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The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:15 a.m., in room 1302, New House Office Building, Hon. James C. Auchincloss (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. The committee will come to order.

The meeting of this subcommittee was called at the appropriate resolution of the full committee to consider House Joint Resolution 211, introduced by Congressman Scudder, of California.

The agenda of the hearings indicates that there will be 6 witnesses for the proponents of this resolution and 5 opponents to the resolution.

It is the hope of the committee and the chairman that witnesses will be brief and to the point and not start making speeches and expressing extraneous views.

The proponents will be heard first, and I will now read for the record and resolution. It is a joint resolution introduced by Mr. Scudder and reads as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION To direct the Administrator of General Services to remove the mural paintings from the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco, California

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House Committee on Public Works that the mural paintings decorating the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco, Calif., have been criticized by civic groups, veterans' organizations, and patriotic and fraternal societies, as well as by local newspapers and numerous individuals, as being artistically offensive and historically inaccurate; and

Whereas the murals cast a derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers and the history of the great State of California: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services shall take such action as may be necessary for the prompt removal of the mural paintings on the lobby walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco, California.

The first witness will be our colleague and the author of this resolution, Congressman Scudder, of California.

STATEMENT OF HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. The first thing I would like to clarify with the committee is the citizenship
status of Anton Refregier, the artist who painted the San Francisco Rincon Annex Post Office murals to which House Joint Resolution 211 pertains.

On April 12, 1941, the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency announced a competition, open to American artists only, for the painting of 27 murals at Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco. The award was high, $26,000, and an art jury composed of three artists and the architect of the building, selected Anton Refregier, of Woodstock, N. Y., as the winner.

Soon thereafter it was publicized that the artist was not an American citizen at the time of winning the award, and was a native of Russia. Such information was eventually placed at my disposal, and I used it in good faith in my remarks in the House on March 5, 1953, the date I introduced the resolution directing removing of the murals.

But to remove all doubt as to the artist’s citizenship status, I requested and on April 16 received the following report from the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

Anton Refregier, born Moscow, Russia, March 20, 1905, of French parents.

Sailed from LeHavre, France, aboard steamship La Savoie, arriving port of New York, December 1920.

Filed declaration of intention April 17, 1928, while residing at 160 Broad Street, Providence, R. I. Naturalized, southern district of New York, November 17, 1930, certificate No. 3236600; residing then at 37 West 49th Street, New York City.

I submit that information for the record, clarifying misinformation as to the artist’s citizenship and removing doubt as to his eligibility to compete in the mural competition.

Controversy over the Rincon Annex murals began as far back as 1941, when the artist to do the job was selected. By 1948 it had reached a stage to where critical articles began appearing in the San Francisco newspapers. One of the most critical was the Argonaut, which launched a crusade for the removal of the murals.

In 1949, the first year I was in Congress, I received letters from individuals and resolutions from civic and patriotic groups. The first resolution to reach me was from the Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West, dated May 26, 1949, which I will read for the record:

GRAND PARLOR, NATIVE SONS OF THE GOLDEN WEST,
May 26, 1949.

Hon. Hubert B Scudder,
Congressman from California.
Washington, D C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was adopted by the Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West in session assembled at Sonora, Calif., May 16-19, 1949.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas pursuant to action taken at the 1948 session of the Grand Parlor, Resolution No. 41 referring to certain murals displayed on the walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco, was submitted to the board of grand officers and by it referred to the Americanism committee for investigation; and

"Whereas said Americanism committee, following an intensive investigation of said murals rendered a report in writing incorporating its findings that said murals do not truly depict the romance and glory of early California history; but on the contrary cast a most derogatory and improper reflection upon the character of the pioneers, and that other murals are definitely subversive and
designed to spread communistic propaganda and tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare, and recommended that the Grand Parlor go on record as opposing said murals. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the findings and recommendations of the Americanism committee in connection with said murals be approved and this Grand Parlor go on record as condemning the said murals for the reasons aforesaid and that a communication be forwarded to the proper authorities advising of such action upon the part of the Grand Parlor and requesting the immediate removal of said murals; be it further

"Resolved, That our representatives in Congress from the State of California be advised of this action of the Grand Parlor and their aid be solicited in accomplishing the objects thereof."

Your attention to this request will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. REGAN,
Grand Secretary, NSGW.

The next resolution was adopted by the American Legion, department of California, in convention assembled in Long Beach, August 14-17, 1949, which I read for the record:

REMOVAL OF UN-AMERICAN MURALS DISPLAYED IN RINCON ANNEX POST OFFICE BUILDING, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF

Whereas numerous members of the American Legion and other veteran groups, the Grand Parlor of Native Sons of the Golden West, civic, fraternal, and patriotic organizations, the local newspapers, as well as public-spirited citizens, have condemned certain murals displayed on the walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco; and

Whereas various committees on Americanism of these organizations have made intensive investigations of said murals and rendered reports in writing incorporating their findings that said murals do not truly depict the romance and glory of early California history, but on the contrary cast a most derogatory and improper reflection upon the character of the pioneers; and that other murals are definitely subversive and designed to spread communistic propaganda and tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare; and

Whereas these organizations have gone on record as emphatically denouncing and opposing said murals; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That these findings and recommendations in connection with the said murals be approved by the 31st Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of California, and action be taken condemning the said murals for the reasons aforesaid, and that a communication be forwarded to the proper authorities advising of such action, with the request that these murals be removed immediately; be it further

Resolved, That our Representatives in Congress from the State of California be advised of the action taken herewith and that their aid be solicited in accomplishing the objects thereof.

Adopted by the American Legion, Department of California, in convention assembled in Long Beach, Calif., August 14-17, 1949.

The next resolution was adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion in session at Indianapolis, Ind., November 17-19, 1950, which is similar to the State resolution, and I ask that it be inserted in the record at this point.

Mr. Auchincloss. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

Resolution 32

Whereas numerous members of the American Legion, Department of California, and other veteran groups, the Grand Parlor of Native Sons of the Golden West, civic, fraternal, and patriotic organizations, the local newspapers, as well as public-spirited citizens, have condemned certain murals displayed on the walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco; and

Whereas various committees on Americanism of these organizations have made intensive investigations of said murals and rendered reports in writing incor-
porating their findings that said murals do not truly depict the romance and
glory of early California history, but, on the contrary, cast a most derogatory
and improper reflection upon the character of the pioneers, and that other murals
are definitely subversive and designed to spread communistic propaganda and
tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare; and

Whereas these organizations have gone on record as emphatically denouncing
and opposing said murals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That these findings and recommendations in connection with the
said murals be approved by the national executive committee in session in Indian-
apolis, Ind., November 17, 18, 19, 1950, and action taken condemning the said
murals for the reasons aforesaid, and that a communication be forwarded to the
proper authorities advising of such action, with the request that these murals
be removed immediately.

