? I mean——

A. Oh, I wouldn't know. I mean I would have to guess.

Q. Let's put it this way: How much money did you earn working for the Department of Justice since you went to work for them in May 1950?

A. Oh, I wouldn't even hazard a guess; I wouldn't even make a guess.

Q. You wouldn't make a guess?

A. No.

Q. It was quite a chunk, right?

A. No, it wasn't quite a chunk.

Q. Oh, I suppose you were paying them—right?

A. No, but I—

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to as being argumentative.

[fol. 1474] Objection overruled.

A. May I have that question again?

The Court: You answered it. He asked if you were paying them and you said no.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, when you work for them, how much do they pay you a day?

A. \$25.00 a day and expenses.

Q. Any limit to the expenses?

A. Yes, they are limited to transportation, if I travel, and \$9.00 a day for sustenance.

Q. And you have no other contract with them under which you are operating at the present time?

A. I have no contract with anyone.

Q. What are some of your duties with the Department of Justice?

A. May I have the wording of that question, please?

(Question read).

The Witness: Your Honor, I don't know—this question, if I answer it, I would have to be discussing the business of the United States Department of Justice, and that is confidential business.

[fol. 1475] The Court: Oh, just in a general way. Does it relate to testifying in cases; does it relate to consulting with them confidentially and secretly; just in a general way.

A. Yes, that I can say, generally, I am called on to discuss cases with members of the Department, and to testify when I'm called on.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. And what was the first occasion that you testified for the Department of Justice since you went to work for them?

The Court (to the witness): We will permit you to keep confidential your secret discussions with the Department,

but we will compel you to answer anything that is of a public nature.

Mr. Cercone: Yes, we don't think work in the FBI should be made public on that.

The Court: I will limit the testimony and the question to what is public knowledge.

The Court:

Q. What public hearings have you appeared at and testified at the request of the Department of Justice?

A. Well, I don't recall exactly the first one, but I testified in a case in New York City known as the Dimitrichen case. I testified——

Mr. Nelson :

Q. Just a minute. You testified in a case in New York City, you said?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you recall the name of the person you appeared against?

A. I can't spell it; I think it was Dimitrichen.

Q. And that was when?

A. Oh, some time in 1950.

Q. What was that? 1950?

A. Some time in 1950.

Q. In New York City?

A. Yes.

Q. And you got paid for testifying in that case, did you not ?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the next case you testified in?

A. Well, I testified in a case, Frank Borich, the case of Frank Borich.

Q. That was 1950, was it?

A. '51, I believe—'50 or '51.

Q. Where was that?

A. In the Federal Building in Pittsburgh.

[fol. 1477] Q. What was the next case you testified in?

A. I testified for the State of New York against the International Workers Order, a Communist Front organization——

Mr. Nelson: Objection, your Honor.

The Court: We will sustain the objection and order that stricken.

The Court (to the witness): Don't use any comments on it, Mr. Cvetic; just be directly responsive.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. That was not an Immigration hearing, was it?

A. No, sir, State of New York.

Q. State of New York?

A. Yes.

Q. Who contacted you to testify for the State of New York in that case?

A. The attorney for the State of New York.

Q. How did he know you?

A. I didn't ask him.

Q. Who recommended you to him, do you suppose?—or do you know?

A. Frankly, I don't know. I didn't discuss this with him.

[fol. 1478] Q. What was the next case you testified in?

A. Well, I testified in a sedition case in this court room last Spring.

Q. And what was—were there any other cases you testified in?

A. Well, I testified in the case of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus Toni Nuss.

The Court:

Q. Toni who?

A. Nuss, N-u-s-s; that's Antoinette.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. And where was that, in Pittsburgh?

A. In Pittsburgh.

Q. And when was that, in 1950?

A. I believe it was '50.

Q. Did you testify in any other cases?

A. I testified in a case for the School Board against Dorothy Albert.

Q. That was in the City of Pittsburgh?

A. City of Pittsburgh.

Q. Any other cases in which you testified?

A. Yes, I testified in the case Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Nathan Albert.

Q. That was in the City of Pittsburgh?

A. Yes, sir.

[fol. 1479] Q. And what other cases did you testify in?

A. Testified in the case of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus The Serbian Progressive Club of Wilmerding, Pa.

Q. Any other cases that you testified in?

A. These are all the ones I recall right now; there may have been one or two others.

Q. Did you testify at any trials outside of the ones you mentioned?

A. I may have, but these are all I recall right now. There may have been one or two others.

Q. You don't recall testifying in any other trials?

A. At this time I do not.

Q. You don't recall testifying in a New Kensington case, do you?

A. Yes, I testified in a case of—I guess it's Westmoreland County, or Commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus Harry Truitt.

Q. Well, were they any other trials you testified in; trials this time we are speaking about?

A. These are all I recall right now.

Q. Didn't you testify in a trial in Connecticut?

A. Well, that wasn't a trial. I think that was a—as far as I recall, a civil proceeding.

Q. Well, isn't that a trial?

The Court:

Q. What was the name of that case?

A. It was the—I think it was Draper and Adler, were [fol. 1480] suing the John T. McCullough and Mrs. McCullough, for \$200,000 for calling him a Communist.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Do you recall any other cases you testified in?