Resolution approved by the national executive committee of the American
Legion in session at Indianapolis, Ind., November 17 to 19, 1950.

Mr. Scudder: In 1951 I become a member of this committee, the
proper committee before which this matter should be heard. During
the year I received many additional letters and resolutions, most of
them arriving about adjournment time and in the fall. I have one
from the American Legion of California signed by Gordon A. Lyons,
but as he is here this morning to testify on the matter I will ask that
the letter be inserted for the record.

Mr. Auchincloss: If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, August 6, 1951.

Dear Congressman Scudder: At various times in the past 5 years organiza-
tions such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Associated
Farmers of California, Sons of the American Revolution, Republican Women's
Council, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, South of Market Boys Associa-
tion, Native Sons and the Native Daughters of the Golden West, the Society of
Western Artists, the local newspapers and many other groups, have objected
to the murals painted by Anton Refregier in the lobby of the Rincon Annex
Post Office of San Francisco. There has been little success in the struggle to
have these objectionable murals removed, mainly because there has been no
coordinated effort on the part of all the organizations involved. With this m
mind, we have contacted these various organizations and received from them
supporting resolutions or letter indicating that the American Legion, Depart-
ment of California, may express for them their feelings with respect to these
murals.

With this in mind, we would like to outline what our objections are to these
murals

1. Although it was supposedly their purpose, they do not reflect the glorious
and romantic history of California.

2. Historically they portray, in the most part, class struggle, racial hatred
discrimination, labor strife, violence, and political corruption.

3. These murals also include very subtle ridicule of characters which are
supposed to represent the American people. For example, in one panel where
a round table group is shown, behind the central figure, representing the United
States, is an extremely unnecessary shading which would indicate that this
person had mule-like ears. In another panel, by chance or design, the American
flag is placed in a secondary position to that of other nations illustrated.

4. The files on the Committee of Un-American Activities of the United States
House of Representatives will produce enough material to fill seven typewritten
pages on the artist's activities with organizations affiliated with the Communist
Party.

We do not feel, nor do we feel that you as California Representatives, wish
our State to be so illustrated.

Thousands of school children are brought to the Rincon Annex annually for
a tour of its facilities and for viewing these murals, and we do not feel that
the scenes depicted fairly illustrate to the children's minds the true history of
our State.
Over the past years this protest has been placed in the hands of the Commissioner of Public Buildings and he has continually given the excuse that we have not presented authentic copies of resolutions or copies of written reports or certificates of the bodies passing such resolutions which would empower us to act for those bodies. We feel that this is nothing more than a runaround, that the murals themselves are adequate enough proof of our feelings and that actually such material should not be necessary for the corrections to be made. We feel that if you, as one of our Representatives, will join with the others from our State to demand that these murals be removed immediately, we will finally reach our goal.

To summarize, we feel that the comment of the Society of Western Artists best describes the entire matter when they say of the murals, "They are artistically bad, historically absurd, and politically corrupt."

Sincerely yours,

GORDON A. LYONS, Department Adjutant.

P.S.-This is in addition to the correspondence already sent to you. All California Representatives will receive this letter.

Mr. Scudder, I decided I would try to get a hearing for these outstanding patriotic groups which were endeavoring to have these murals removed. The subject of the removal of these murals was discussed with the committee and Mr. Reynolds, and it was thought that a committee resolution would suffice to effect their removal. While discussions were held, no action was taken.

This year I felt we should act. Our subcommittee held a special meeting which was attended by Mr. Reynolds and his counsel, and it was determined that a House joint resolution would be necessary. Therefore, I introduced House Joint Resolution 211, which we have before us. Since introducing this resolution, I have received many more letters and resolutions, which I shall read in part, and ask that they be inserted in the hearings.

I have a resolution sent to the editor of the Argonaut Club of San Francisco in which they state:

The members of the executive board of the Young Democrats of San Francisco, Inc., have asked us to convey to the Argonaut our appreciation of the courageous stand you have taken regarding the Refregier murals in the Rincon Annex of the San Francisco post office.

It goes without saying that Anton Refregier has the right to paint any kind of murals he so desires, and those people who wish to buy or view those paintings have the right to do so. However, it would seem that the American taxpayers, who are unquestionably opposed to everything Mr. Refregier believes in, should not be asked to finance the display of "his works of art"

Another factor, we think, should also be considered; the fight against communism is not merely a fight against enemy guns and bullets and tanks but against enemy ideals and ideas. This makes the display of the Refregier murals in a Government building little short of treason. We are sure that if a Government official in one of the Iron Curtain countries authorized the display of murals containing democratic ideas and ideals in one of their buildings, his punishment would be swift and severe.

Sincerely,

YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF SAN FRANCISCO,
EDWARD LEVIN, President.
DEAN LIPTON, Public Relations Director.

I have a resolution similar to the one that was presented by the American Legion which was adopted by the Republican Women's Council of San Francisco at their regular meeting on June 25, 1951.

Mr. Auchincloss. Mr. Scudder, do you want that in the record?

Mr. Scudder. Yes. I would like to have these in the record.

Mr. Auchincloss. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record.
Whereas the American Legion and other veteran groups, the Grand Parlor of Native Sons of the Golden West, numerous fraternal and patriotic organizations, civic, and local newspapers, as well as public-spirited citizens, have condemned certain murals displayed on the walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office building in San Francisco; and

Whereas various committees on Americanism of these organizations have made intensive investigations of said murals and rendered reports incorporating their findings that said murals do not truly depict the romance and glory of early California history, but on the contrary cast a most derogatory and improper reflection upon the character of the pioneers; and that other murals are definitely subversive and designed to spread communistic propaganda and tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare; and

Whereas these organizations have gone on record as emphatically denouncing and opposing said murals. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That these findings and recommendations in connection with the said murals be approved by the Republican Women's Council of San Francisco, and action be taken condemning the said murals for the reasons aforesaid, and that a communication be forwarded to the proper authorities advising of such action with the request that these murals be removed immediately; be it further

Resolved, That our representatives in Congress from the State of California be advised of the action taken herewith and that their aid be solicited in accomplishing the objects thereof.

Resolution adopted by the Republican Women's Council of San Francisco, at their regular meeting, June 25, 1951.

Mr. SCUDER. I have another resolution which I will hand to the reporter from the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Without objection it will be inserted in the record.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

THE CALIFORNIA SOCIETY OF THE
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
January 11, 1950.

To the POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the meeting of the board of managers of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution held on January 9, 1950, it was voted to join with the Department of California American Legion, and other patriotic groups, in condemning the murals placed in the Rincon Annex Post Office at San Francisco, and, further, that the request be made that these murals be removed as soon as possible.

It is the feeling of the board of managers of the California Society, Sons of the American Revolution, that these murals are not in keeping with the spirit of patriotism which should dominate any public buildings of our United States Government, that the subjects chosen are controversial and ill advised, and do not represent our country and its people.

Yours very truly,

H. LEWIS MATHEWSON, Secretary.

Mr. SCUDER. Also a resolution adopted by the California Society Daughters of the American Revolution at the 42d annual State conference at Los Angeles on March 24, 1950.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record.
RESOLUTION NO. 11

Whereas Resolution No. 39 passed by the American Legion, Department of California, has been brought to our attention, and which reads, in part, as follows:

"Whereas numerous members of the American Legion and other veteran groups, the Grand Parlor of Native Sons of the Golden West, fraternal and patriotic organizations, civic groups, the local newspapers, as well as public-spirited citizens, have condemned certain murals displayed on the walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco; and

"Whereas various committees on Americanism of these organizations have made intensive investigations of said murals and rendered reports in writing incorporating their findings that said murals do not truly depict the romance and glory of early California history, but on the contrary cast a most derogatory and improper reflection upon the character of the pioneers; and that other murals are definitely subversive and designed to spread Communist propaganda and tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare; and

"Whereas these organizations have gone on record as emphatically denouncing and opposing said murals. Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled this 24th day of March 1950, commend and endorse this action: and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the American Legion, Department of California."

(Above resolution was adopted by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the 42d annual State conference at Los Angeles on March 24, 1950.)

Mr. Scudder. I have a letter from the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, of San Francisco, Calif., addressed to the chairman of the California congressional delegation, under date of May 16, 1952, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Auchincloss. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

SAILORS' UNION OF THE PACIFIC,

CHAIRMAN, CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As secretary-treasurer of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, I personally would like to add wholehearted support to the movement now under way to remove the subversive murals from the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco, Calif.

Very truly yours,

HARRY LUNDERBERG,
Secretary-Treasurer, Sailors' Union of the Pacific.

Mr. Scudder. I have another resolution from the AMVETS of California.

Mr. Auchincloss. If there is no objection, it will be inserted in the record.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

The Bay Area Council of the American Veterans of World War II held a special meeting on April 14, 1953, at the Marine Memorial Club, San Francisco, Calif., and it was unanimously voted and passed by the membership and agreed
upon by the resolution committee that the following resolution be approved and submitted to our representatives in Congress for consideration:

"Whereas the membership of the AMVETS in the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., has opposed the mural painting now displayed in the Rincon Annex Post Office, San Francisco, Calif.; and

"Whereas the painting consists of a priest holding a Red Bible in his hand, a set of guns from a naval battleship pointing out, and the American flag being misplaced with flags of other nations, representing a communistic painting; and

"Whereas the Post Office Department is a Government agency supported by the American people, who are in the battle against communism; and

"Whereas the Post Office Department represents the Government of the United States and its citizens: Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Bay Area Council AMVETS, in the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., That we oppose the mural paintings in the Rincon Annex Post Office, San Francisco, and request that their removal be enforced by necessary legislation in the Congress of the United States."

Respectfully submitted for consideration and approval by the California congressional delegation.

JAMES J. KEHOE,
AMVETS Bay Area Council Commander.

Passed April 14, 1953, at meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. SCUDDER. I have a letter from the Disabled American Veterans addressed to me.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Without objection, those letters will be inserted in the record.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 16, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT B. SCUDDER,
Congressman, First District of California,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCUDDER: We have been advised of the resolution you introduced in Congress for the removal of the murals presently displayed on the walls of the Rincon Annex, Post Office Building in San Francisco. We know that you have the support of the combined veterans and their organizations in the State of California.

The Disabled American Veterans, whom I represent as department commander, will certainly join with you and the other veteran groups in condemning these murals. Should they not be removed prior to the department convention, June 21-24, we will present a resolution for action by the entire body of the convention.

There is no doubt in my mind but that the support of all of the members of our organization will be had for this public-spirited action. Please feel free to use me or my office for any purpose which may advance the cause of the removal of the murals.

Respectfully,

E. L. JOHNSON, Department Commander.

Mr. SCUDDER. I also have a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California, under date of April 22, 1953, which reads as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif., April 22, 1953.

Congressman HUBERT B. SCUDDER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCUDDER: The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of California, wish to thank you for presenting Resolution No. 211 with reference to the murals at the San Francisco post office. Your actions are certainly to be commended and reflect true patriotism.

The Department of California on numerous occasions during the past 4 years have expressed their desire that the murals at the San Francisco post office be replaced; however, until your recent action our pleas were unanswered.
On February 4, 1953, our national commander in chief, James W. Cothran, personally inspected the San Francisco post office and reviewed the above-mentioned murals at which time he expressed his views that they should certainly be removed or replaced.

You may be assured of our continued support in your efforts in maintaining and promoting loyalty, Americanism, and patriotism.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. STEWART, Department Adjutant.

By direction of:

WALTER G. KEIL, Department Commander.

In the April 1953 issue of the pamphlet Polish Affairs published in London by the Free Poles, there is a revealing section devoted to the Communist ideology entitled “Political Inspiration in Art.” According to this article, it is through art that the Soviet Communist Party is utilizing another means of injecting their ideas of socialistic realism into the minds of people by encouraging artists to glorify the heroism and nobility of the simple man under the rulership of the Soviet.

I ask to insert an article from the Polish Affairs entitled “Political Inspiration in Art.”

Mr. AUCINCLOSS. If there is no objection, it may be inserted.

(The article referred to is as follows:)

[From Polish Affairs, London, April 1953]