A. No. I think that may be—there may have been one or two others but this is—

Q. Well, now, in any of these cases that you testified in, did you always get your daily \$25.00 and \$9.00 expenses?

A. No, sometimes I did and sometimes I didn't. I mean——

Q. Yes. Did you ever get more than the \$34.00?

A. No, I don't think so. I——

Q. You never got a flat fee for testifying in any case, did you?

A. I don't think so.

Q. I mean a flat sum?

A. No.

Q. Well, aren't you sure? Your answer is you don't think so.

A. No, I say I——

Q. Who besides you should know that?

A. Well, when you mention a flat fee I never agreed to any flat fee for testifying anywhere. I don't—if the fee is \$4.00 per witness this is what I'm paid. If it's more, then——

Q. Did you ever get paid per head?

A. Per head?

Q. Piece work. Do you know what I mean?

[fol. 1481] A. Piece work?

Q. On the basis of conviction?

A. No, sir.

Q. What are your other means of income?

A. I am a technical advisor for the Ziv Corporation.

Q. Pardon?

A. I'm a technical advisor for the Ziv Corporation.

Q. Yes, and what does that bring you annually?

The Court: Well, now——

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to.

The Court: I think that's objectionable. The man's other income is a personal matter, Mr. Nelson. If he has other income, the amount of it, I think——

Mr. Nelson: Your Honor, he has radio programs that we read about in the paper, what it's based on——

The Court: Well, you can ask him.

Mr. Nelson: The fact that he's an experienced person ostensibly, and he sells——

[fol. 1482] Mr. Cercone: I object to these speeches——

The Court: Now, listen to me, gentlemen, a moment. I'll let you ask him what his duties entail in connection with the Ziv Corporation and whether it's based on his knowledge here, if you want to ask him that.

Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, I believe the point is——

The Court: Oh, as to the amount of his income, he admits he has income from that source, the exact amount of it, why——

Mr. Nelson: But it's selling articles about Communism——

Mr. Cercone: I object to these speeches——

The Court: The only thing that is involved here is whether he is a paid witness here. He says he's a paid witness here, and if you want to develop that he capitalizes [fol. 1483] on his information otherwise, why, you may do so, the exact amount of it is not relevant here.

Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, he sells articles, he makes speeches——

The Court: I'll let you ask him that, but I'm not going to make him disclose his actual amount of income. As far as this case is concerned, yes, you can ask him what he is getting paid here, and he has told you that.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, do you get any income from articles that you sell to magazines that deal with your supposed experience in the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania?

A. Not at the present time.

Q. Did you ever get any income from an article or articles written about your ostensible experience in the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. And what were those articles?

A. They were articles that were published in the Saturday Evening Post, July of 1950.

Q. And what did those articles bring you?

[fol. 1484] Mr. Cercone: I object to that, your Honor.

The Court: Do you mean by way of compensation?

Mr. Nelson: Yes, your Honor.

The Court: The objection is sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, we were allowed to go into this question in the other trial.

The Court: Well, I'm not going to make the man disclose his personal income. Now you can show——

Mr. Nelson: He is making blood money, your Honor; he is making money on testifying——

Mr. Cercone: I object to these speeches.

The Court: The amount of it I said I would not compel him to disclose. We will grant you an exception, and you will be limited on your question. You can ask him anything else concerning it but the exact amount of it is his own [fol. 1485] personal information and has no bearing on this case and I will not make him disclose it.

Mr. Nelson: Well, it has a bearing, your Honor.

The Court: Well, that's where you and I differ, and I have sustained the objection and have granted you an exception, so proceed.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Do you get paid for making speeches at places—at organizations and gatherings dealing with the ostensible experience you had in the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania?

A. Sometimes I do and sometimes I do not.

Q. Well, do you get paid for radio speeches you make based on your ostensible experience in the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania?

A. Sometimes I do and sometimes I don't.

Mr. Nelson: Is the Court going to permit me, your Honor, to go into the question of amount in these cases?

The Court: I am not.

[fol. 1486] Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, you appeared on a television program, didn't you, dealing with your ostensible experience in the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania?

A. Not one; many programs.

Q. Many?

A. That's right.

Q. And you always got paid for those programs?

A. Not always.

Q. How many times did you get paid—fifty per cent of the time?

A. No, I don't know how many. I wouldn't guess.

Q. Did you sell any—sell your story about your ostensible Communist activities to a moving picture company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you got quite an amount for that, didn't you?—quite a sum?

Mr. Cercione: I object to that, your Honor.

Objection sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Then, according to the papers yesterday, you sold a story to this—a contract for a year to this Ziv Corporation; is that right?

A. Ten years.

[fol. 1487] Q. Ten years? No wonder Harry Alan Sherman is sore at you——

Mr. Cercione: That is objected to, your Honor.

The Court: The objection is sustained. We will strike it from the record.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, since we can't go into the amount and how much you made on specific jobs in the course of the year 1950, what was your total amount?

Mr. Cercione: This is objected to, your Honor.

Objection sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. I believe you testified when you worked for the FBI that you lived in the William Penn Hotel; is that right? Pittsburgh?