POLITICAL INSPIRATION IN ART

The Council of Culture and Art, which met in Warsaw last January to survey the achievements in 1952, noted that the spirit of “ideological offensiveness” was slackening among artists and writers. There were apparently throwbacks into antirealistic aesthetic theories, flights from the present day, and signs of “incorrect” interpretations of the national tradition. With respect to painting and sculpture, this criticism was made more articulate in Mr Sokorski’s (Minister of Culture and Art) summing up of the 1952 national exhibition, some kind of Polish Salon d’Automne. The exhibition, he said, laid bare certain fundamental mistakes in the present stage of development of painting and sculpture along the lines of “Socialist realism.” The experiment to show the “new ideological content” was the use of the “old, kameral, postimpressionist means” should be considered as miscarried and the postimpressionist ways of expression be, therefore, rejected; they represent the artistic superstructure of the decadent bourgeois era, inappropriate to express the “great human truth” of our time. The “social-political and ideological attitude of the artist,” proclaimed Mr. Sokorski, exercises a decisive influence on the “value of an object of art.” The antirealistic tendency among Polish painters and sculptors hindered them from seeing the world in its true shape, the true being defined as the typical and the typical singled out for them by the Communist Party, according to a revealing passage in Mr Malenkov’s speech to the 19th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Typical, said Mr. Malenkov, does not mean the statistical average but that which expresses the essence of the given social-historical phenomenon. “A deliberately magnified image, brought out in salient relief, does not exclude typicalness; it reveals the typical more fully and emphasizes it. Typicalness is the main sphere of the manifestation of partisanship in realistic art. The problem of typicalness is always a political problem.” Since Polish artists were still failing to understand the intricacies of political problems, a more crude criterion was necessary to sift the grain from the chaff in their work. It is, perhaps, worth noting that at the 1952 national exhibition the first prize for painting was given to the picture with the caption “Gogol,” the first and second prizes for sculpture to “Belojannis’ Mother” and “Head of a Soviet Soldier.”

Literature also received its share of blame. An article in Trybuna Ludu, reviewing the recent literary production in Poland in the light of Mr Malenkov’s speech, accused it of naturalism, which “in spite of appearances to the contrary is far away from truth.” A great realistic art goes deeper and seeks for the
typical, in Mr. Malenkov's sense. Through typicalness, political problems and the party approach come to the fore. "An intended overemphasis in artistic presentation, in order to expose and to brand bad, false, and harmful men—class enemies, bureaucrats, careerists, egoists, misers, idlers, etc.—who slow down the Socialist construction, and a poetic exaggeration revealing the spiritual beauty, moral stamina, and creative passion of the architects of socialism, make of the art of Socialist realism a gravedigger of the old and a midwife of the new Socialist world." Trybuna Ludu has only one piece of advice to show how this literature can come into being—by a serious study of leading Soviet art, which is imbued with a deep humanism and with the moving truth of the heroism of the simple Soviet man.

Mr. Malenkov's pronouncement on typicalness which inspired the rising wave of criticism and exhortations to Polish artists and writers marks the stage when the Communist Party becomes openly and directly the supreme arbiter in matters of art and literature. Socialist realism has been unmasked from its last pretension to be a new way of seeing, experiencing, and describing the world. For the writer and artist it spells the coming of what Mr. Milosz called in La Grande Tentation the fourth stage, that of voluntary action, in their relation to the party and the state. Although actually not told what they should paint or write about, the time comes when they feel an irrepresible inspiration to glorify Mr. Bierut in a poem or portrait, to express their emotional experience on reading the communique of the state planning commission, or to immortalize a cow in People's Poland, which, under the leadership of the Communist Party, is able to provide more milk than was ever possible in the capitalist Poland.

Mr. SCUDDER. I feel these murals are ill-advised and slanderous to the American people and endeavor to belittle the United States of America and its history and its institutions.

At this time I would like to call on the next witness we have, Congressman Donald Jackson.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Jackson, would you take the witness stand, please?

STATEMENT OF HON. DONALD L. JACKSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. AUCHINCLOS. This is Donald L. Jackson, Congressman from California.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I certainly feel Congressman Jackson needs no introduction to the Members of Congress and the members of the committee, or the patriotic organizations of America, for the splendid work he is doing to get rid of communism in the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At this time I should like to state that I am here as a Californian and as a Member of Congress rather than in my official capacity as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I believe that there is material which I have brought this morning which is relevant to this matter and which should, as background material, be included in the hearings on this subject.

Public records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities contain the following information concerning Anton Refregier. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by, or findings of, this committee. It should be noted that the subject individual is not necessarily Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler, unless otherwise indicated.

Mr. Walter S. Steele testified in August 1938 before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities that Anton Refregier was one of the instructors at the John Reed School of Art, operated by the New York branch of the John...
Reed Club (public hearings, vol. 1, p. 560). Anton Refregier was a member of the Writers' Bureau of the John Reed Club, as shown in the Daily Worker of July 15, 1933; he was an artist for the same club, portraying revolutionary themes (Daily Worker, March 21, 1934, p. 7); and in 1934 and 1936, he was one of the instructors at the John Reed Club School (JRC Bulletin for April 1934, p. 4; the Daily Worker of February 14, 1936, p. 5). In a report released March 29, 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the John Reed Clubs of the United States as having been "named after the founder of the American Communist Party."

The Daily Worker of March 21, 1932 (p. 2), revealed that one A. Refregier was the artist for a pamphlet published by the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, cited as having been "until 2 years ago, the name of the Communist front for Negroes. The name was later changed * * * in 1936, to the National Negro Congress." (See report of the special committee * * * dated January 3, 1939; also cited in a later report dated March 29, 1944.)

Anton Refregier has been an artist and cartoonist for New Masses, as shown in the following issues of the publication: December 1930 (p. 13); January 1931 (p. 19); October 1931 (p. 10); September 29, 1936 (p. 18); January 5, 1937 (p. 11); January 26, 1937 (p. 8); March 9, 1937 (p. 11); April 13, 1937 (p. 15); May 11, 1937 (p. 20); January 4, 1938 (p. 19); January 11, 1938 (p. 18); February 1, 1938 (p. 13); March 1, 1938 (p. 21); June 14, 1938 (p. 7); February 18, 1941 (p. 33). One, A. Refregier, was named as a contributing artist to New Masses’ second annual art auction in the issue of that publication for April 1, 1941 (p. 25); one individual named Refregier (with no name or initial given) was named as having contributed to the third annual art auction which was held under the auspices of New Masses (see issues of Mar. 24, 1942, p. 25; Mar. 31, 1942, p. 27; and Apr. 7, 1942, p. 27). In the April 28 (1942) issue of the publication, Anton Refregier was named as one of the contributing artists to the New Masses art auction. He was a member of the committee for art auction, New York City, which was held under the auspices of New Masses (see Feb. 9, 1943, issue of New Masses, p. 29); he was named as member of the committee for New Masses fourth annual art auction in the New Masses for February 23, 1943 (p. 27); and New Masses for February 8, 1944 (p. 31) revealed that he was a member of the committee for New Masses fifth annual art auction.

New Masses of April 2, 1940 (p. 21) published a petition to the President of the United States, defending New Masses and requesting him “to exert your influence to end this attack on freedom of the press. * * * Anton Refregier was one of those who signed the petition. He was named as contributing editor to New Masses in the issues dated April 30, 1946 (p. 2) and July 22, 1947 (p. 2); a contribution by another, A. Refregier, appeared in the September 1981 issue of that publication (p. 22).

New Masses has been cited as a “Communist periodical” by the Attorney General of the United States (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688); it was cited as a national circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in a report released March 29, 1944; the publication had previously been cited in reports of the special committee dated January 3, 1939, and June 25, 1942.

Beginning with the March 1948 issue, New Masses and the Marxist quarterly, Mainstream, combined to publish a monthly magazine known as Masses and Mainstream. Anton Refregier participated in a demonstration sponsored by Masses and Mainstream, as shown in the Daily Worker of May 25, 1948 (p. 13); his address was shown as New York. He was named as a member of the permanent committee for the Masses- Mainstream art auction in the Daily Worker of February 20, 1948 (p. 13), and contributed to the October 1948 issue of Masses and Mainstream (p. 58); drawings by Anton Refregier appeared in Masses and Mainstream for November 1, 1949 (pp. 89 and 91).

Anton Refregier contributed to the Daily Worker of April 2, 1936 (p. 5); an article by him appeared in the October 13, 1949, issue of the same publication (p. 10). The Daily Worker was cited as the “chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party” in Report 13 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; the publication had previously been cited in reports of the special committee, dated January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; and June 25, 1942. It was cited as the “official Communist Party, United States of America, organ” by the Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1920 released May 11, 1943.
Illustrations by Anton Refregier appeared in Fight magazine for August 1937 (p. 46). Fight was the official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism, later known as the American League for Peace and Democracy. He signed a statement on the international situation which statement was released by the American League for Peace and Democracy (New Masses of Mar. 15, 1938, p. 19); a leaflet, Art for China, dated March 12-26, shows that Anton Refregier was one of the sponsors of an exhibition and sale of art, held by the China Aid Council, a subsidiary of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

The American League Against War and Fascism was established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union. The American League for Peace and Democracy was established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism and was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International (United States Attorney General, Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684).

These quotations, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, are quotations from the official reports of the committee.

Both organizations were cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948) and as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (reports dated January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). The American League for Peace and Democracy was also cited in reports of the special committee dated January 3, 1941, and January 2, 1943.

Anton Refregier was one of those who signed an open letter in defense of Harry Bridges, cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944. The open letter, signed by "more than 600 prominent Americans * * *" requested President Roosevelt to use his Executive authority 'to rescind the Attorney General's (Francis Biddle) decision' ordering the deportation of Harry Bridges, west coast labor leader. Their action was revealed with the publication by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties of an open letter to the President of the United States of America," which analyzed "the public reaction to the deportation order issued by Attorney General Francis Biddle on May 28, 1942 * * *" The open letter also pointed out that "It is equally essential that the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded." (See: The Worker of July 12, 1942; the Worker for July 19, 1942, p. 4, in which the entire open letter is printed; and a booklet entitled "600 Prominent Americans Ask President To Rescind Biddle Decision," published September 11, 1942, by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which contains the entire open letter dated July 11, 1942.)

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *" (United States Attorney General, Congressional Record, Sept 24, 1942, p 7687); the National Federation * * * was cited as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Rept. 1311 of Mar. 29, 1944); the organization had previously been cited in reports of the special committee dated June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943. In Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947, the organization was cited as being "actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law " The United States Attorney General included the national federation in his lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

A printed program of the Artists' Front To Win the War dated October 16, 1942 contains the name of Anton Refregier in a list of sponsors. The Artists' Front To Win the War was cited as a Communist front in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.

The Daily Worker of April 22, 1946 (p. 4), reported that Anton Refregier, identified as an artist, lent his support to the May Day parade "The May Day
parade in New York City is an annual mobilization of Communist strength" (Rept. 1311 of the special committee * * * dated March 29, 1944).

The official program of the American People's Meeting of the American Peace Mobilization (held in New York City, April 5, 1941) shows that Anton Refregier was one of the sponsors of the American Peace Mobilization. The American Peace Mobilization was cited by the United States Attorney General as "formed in the summer of 1940 under the auspices of the Communist Party and the Young Communist League as a front organization designed to mold American opinion against participation in the war against Germany * * *" and was included in his list of subversive and Communist organizations (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948). In Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, the American Peace Mobilization was cited as "one of the most seditious organizations which ever operated in the United States"; it was cited previously by the special committee in reports of January 2, 1943, and June 25, 1942.

Anton Refregier was one of the members of the United American Artists who signed a letter to President Roosevelt, issued by the organization, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 16, 1941 (p. 7). He was among the artists who contributed drawings to the book, Winter Soldiers, which was published by the Committee for Defense of Public Education with the cooperation of the United American Artists Workshop Group. Both the United American Artists and the Committee for Defense * * * were cited as Communist-front organizations in the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities released March 29, 1944.

The call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6-8, 1943, issued by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, contains the name of Anton Refregier in the list of sponsors of the organization; a letterhead dated March 18, 1946, and a memorandum issued by the council on March 18, 1946, named him as one of the sponsors of that organization; he signed a statement of the council praising Henry Wallace's Open Letter to Stalin in May 1948 (from the pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, p. 9). In this connection, Mr. Refregier was identified as an artist and his address was shown as San Francisco, Calif.

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as a Communist Party front in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities March 29, 1944, and was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

Letterheads of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee dated February 26, 1946, and May 18, 1951, named Anton Refregier as a national sponsor of that organization. A letterhead and a mimeographed letter dated April 28, 1949, show that Anton Refregier, Woodstock, N. Y., was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and that he signed an open letter of the organization, addressed to President Truman concerning Franco Spain. In 1951 he signed the Spanish Refugee Appeal's petition to President Truman "to bar military aid to or alliance with Fascist Spain" (mimeographed petition attached to letterhead of May 18, 1951). He was a member of the National Reception Committee for Madame Irene Joliot-Curie, as was shown on the invitation issued by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee for a dinner in her honor held in New York City, March 31, 1948.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as a Communist-front organization in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944. The organization was also cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

Anton Refregier was one of the sponsors of a National Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born which was held in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25 and 26, 1947, as shown on a program and the call to the conference. He was named as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in the following sources: Letterhead dated December 11-12, 1948, Daily Worker of April 4, 1951 (p. 8), in which his address was shown as Woodstock, N. Y.; and a typed portion of coupons issued by the American committee to be used in appreciation of contributions received on behalf of Communists facing deportation, part of exhibit 52 in testimony of Matthew Cvetic before the committee; photostatic copy of undated letterhead of the 20th Anniversary National Conference * * * U. E. Hall, Chicago (December 8-9,
1951; letterhead of Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, April 30, 1951; Daily Worker of August 24, 1951 (p. 8); and an undated letterhead which distributed a speech of Abner Green at the conference of December 2-3, 1950. The Daily Worker of August 10, 1950 (p. 5), listed Anton Refregier as a signer of the American committee's statement against denaturalization.