A. Part of the time, yes, sir.

Q. Did you know the manager of the William Penn Hotel at the time, personally?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And who is that?

A. It was Tom Troy.

[fol. 1488] Q. Did he know your business?

Mr. Cercione: This is objected to, your Honor, as being immaterial to the issue.

The Court: Well, I can't see any purpose in it but I'll permit the question to be answered as asked.

The Court:

Q. Did Mr. Troy know your business?

The Court: (to counsel) I suppose by that you mean did he know of his connection with the FBI?

Mr. Nelson: Right.

Mr. Cercione: I object to giving—having this witness give any information that would conflict with his duties with the FBI.

The Court: Well, if you think that it does, I will sustain the objection, because I don't see any relevancy here.

[fol. 1489] Mr. Nelson: No, your Honor, I—as the next few questions would develop—

The Court: The only point that I see you can make on it is whether or not anyone else knew of his connection with the FBI; is that the point you want to make?

Mr. Nelson: No. I want to know whether the manager of the hotel knew.

Mr. Cercione: It certainly makes no difference, your Honor, what any one person knew, as to the relevancy in this case.

The Court: Well, if you think there may be some harmful effects from it other than its effect in this trial, I'll sustain the objection. I can't see the relevancy of it myself. The objection is sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. So it is true, isn't it, Mr. Cvetic, that Mr. Troy knew your business when you lived in the William Penn Hotel, [fol. 1490] he knew you were connected with the FBI?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to as the same question.
The Court: It is the same question. The objection is sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. While you worked for the FBI and while you lived in the William Penn Hotel, it is true, is it not, that you were giving information to Mr. Troy about Local 237 of which he was keenly interested?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to as being entirely irrelevant.

The Court: The objection is overruled. If he wants to show the motives, the activities of this witness or not as he asserts them in connection with FBI matters, but for other purposes I will permit it to be shown to affect his credibility as a witness but I will not permit any specific names to be mentioned or other persons involved in this matter. If he [fol. 1491] wants to ask him the question as it is done in other cases concerning, I think, Mr. Crouch and his activities on the Miami Herald, and that it was for purposes concerning Union organizations, or strikes, I'll permit that to be done.

Mr. Cercone: Your Honor, I ask that an offer be made at Side Bar concerning this phase of the cross examination.

Mr. Nelson: I think that's another way of blocking this——

The Court: The offer is apparent. He wants to discredit this witness on the basis he wasn't performing duties as an FBI agent, but had other purposes in mind.

The Court (to the witness): You may answer the question.

A. Let me have the question, please.

The Court: Read the question.

[fol. 1492] (Question read.)

A. No, sir.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. How's that?

A. No, sir.

The Court: Was Local 237 a Union at the hotel?
Mr. Nelson: Right.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Mr. Troy was head of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh at that time, wasn't he?

Mr. Cercone: I object to this.
Objection sustained.

The Court: I told you I would not permit any specific mention of parties or activities concerning individuals.
Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Do you deny that Mr. Troy was interested in the affairs of Local 237, Mr. Cvetic?

[fol. 1493] Mr. Cercone: This is objected to.
Objection sustained.
Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Isn't it true that you were a guest of Mr. Troy for five years at that hotel, the most expensive hotel in town; isn't that true?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to.
Objection overruled.

The Court:

Q. Did you pay your way at the hotel or were you a guest of Mr. Troy?

A. I paid my way, Judge. You get nothing for free over there.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. How much did you pay over a period of five years at the William Penn?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to as being irrelevant, your Honor.

Mr. Nelson: Well, he says he paid for it——

[fol. 1494] The Court: Do you want to know whether he got any reduced rate, or whether he paid full rate; ask him that question——

A. I got a monthly rate. They have monthly rates and I——

Mr. Nelson:

Q. How much was the monthly rate?

A. Gee, when I started I think it must have been about \$80 a month, or something like that.

Q. \$80 a month?

A. \$80 or \$85.

Q. Are you sure about that?

A. I said about \$80 or \$85 a month.

Q. What was the highest you paid in there?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to.

The Court: The objection is overruled.

Mr. Cercone: We are getting beyond the scope of the cross examination.

The Court: Well, cross examination has considerable scope, so we will permit the question.

[fol. 1495] The Court:

Q. What was the highest you paid to the hotel per month?

A. At that time I think it was around \$110.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. At that time you paid about \$100 a month, or \$110?

A. Around that.

Q. Well, what was your income from the FBI at that time?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to, your Honor.

Mr. Nelson: These questions were answered, your Honor, in other trials, and this witness claimed that he got just a little bit of an income from the FBI——

Mr. Cercone: Let the Court decide on the objection.

The Court: The objection is overruled.

The Court (to the witness): Answer the question.

A. \$85 a week and expenses.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Is that what you got from the time you started to work [fol. 1496] for the FBI?

A. The first 22 months that I worked for the FBI, I worked without pay, cost me a couple thousand dollars to give them this conspiracy.

Q. I see—

A. After—

Q. I see, it cost you money?

A. Yes, I was on my own. When I first went to work they paid me \$15 a week and when I left they were paying me \$85 a week.