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" in Report 1511 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944; it was also cited as a Communist-front organization in the special committee's report of June 26, 1942. The American Committee was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948).

In the spring 1947 catalog of the California Labor School, Anton Refregier was listed as a member of the faculty or lecturer (p. 46); in this same catalog he was named as a member of the Arts Advisory Council of the California Labor School (p. 42). He spoke at the California Labor School, as was shown in the Daily Worker of Aug. 11, 1947 (p. 11), and the Daily People's World of December 1, 1947 (p. 4). He was named as an art instructor at the California Labor School in the Daily People's World of March 11, 1948 (p. 5); he signed a letter in defense of the school, as was shown in the Daily People's World of June 2, 1948 (p. 5), and was judge for the art carnival held by the school (Daily People's World, Nov. 7, 1947, p 5). In the yearbook and catalog for 1948 issued by the school, he was named as an instructor and lecturer (pp. 28, 33, and 38).

The California Labor School was cited as a subversive and Communist organization by the United States Attorney General in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948).

In the summer 1948 catalog of the Jefferson School of Social Science, Anton Refregier was listed as an instructor or guest lecturer (p. 39); he was named as teacher of a class in creative painting and composition, in the school's winter 1950 catalog (pp. 42, 43, and 57); his photograph, as an instructor at the school, appeared in the Daily Worker on January 24, 1950 (p. 5); the spring 1950 catalog named him as one of the instructors (p. 44); he lectured at the school, as was shown on the sixth-anniversary dinner invitation issued by the school on January 27, 1950.

In the March 29, 1944, report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, it is noted that "at the beginning of the present year the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy were merged into the Jefferson School of Social Science"; the school was cited as an "adjunct of the Communist Party" by the United States Attorney General (press release of Dec. 4, 1947).


Anton Refregier, artist, was a member of the program committee of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace which was held in New York City, March 25-27, 1949 (Daily Worker, Feb. 21, 1949, p. 2); he was a sponsor of the conference, according to the "call" and the conference program. The Cultural and Scientific Conference was arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. As reported in the Daily People's World of March 29, 1948 (p. 5), murals painted by Mr. Refregier were defended by the National Council of the Arts.* * *. He signed a resolution against atomic weapons, released by the National Council * * * (mimeographed list of persons who signed, attached to a letterhead of the council dated July 28, 1950). A letterhead of July 28, 1950, named him as a member of the board of directors of the National Council * * * as did a leaflet, Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention 1950. He signed a statement in support of Henry A. Wallace (Daily Worker, Oct. 19, 1948, p. 7), signed a statement protesting curbs on lawyers in political trials (Daily Worker, Mar. 10, 1952, p. 8), and endorsed a resolution calling for a hearing of Tunisia's demands in the United Nations (Daily Worker, June 2, 1952, p. 3), all of which were issued by the National Council * * *.

The Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace was cited as a "supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations" in the Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference * * * released by this committee April 19, 1949. The
National Council * * * was cited as a Communist-front organization in the same review.

An officials leaflet of the American Sponsoring Committee, World Congress for Peace, Paris, April 20-25, 1949, listed Anton Refregier among those who joined in sending "our warmest greetings to the World Peace Congress." The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the World Peace Congress (Paris, April 20-23, 1949) as a Communist front among the "peace conferences" which "have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic defense pact" (H. Rept. 1954, Apr. 26, 1950, p. 10; Interim Statement on the Communist Peace Petition Campaign, July 13, 1950; and H. Rept. 378, Apr. 1, 1951, p. 16).

Anton Refregier, artist of Woodstock, N. Y., endorsed the World Peace Appeal, as was shown on an undated leaflet entitled "Prominent Americans Call for * * *" (received Sept. 11, 1950). The World Peace Appeal has been cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at the meeting in Stockholm, March 16-19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal'"; and as having "received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and all Communist Parties throughout the world" (Committee on Un-American Activities in the Report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, Apr. 1, 1951, p. 34).

The Daily Worker of May 1, 1951 (p. 11), named Anton Refregier as a sponsor of a contest arranged by the American Peace Crusade for songs, essays, and paintings advancing the theme of world peace. Mr. Refregier's address was shown as Woodstock, N. Y. He was one of the sponsors of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace held in Chicago, June 29-July 1, 1951, by the American Peace Crusade (leaflet of the "crusade" and the "call" to the Congress). The Daily Worker of December 14, 1951 (p. 7), reported that Anton Refregier was to be the host at the American Peace Crusade's reception in honor of Charles White, a Negro artist, scheduled for December 15.

The American Peace Crusade has been cited as an organization which "the Communist Party established" as "a new instrument for their 'peace' offensive in the United States" and which was heralded by the Daily Worker "with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives" (Committee on Un-American Activities, statement on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and H. Rept. No. 378, Apr. 1, 1951, p. 51).

A letterhead of August 21, 1949, listed Anton Refregier among those who signed an open letter to Senators and Congressmen urging defeat of President Truman's arms program; the open letter was released by the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, cited by this committee as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949 and as having been instigated by "Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign" (Rept. 378, Apr. 1, 1951, p. 56).

Anton Refregier was a sponsor of the American Continental Congress for World Peace, Mexico City, September 5-10, 1949, as shown on the "call" to the Congress and the program in Spanish (p. 7). This committee cited the American Continental Congress * * * as "another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere" (Rept. 378, Apr. 1, 1951, p. 21).

Anton Refregier spoke at a rally held on behalf of the Communist leaders convicted, October 14, 1949, of advocating overthrow of the United States Government and destruction of American democracy by force and violence; the rally was held under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress, as was shown in the Daily Worker of June 21, 1949 (p. 2). He was named as an additional sponsor of the Bill of Rights Conference of the Civil Rights Congress which was held in New York City, July 16-17, 1949, in the "Call to a Bill of Rights Conference" (p. 11). In Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Civil Rights Congress was cited as being "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "Controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Rept. dated Sept. 2, 1947). The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948).
It is noted that Anton Refregier, Woodstock, N. Y., signed a statement defending the 12 indicted Communist leaders, which appeared in the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 9); the same statement appeared in an advertisement in New Republic of March 28, 1949 (back cover). He was a sponsor of the National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders, as was shown on the organization’s letterhead of September 9, 1949. The Daily Worker of May 16, 1952 (p. 3) reported that Mr. Refregier was a sponsor of a conference to be held June 14 at St. Nicholas Arena, New York City, under auspices of the National Conference to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims; on August 11, 1952, the same publication listed him (on p. 3) as a signer of a telegram greeting Eugene Dennis, Communist, on his 45th birthday, under auspices of the National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims. He signed a letter “upholding right of V. J. Jerome to publish his pamphlet Grasp the Weapon of Culture,” which was cited as an “overt act” in the Smith Act indictment of Jerome (Masses and Mainstream, May 1952, p. 27).

Parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, I should say that the V. J. Jerome herein referred to was a Communist Party functionary in the cultural section of the Communist Party, who was sent to Los Angeles to establish a beachhead in the moving-picture industry in that city.

The Daily Worker of August 23, 1951 (p. 1) reported that Anton Refregier was a member of the Committee for Freedom of the Press which pledged aid for continued existence of the Communist Daily Worker. He signed an open letter to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization condemning the arrest of Rose Nelson Lightcap (“vice president of the Emma Lazarus division of the Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order, and wife of Daily Worker reporter Harry Raymond”) under the McCarran Act (Daily Worker, October 25, 1950, p. 2). The Daily Worker of November 18, 1952 (p. 8) reported that he was to participate in a theater rally to secure clemency for the Rosenbergs, November 19, Palm Gardens, New York City; Ethel and Julius Rosenberg were convicted of espionage and sentenced to death. He signed a brief submitted by the Cultural Workers to the October 1949 term of the Supreme Court of the United States in behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo, two of the so-called Hollywood Ten who were convicted of contempt of Congress for their refusal to affirm or deny Communist Party membership before a congressional committee. He signed a statement in support of Pablo Neruda, Chilean Communist, as was reported in the Daily Worker of April 10, 1950 (p. 2). The Daily Worker of May 4, 1948 (p 11) reported that he signed a statement attacking the Mundt anti-Communist bill.

That, Mr. Chairman, constitutes the documented information which I have obtained from the committee. Again I should like to stress that I am not appearing as a member of the committee, but simply as a Californian and a Member of Congress who feels that this material should be considered in the discussion which will hereafter take place with respect to this subject.

Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you very much, Mr. Jackson. We are very grateful to you for your statement, which was factual. It will be of assistance to us in our deliberations. I would like to ask you a question.

Have you seen these murals yourself?

Mr. Jackson. I have seen photographic duplications of them—representations of the murals; yes, sir.

Mr. Auchincloss. But you have not seen them?

Mr. Jackson. I have not personally seen the murals.

Mr. Auchincloss. Have you an opinion as to their—I do not like to say worth, but as to their subversive qualities. Have you an opinion about them?

Mr. Jackson. Well, sir, I should hate to pose as an art critic. I believe from the reproductions I have seen that several murals in
question are in my opinion not truly representative of the history of California, nor of the institutions which they profess to represent.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. You think they are foreign to Americanism?

Mr. JACKSON. Let me say, sir, if they were in the Capitol of the United States I would join in protesting them.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Have you any questions, Mr. Scudder?

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I have just received two letters with the records of the people who selected the artist for this work—Victor N. Arnautoff, Arnold Blanch, and Philip Guston. The first two voted in favor of Mr. Refregier. Philip Guston voted against.

There is a record on the first two and none on the third. As long as you have read the other records, would you mind reading this into the record?

Mr. JACKSON. I am sorry, Mr. Scudder, but I do not have them with me.

Mr. SCUDDER. I have them here from Mr. Velde's committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Again I should like to make it clear that these reports as indicated by the opening paragraph do nothing more than set forth the information in the possession of the committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. One question, if I may. Do you recognize the papers that you have as being authentic articles from the files of your committee?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, I do.

Mr. McGREGOR. The letters that have just been handed to you by Congressman Scudder?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, sir. I do.

The documents which have just been handed to me report the following, subject to the opening statement that I have made.

VICTOR N. ARNAUTOFF

According to the Daily Worker, December 10, 1952 (p. 4), Dr. Victor Arnautoff was a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for the leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act.

A photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the 20th Anniversary National Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, U. E. Hall, Chicago, Ill, December 8-9, 1951, listed Victor Arnautoff as a sponsor of that organization. He signed a statement of the American Committee * * * against denaturalization as shown by the August 10, 1950 issue of the Daily Worker (p. 5). The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee * * * as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

Victor Arnautoff, artist, San Francisco, was a delegate to the American Continental Congress for World Peace as reported by the September 21, 1949, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 5). According to the September 16, 1949, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 2), Victor Arnautoff was a speaker at the American Continental Congress for Peace; his speech was reprinted in the October 6, 1949, issue of the newspaper (p. 5). The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 21), cited the American Continental Congress for Peace as "another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere."

A pamphlet, We Can Keep Peace (p. 3), published by the American Russian Institute of San Francisco, 1950, listed Victor Arnautoff as a San Francisco sponsor of the Committee To Welcome the Dean of Canterbury. According to
the New York Times of September 21, 1948 (p. 5), the Committee To Welcome the Dean of Canterbury was formed in 1948 when the State Department refused to grant a visa to Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, because his proposed visit to the United States was sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, an organization on the Attorney General’s list.

The American Russian Institute of San Francisco was cited as a Communist organization by the Attorney General in a letter released September 21, 1948.

The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The special committee ***, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council *** as follows: “In recent months, the Communist Party’s principal front for all things Russian has been known as the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship.”

Victor Arnautoff was a member of the faculty or a lecturer at the California Labor School as shown by the spring 1947 catalog of the school (p 44), in which he was identified as a painter; assistant professor, Stanford University, graphic arts department; instructor, California School of Fine Arts; painted murals in San Francisco, the bay area and Texas. He was listed also as a member of the faculty of the school in the Yearbook and Catalogue, California Labor School, 1948 (pp. 25, 36), and in the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947, (p. 54). According to the Daily People’s World of November 7, 1947 (p. 5), Victor Arnautauf was a judge at an art carnival given by the California Labor School.

I should point out the spelling is very slightly different there.

His engravings were exhibited by the California Labor School as reported by the June 22, 1948, issue of the Daily People’s World (p. 5). On June 10, 1952, the Daily People’s World (p. 7), reported that Victor Arnautuff would discuss realism in Russian and Soviet art at the California Labor School on June 11. The Attorney General cited California Labor School as a subversive and Communist organization at 216 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948.

The Daily People’s World of February 10, 1948 (p. 3) listed Victor Arnautuff as a signer of a letter to the President, released under auspices of the Civil Rights Congress, protesting against the deportation of Communists.

The Attorney General cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The congressional committee ** in its report of September 2, 1944 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties): “dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party” and “controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it.”

Art criticisms by Victor Arnautuff are found in the Daily People’s World issues of April 19, 1948 (p. 5), and September 17, 1948 (p. 5). The Daily People’s World was cited as “the official organ of the Communist Party on the west coast” by the special committee ** report, March 29, 1944 (p. 95).