Q. So you were living at the hotel here for a period of five years and you say you paid from \$80 to \$110 a month?

A. That's right.

Q. For your room there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you say that Mr. Troy did not give you any concessions because of the reports you made on the Union activities; is that your claim?

A. I made no report on Union activities. You said that. You were reporting to him on that; I wasn't.

Q. Well, was he interested in the affairs of that Union as head of the Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to.
[fol. 1497] The Court: The objection has been sustained, that's repetition, and we will sustain it again.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Now, this picture you sold to the FBI—or, the picture about your experience in the Communist Party, as you say, while you worked for the FBI, which you sold to Warner Brothers, you got a considerable income from that, did you not?

Mr. Cercone: That is objected to, your Honor. We are going over the same thing again.

The Court: Leave out the word "considerable" and I'll permit the question to be answered.

The Court:

Q. You received an income from the sale of your rights to Warner Brothers?

A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. And who else derived an income from that, from the sale of that article?

Mr. Cercone: That is objected to, your Honor.
[fol. 1498] Objection sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, I want to show a group of people who are trying to make a racket out of this business, making money on Communism.

The Court: You are only relating to one man, that's the witness here. If you want to ask him if he was associated with any others, without naming them, you may.

Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, the name that I——

Mr. Cercone: I object to him mentioning any names because this is just a speech and it isn't a part of the case.

The Court: Come up to Side Bar, gentlemen, we will rule on it.

(At side bar):

Mr. Nelson: Do I have a right, your Honor——

Mr. Cercone: I object to him shouting at Side Bar.
[fol. 1499] The Court: You want to show whether somebody named on the indictment was involved in it?

Mr. Nelson: Right. There are people here and I have a right to go into that.

The Court: All right. I am going to permit you to do that, whether he is called as a witness at this time or not, if his name is on the indictment.

Mr. Cercone: Well, we will object to the question in this form, and if it is allowed we submit it ought to be restricted very narrowly.

The Court: There is only one man he has in mind, Harry Alan Sherman.

Mr. Cercone: I mean the——

The Court: There is only one question, was there anyone else associated with this case in any way who benefited by the sale of these rights to Warner Brothers; is that what you want to know?

[fol. 1500] Mr. Nelson: Yes, and a few more around that idea, not much on it.

The Court: We will see what the names are. We will permit it.

(End of side bar)

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Did anyone else connected with you or with this case derive an income from the proceeds of that motion picture?

A. Well, I don't know who all is connected with this case. I guess you'll have to——

Q. Well, didn't you testify before the Grand Jury?

Mr. Cercone: That is objected to, your Honor, as to what was testified to before the Grand Jury.

The Court: He's not going to testify to what it was.

Mr. Nelson: I didn't ask him to say what he testified to. I said, "Did you?" It's a public record, it's known.

[fol. 1501] The Court: Well, it's understood. The name you are eliciting is the name that appears on the indictment. Tell him the name that you want to know whether he——

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Did Harry Alan Sherman, your ex-attorney and the one who claims discovered you——

Mr. Cercone: I object to these speeches——

A. (Continued:)—receive an income from——

The Court: We don't know what Mr. Sherman claims, or anything about that, Mr. Nelson, and it isn't your right to say what he claims. Now, if you want to mention the name "Mr. Sherman", why that's permissible.

Mr. Nelson: Your Honor, it was brought out before, it's a matter of public knowledge, I don't see——

The Court: It wasn't brought out in this trial; I don't [fol. 1502] know anything about this what has been brought out before, but I don't recall that anything has been brought out in this trial about Mr. Sherman. His name was mentioned once or twice.

Mr. Cercone: He was just an attorney, that's all. We admit that he's an attorney at the Bar.

The Court: Well, now, never mind what you admit. You are asking whether Mr. Harry Alan Sherman, whose name appears on this indictment—

The Court:

Q. Did he share in any of the profits from the sale of your experiences to Warner Brothers?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He did. All right.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. How much did he get?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to.

Objection sustained.

Exception noted.

[fol. 1503] Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, he got a considerable sum, even though you got more; is that true?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to.

Objection sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, these stories that you sold to the Saturday Evening Post, and the motion picture you marketed with Warner Brothers, is it true or is it not true what appears in the picture that bears your name, the story is based on falsehood?

Mr. Cercone: Your Honor, I object to this question.
 Objection sustained.
 Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, is it true or not true that in the motion picture there is murder committed, ostensibly by myself?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to because that movie has nothing to do with this case.

[fol. 1504] Objection sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson: Well, I want to show that these people spoke untruths—

Mr. Cercone: Your Honor, I object to this—

Mr. Nelson: Will Mr. Cercone permit me to make a statement?

Mr. Cercone: No, I won't permit you.

The Court: Come forward, gentlemen.

(At side bar):

Mr. Nelson: Your Honor, I want to show that these people have told untruths and lies, and that their game is, their whole life income at the present time is based on the sale of these stories.

Mr. Cercone: We submit that Cvetic never knew he was going to write a movie the nine years he was working—

[fol. 1505] Mr. Nelson: I think just a few questions—

The Court: No one is ascribing to the authenticity of the movie.

Mr. Nelson: I want to show it, whether it is true or not—

The Court: All right.

Mr. Nelson: I want him to say it's a lie, and it is a lie, you know—

Mr. Cercone: I object to that.

The Court: This movie is not portrayed here—

Mr. Nelson: It's played in these theaters and every juror has seen it, and in that story there is the ostensible lie that the Communist Party commits murder, and he knows that's a lie.

The Court: Well, it is stipulated in front of the jury then that the movie——

[fol. 1506] Mr. Nelson: Is based on untruth?

The Court: No, stipulate that the movie is fictional to some extent.

Mr. Nelson: Well, I object to that. You can't interpret it.

The Court: To what extent do you want——

Mr. Cercone: We would have to go into a hearing on that.

The Court: Well, you have demonstrated that he has capitalized on them. Now, what more do you want? You can argue that to the jury.

Mr. Nelson: I want to show to what extent he will go. He does the same thing on the stand when he testifies.

The Court: No, he is not responsible for what Warner Brothers do in making a picture any more than—well, I suppose there is some supervision when you sell a book to a [fol. 1507] movie group, they don't pretend to demonstrate the facts as they actually occurred; they make it interesting for the public to view. So I don't think that is involved here, Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Nelson: I think, your Honor, it is closing a very important avenue of showing the credibility of this person. He's a disreputable character although he manages to put on a halo of a saint at present, and I want to show he is nothing more than a cheap racketeer.

The Court: Well, we are not going into the details of the picture. If you want to ask him whether he supervised the making of the picture, or whether everything in the picture is exactly as he told it, or whether it isn't, whether it's fictional to some extent, I'll let you do that, but we're not going to let you go into the details of the picture.

Mr. Cercone: That's going into the same thing.

The Court: Oh, no, it isn't. He isn't going to explain the [fol. 1508] movie. I'm going to let him go beyond that. He can say whether some of it is fictional and glamorized or portrayed in an attractive way for the purchasing public.

Mr. Cercone: That's everything that the jury has to know about the movie——

The Court: That isn't the point involved. We don't care whether the jury saw it. I didn't see it myself, so I don't know.

Mr. Nelson: I read the story——

The Court: Well, let him admit it is in part fiction the way Warner Brothers portrayed it and put it on, but the details of it, whether it is——

Mr. Nelson: My intention in asking this question was to get an honest answer from this witness, that he stated an untruth and sold an untruth, and that has been used as poison against people like myself. That's the reason I'm on trial, your Honor.

[fol. 1509] The Court: Ask him this, whether the picture demonstrated his experiences as he told them or whether it didn't?

Mr. Nelson: All right, I'll do that.

The Court: You can ask that. Then, of course, it gets back to the point whether he told Warner Brothers or sold them his experiences as they actually happened, but he is not responsible, I guess, after that for what Warner does in making a picture that would sell to the general public.

Mr. Nelson: If I had my name attached to something I would take full responsibility for whatever it is.

The Court: I don't think you can hold these movie companies that close to it. They put on pictures——

Mr. Cercone: If we open up this phase of the case we would have the right to go over the movie and have him say [fol. 1510] what is true and what is not true.

The Court: I am not going into that at all.

Mr. Nelson: I hadn't intended to go into that, I want to go into the simple things.

The Court: Well, ask him whether when the movie was made if they demonstrated his experiences as he sold them to Warner Brothers, without alteration.

Mr. Nelson: I'll go with you on something of that line.

The Court: All right, but I'm not going into the movie and demonstrate where it varied.

(End of side bar)

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, does the picture "I was a Communist For The FBI" carry your name?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It has your name attached to it. And does it portray the truth that you saw, as you saw things in the Communist Party?

A. With certain dramatic license that the studio ap- [fol. 1511] parently took it does portray the truth.

Q. It does portray the truth?

A. With certain—

Q. Then you have to answer the question: Is it true or is it not true that there was no such thing as murder in the experience that you had in the Communist Party?

Mr. Cercone: I object to that question, your Honor, as getting into the movie. We would have to show the movie here and have Mr. Cvetic tell us what was true and what was not true.

Mr. Nelson: I think it's a simple proposition, he's trying to cover up here—

Mr. Cercone: I'm not covering up anything, but we don't want to be responsible for any movie.

The Court: I haven't seen the movie. I don't know whether any juror has. This witness hasn't testified anything to murder, and any consequences of any act, so whether the movie does or does not, I don't know, but I'm not going to get into the details of the movie. It isn't here, and the only [fol. 1512] point that you are privileged to make here is, did this witness capitalize on his experiences and sell those experiences to the—

Mr. Nelson: They weren't his experiences, your Honor. That's the only point that I want to make. They are lies—

Mr. Cercone: Your Honor, I object to these speeches again—

The Court: I don't care about that, whether he sold lies to the movie house or not.

Mr. Cercone: Let him prove that there are lies here, not in the movie—

The Court: Oh—

Mr. Cercone: Well, we have to put a stop to these speeches.

The Court: I am putting a stop to them, and I'm not going into the details concerning any movie.

[fol. 1513] Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, he capitalized on an ostensible experience that he had in the Communist Party——

The Court: Well, I don't——

Mr. Nelson: —which is based on absolute falsehood, and the prosecutor is trying to block this out because he knows——

The Court: He isn't blocking it off, I'm blocking it off, I'm not going——

Mr. Nelson: Well, I object to that ruling.

The Court: —I'm not going to try this case on the basis of a movie. The man says that he sold his experiences, that the movie was made, certain licenses were taken, and what they showed on the screen has varied from what he has testified to here, I don't know and I don't care, but I'm not going to permit it to be offered to the jury where there is any variance. The jury will be instructed that they are trying this case on what they hear here and here [fol. 1514] alone. Beyond that I'm not going to permit either side to go.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. While you were a member of the Communist Party——

The Court: I think he has answered as fully as I will permit him to answer on that, that he sold his experiences there, they took dramatic license, or whatever kind of license they are entitled to take in making a picture, I suppose they glamorized it or made it attractive to the purchasing public, and beyond that I am not going to go. But the point you are making is that he sold the experiences and was paid for them, and that reflects on his credibility here as a witness, so that is as far as I will let you go, Mr. Nelson. If you have any objection to the ruling I will grant you an exception.

Mr. Nelson: Well, I object.

Exception noted

Mr. Nelson:

Q. While you were a member of the Communist Party, did you see any member of the Communist Party in this district commit murder?

[fol. 1515] Mr. Cercone: That is objected to, your Honor.

Mr. Nelson: Wait a minute, now. Sure you are objecting—

Mr. Cercone: Is this based on your objection to the movie again?

The Court: The objection is sustained. No one in connection with the Communist Party is, as I understand the indictment on the basis of sedition, is charged with accomplishing anything, so the results are immaterial here, and in fairness to you and the witness and the jury too, if he knew of murder being committed and concealed it, he would be committing a crime himself.

Mr. Nelson: My only point is, this man is making a racket out of this business—

The Court: You brought in the matter of murder. No one here knew anything about that picture until you brought it up, Mr. Nelson, so I think—

[fol. 1516] Mr. Nelson: Oh, I think everybody knows about it, your Honor.

Mr. Cercone: I think this defendant is trying to prove his case by a movie. If he wants to show any falsehoods here, here is the man right here and now is the time to do it.

Mr. Nelson: I want to show that this man would go to any steps to make money—

Mr. Cercone: Show it here right now—

Mr. Nelson: Then why do you block it off—

Mr. Cercone: Let's not go into a movie.

The Court: If that is your purpose, I think the jury understands your purpose and the Court understands your purpose, but I'm giving you the extent of your privilege in order to demonstrate it, Mr. Nelson, so proceed on to some other subject.

[fol. 1517] Mr. Nelson:

Q. Well, would the radio series that you sold just recently include the idea that Communists commit murder?

Mr. Cercone: That is objected to, your Honor. That isn't in this case at all.

Objection sustained

Exception noted

Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, I believe that the Court has blocked a very important avenue of my examination.

The Court: Well, we have granted you an exception. If we are wrong on it your record is protected, Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Nelson: If I can't go into these matters it is impossible for me to expose this only witness who was connected with me in any way in the last two years, in the period under the indictment, and I believe that I should be permitted to examine him as I examined others to the best of my ability, not being a lawyer, and show him up for what he is.

[fol. 1518] Mr. Cercone: Your Honor——

The Court: You may ask on the point of murder, if you want, whether he told Warner Brothers that he observed anything of that nature, I think probably that would—or ask him about any—well, if I open the door to you in one particular I'll have to open it up in every particular and we'll be trying this case on the basis of a movie or a radio program——

Mr. Nelson: But he's a witness, your Honor.

The Court: He's a witness——

Mr. Nelson: And his story is going to be put over to the jury.

Mr. Cercone: I object to this again if we are going to continue on this movie. I submit this man was active with this defendant over a period of five years. Why didn't he ask him about that?

Mr. Nelson: We'll come to that; we'll come to that.

[fol. 1519] Mr. Cercone: Well, get on it.

Mr. Nelson: Don't worry, we'll get to that.

Mr. Cercone: Well, don't talk about a movie.

Mr. Nelson: I know you don't like to talk about——

The Court: There's only one——

Mr. Cercone: I've never even seen it.

Mr. Nelson: I'm sure you didn't see it——

The Court: Now, just a minute, gentlemen. If you listen to me I'll try to be as fair on this and act on it as lawfully

and as correctly as I see it. Any witness here who makes a statement can be confronted with a contrary statement made elsewhere, to affect his credibility.

Mr. Nelson: That's my point, your Honor.

[fol. 1520] The Court: But he has made no statement here concerning the commission of any crime on the part of you or anyone else elsewhere, and I don't think that you can bring in to confront him here with something someone else did, even though he had a part in it to the extent of selling the rights to that other party, Warner Brothers. Now, regardless of the movie, regardless of the radio program, I'll let you ask him what he did to sell, if he got a copy of his experiences that he sold to Warner Brothers, or you might ask him concerning what he told them, but what they did thereafter I'm afraid is beyond the realm of cross examination here, Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, I think if a picture or an article bears a man's name and it is sold to the public as the truth, I believe we ought to have the right to examine him, especially when he appears to be the key witness of the prosecution.

Mr. Cercone: I think the best evidence is right here in Court. We have got the witness——

[fol. 1521] The Court: No, he's a witness, he's on the stand, and subjects himself to extensive cross examination if he makes a statement here, if he made a statement to the contrary elsewhere, why, of course, the defendant does have this argument, that the witness said here "That picture does portray my experience with certain license taken by the producer." Now, it is a very close line there that causes me to hesitate to shut him off. I have done so as far as making a specific mention of things if the picture is concerned, but we have gone so far on this matter and I certainly wouldn't like to do an injustice to the defendant or make an error here that——

Mr. Cercone: We don't want to shut off anything that would prejudice the defendant——

The Court: —that would cause grounds for a new trial or a retrial on this matter.

Mr. Cercone: If the Court is considering the question of murder, I'm perfectly willing——

[fol. 1522] Mr. Nelson: I object to the Court's remarks, your Honor. You made a statement here and I move for a mistrial. You made a statement here implying that this case is not going to be decided in this court room. You made a statement here, your Honor, that this case is going to go up for appeal and for higher Courts, and therefore——

The Court: You are making that——

Mr. Nelson: You made a public statement here.

The Court: The new trials are granted by this Court, not by any higher Court.

Mr. Nelson: It doesn't concern this jury, and your weight should not be thrown in at this stage that this trial is not going to be settled in this court room, and I move for a mistrial.

The Court: I told you, and I'm telling this jury, and I'll state it again for the record for your benefit and the [fol. 1523] benefit of anybody else, I'm trying this case to the best of my ability, to see that you get a fair trial, and if I make any mistakes I'm endeavoring to give you the full benefit of the record so this record will show that you have objected and that your objections have been noted and that your exceptions to the rulings have been noted. The purpose for that is to assure you that if a mistake is made in this trial that you will be granted a new trial.

Mr. Nelson: Well, you stated you wanted to make sure I don't get another trial.

The Court: No, I didn't say that——

Mr. Nelson: On the basis of an error.

The Court: I said to you that I'm endeavoring to prevent any error, to prevent the necessary retrial of a case, in this case as in any other case, and that's my purpose here and that is the purpose of my hesitating and ruling out this opportunity that you are seeking to cross examine [fol. 1524] this witness on a movie or on a radio program. Now, if you haven't any objection, why, of course, there is no need for me to rule on it.

Mr. Cercone: We have no objection.

The Court: If you want to withdraw your objection about this defendant asking for particulars concerning the movie, that relieves the necessity for me to rule on it.

Mr. Cercone: As to that one question though. I don't think we should go into the whole movie because I haven't seen the movie and I wouldn't be able to ask questions on it.

The Court: I haven't either.

Mr. Cercone: But if he wants to ask that question, whether—concerning murder in the movie, I'm perfectly willing to have him ask it.

The Court: All right. Ask the question.

[fol. 1525] Mr. Nelson:

Q. So, Mr. Cvetic, the picture you sold to the Warner Brothers which infers that I committed murder isn't true; isn't that so?

A. I don't believe that the movie infers that you committed murder; I don't recall your name even being used in the movie.

Q. No, of course not, you saw to that, but you said the Communist leaders of Western Pennsylvania; isn't that what you said?

A. First of all, may I correct you, Mr. Nelson, I didn't see to that.

Q. Well, it bears your name, you're responsible for it, aren't you? You claim it's the truth. You claim you saw that in the Communist Party while you were in it?

A. I says—

Q. You're lying, isn't that so—

The Court: Just a minute, now. Give the man a chance to answer the question before you call him a liar.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Go ahead, answer it, Mr. Cvetic.

A. What is the question?

The Court: Read the question, but ask the second part [fol. 1526] being attached thereto and strike that from the record.

(Question read as follows: "Well, it bears your name, you're responsible for it, aren't you? You claim it's the truth. You claim you saw that in the Communist Party while you were in it?")

A. Yes, I testified that it was the truth with certain dramatic licenses that were taken.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Dramatic licenses, dealing with the question of murder, is that just a little dramatic incident?

A. Well, I mean the Communists did murder Trotsky. Now you know that, Steve.

Q. Now, Cvetic, I'm asking you what do you know about the question that we are dealing with here in Western Pennsylvania. Did you see any such things committed here?

A. Any such what things?

Q. Murder.

A. No, sir——

Q. You know what I'm talking about.

A. No, sir.

[fol. 1527] Q. All right, Mr. Cvetic——

A. If I did I certainly would have reported it to the law.

Q. But your picture does travel all over the United States telling the people of this country that you, an agent of the FBI, saw this thing committed here; isn't that so?

A. That's what you call dramatic license, Steve.

Q. Don't call me Steve——

A. Do you want me to call you "traitor"?

The Court: No, you call him nothing——

Mr. Nelson:

Q. If you do, I'll——

The Court (to the witness): You just answer the questions.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. So it isn't true, is it, Mr. Cvetic, that there was such a thing in the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania as murder?

A. No.

Q. Yet you got plenty of blood money for it, didn't you?

Mr. Cercone: I object to this kind of an argument. And the fact that this defendant——

[fol. 1528] The Court: Strike out the last part——

Mr. Cercone: —is putting on an act of being angry certainly doesn't take away from the testimony——

The Court: Oh——

Mr. Nelson: Now, look——

The Court: This man is on trial here——

Mr. Nelson (continued): All you are trying to get here is bloodshed in this court room——

The Court: Just a minute——

Mr. Nelson (continued): That's all you're trying to get—I'm sorry, your Honor——

The Court: We'll take a ten minute recess.

Recess.

[fol. 1529] After recess.

Matthew Cvetic, recalled, resumed his testimony as follows:

Cross-examination (continued):

Mr. Nelson:

Q. So it is true, then, Mr. Cvetic, is it not, the story you told and derived money from which is supposed to be a picture about the truth in the Communist Party is really completely an untruth, isn't it?

A. No, sir, that isn't——

Q. It's a falsehood, isn't it?

A. No, sir.

Q. Isn't that what you testified to a minute ago?

A. I did not.

Q. That the question whether you had seen murder committed is untrue?

Mr. Cercone: Now, your Honor, the witness has answered that it was purely dramatic license——

Mr. Nelson: Now, don't——

The Court: Objection overruled.

[fol. 1530] A. I testified that dramatic license was taken.

Mr. Nelson: If you are ready to throw in the rope, or the towel, go ahead and do it.

Mr. Cercone: Now——

The Court: Strike those remarks out.

Mr. Nelson: You are worried about your key witness.

Mr. Cercone: Don't worry about that.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Who else made money with you out of that lying story?

Mr. Cercone: That is objected to.

The Court: He has told you the one that was associated in that indictment, Harry Alan Sherman.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. All right. Did anyone else make money on that with you, in association with you—

[fol. 1531] Mr. Nelson: That's important, your Honor. They got a corporation which is dealing with a racket—

Mr. Cercone: I object to that.

Objection sustained.

The Court: Unless there is some connection with this case shown. How he operates it or sells it individually, with others, or a corporation, that is immaterial here.

Mr. Nelson: All right.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Who wrote that lying story for you which bears your name?

Mr. Cercone: This is objected to.

The Court: The form of the question is objectionable and objection to it is sustained.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. Who wrote the story you sold for—to Warner Brothers, which is based on falsehood instead of truth—

[fol. 1532] Mr. Cercone: Your Honor, I object to that statement.

Objection sustained.

Exception noted.

The Court: Who wrote the story, do you want him to answer that?

Mr. Nelson :

Q. Who wrote the story for which you got blood money?

Mr. Cercone: I object to that.

Objection sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Cercone: And I ask that the jury be instructed to disregard all these speeches.

The Court: The jury has been instructed before that any time a statement is made that is objectionable and is stricken, to disregard it.

The Court:

Q. Who wrote the story as you sold it to Warner Brothers?

The Witness: Your Honor, do you want me to answer [fol. 1533] that?

The Court: Yes.

A. Pete Martin.

Mr. Nelson :

Q. Who is Pete Martin?

A. He's an editor for the Saturday Evening Post.

Q. What was his cut from the story?

Mr. Cercone: I object to the form of the question.

Objection sustained.

Exception noted.

Mr. Nelson: Well, your Honor, I want to show that these people make a chunk of money and they'll use this man's lying story——

Mr. Cercone: I object to that——

Mr. Nelson (Continued): —embellish and dress it up and sell it everywhere they can for money.

The Court: The objection is sustained. We will have no more comments on it, Mr. Nelson. Make another question [fol. 1534] and we will see whether or not it comes within the realm of admissibility.

Mr. Nelson: Well, not being a lawyer, your Honor, I can't get around these legal——

The Court: I have told you before that we won't permit the interest of anyone else not named in that indictment or included in this case to be shown here, and I am going to stand on that ruling.

Mr. Nelson: I want to show, your Honor, that there are people who make money out of this——

Mr. Cercone: I object——

Mr. Nelson: —and they use this type of a stool pigeon and a plain ordinary——

Mr. Cercone: I object to these kind of speeches, to get in evidence——

Mr. Nelson: —spy, in order to make money for themselves.

[fol. 1535] Mr. Cercone: I object to this, your Honor.

The Court: The objection is sustained. You may show he was associated with others in doing it. He has told you Mr. Martin, the editor of the Saturday Evening Post wrote it for him, he told you Harry Alan Sherman was interested as his attorney, now if you want him to—if you want to inquire as to whether there were others associated with him, without naming them, you may.

Mr. Nelson:

Q. All right. Who else was associated with you in the venture known as "I Was a Communist for the FBI" that you sold to Warner Brothers?

A. Jim Moore from the Sun-Tele——

Q. Who?

A. Jim Moore from the Sun-Tele.

Q. And who else?

A. Well, they were the only ones who were associated with me here.

Q. And what was Mr. Moore's interest in this venture?

A. Public Relations.

Q. Platonic——

A. Public Relations.

Q. I see. Public Relations——

[fol. 1536] A. Press relations, I guess you would call it.

Q. He got no cut from the story, did he?

Mr. Cercone: Your Honor, I object to that.