A thorough search of the public records, files, and publications of this committee has failed to reveal any information concerning Adolph Blanch and Philip Gustin.

The next document which I have reads as follows:

SUBJECT: ARNOLD BLANCH

The public records, files, and publications of this committee reveal the following information concerning Arnold Blanch:

Arnold Blanch signed a public statement of the American Committee To Save Refugees, as shown by an undated leaflet, For the Rescue of Refugees, published by the organization. The American Committee To Save Refugees was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944.

According to New Masses of March 16, 1937 (p. 26), Arnold Blanch was a sponsor of a Send-Off Dinner for the Ambulance Corps, March 16, 1937, of the American Artists and Writers Committee of the Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy. “In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist
cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * such as * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 82).

A program, Artists' Front To Win the War (dated October 16, 1942, p. 5), named Arnold Blanch as one of the sponsors of the Artists' Front To Win the War, cited as a Communist front by the special committee * * *, report, March 29, 1944.

Arnold Blanch was a sponsor of the China-Aid Council, as shown by a leaflet, Art for China Exhibition, dated March 12–March 26. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the China-Aid Council as a "subsidiary" of the American League for Peace and Democracy (Report of June 25, 1942, p. 18). The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as "designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special committee * * *, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League * * * as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States * * *".

A lithograph by Arnold Blanch entitled "The Cornfield" appeared in the December 15, 1936, issue of New Masses (p. 31). New Masses was cited as a "Communist periodical" by the Attorney General (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688). The special committee * * *, in its report of March 29, 1944, cited New Masses as a "Nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party."

Arnold Blanch signed a statement by American Progressives on the Moscow Trials, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 28, 1938 (p. 4) and in New Masses of May 8, 1938 (p. 19).

That completes the information, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

Mr. Steed. Who selected Arnautoff and Blanch?

Mr. Scudder. I believe that will come out better in the testimony of Mr. Reynolds. He is the man who has charge of that.

I do desire to thank Mr. Jackson very much for clearing up some of the background because we feel it is important that the associations influenced the type of murals that were developed. We appreciate very much your being with us, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Jackson. I should like to say in conclusion, if I may, Mr. Chairman, that this dossier from the files represents one which would be considered, in relation to others, a very lengthy record.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. Scudder. Thank you very much, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Auchincloss. At this time, with the consent of Mr. Scudder, I would ask Mr. Reynolds, the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration, if he will take the stand.

STATEMENT OF W. E. REYNOLDS, COMMISSIONER, PUBLIC BUILDING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Reynolds. I do not know if you have a prepared statement to make or not, but your office, I understand, has had a great deal of correspondence and a great deal of information, naturally, about this subject. In response to a letter sent to you by the clerk of this committee, certain questions were asked in that letter and you answered them. For the record, I want to ask you those questions at this time and you can give your answers, and any members of the committee who would like to question you may do so, and we will have that in the record.

Mr. Auchincloss. On April 12, 1941, who in the Public Buildings Administration made the announcement of this contest to paint the murals?
Mr. Reynolds. We had in those years a section called the Section of Fine Arts and the announcement was made by them. It was headed by Edward Bruce.

Mr. Auchincloss. Under what authority?

Mr. Reynolds. The authority is contained under the basic statutes of the Public Buildings Act of 1926.

Mr. Auchincloss. Does “American artists” mean artists who were American citizens at the time of the competition?

Mr. Reynolds. Not necessarily so. It may from a strictly legal standpoint, but that issue is not involved here because the man was an American; but the connotation usually is that people who have been working in this country for a great many years, similar to an American writer who was considered English for years and years because he was writing in England and later became an English citizen.

Mr. Auchincloss. That means artists who were in America whose work had been accepted?

Mr. Reynolds. That is right.

Mr. Auchincloss. How many artists competed in this competition?

Mr. Reynolds. Eighty-two.

Mr. Auchincloss. Was each and every entry examined and passed upon?

Mr. Reynolds. It was.

Mr. Auchincloss. Who selected the jury for determining the winner of the contest?

Mr. Reynolds. The Section of Fine Arts selected the jury.

Mr. Auchincloss. With the approval of the Commission?

Mr. Reynolds. That is correct.

Mr. Auchincloss. Was the selection of Refregier unanimous?

Mr. Reynolds. No. It was 3 to 1.

Mr. Auchincloss. Who was the dissenting member?

Mr. Reynolds. Philip Guston.

Mr. Angell. Did you say 2 to 1?

Mr. Reynolds. It was 3 to 1.

Mr. Scudder. Mr. Chairman, one of them was a member of the Commission, was he not, and not an artist?

Mr. Reynolds. That is right. That would be a 2-to-1 vote of the artists themselves.

Mr. Auchincloss. Can you tell us who the dissenting member was?

Mr. Reynolds. Philip Guston.

Mr. Auchincloss. What reasons were given for his dissent?

Mr. Reynolds. The following is quoted from the report of the jury dated October 9, 1941:

Relative to design No. 23, Mr. Guston said: “In my estimation although some of the designs in submission No. 23 fell down in their design and mural quality a number of the panels had strong mural dignity and penetration of the drama involved in the contents and surpassed the best work of submission No. 31.” (No. 31 was the submission by Mr. Refregier.)

Mr. Auchincloss. Who announced the results of the judging?

Mr. Reynolds. It was announced by, Mr. Bruce, who was the head of the Section of Fine Arts at that time.
Mr. Auchincloss. You sent us a copy of the contract with your letter?

Mr. Reynolds. That is right.

Mr. Auchincloss. I ask unanimous consent that this contract be inserted in the record at this point. There is no objection, and it will be so inserted.

(The contract referred to is as follows:)

FORM 8651—PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

CONTRACT OF ANTON REFRIGIER, OF WOODSTOCK, NEW YORK, FOR PAINTING 27 MURALS FOR U. S. POST OFFICE AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, RINCON ANNEX

Dated: October 21, 1941.

Amount: $26,000.00.

Copy assignment: CG O FM/F FINE ARTS ARTIST PER

Public Buildings Administration, November 21, 1941

Approved by direction of the Federal Works Administrator.

J. W. Cook,
Chief Counsel.

WA1pb 3339

CONTRACT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ANTON REFRIGIER, ARTIST

THIS AGREEMENT, entered into this 21st day of October, 1941, between the United States of America, acting by and through the Federal Works Administrator, represented by the Commissioner of Public Buildings, Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency (hereinafter called the "Commissioner"), and Anton Refregier of Woodstock, New York (hereinafter called the "Artist"), witnesseth that the parties hereto do mutually agree as follows:

ARTICLE 1. Scope of contract.—(a) The Artist, for the consideration hereinafter mentioned, shall furnish the materials and render the services required in the preparation and furnishing of 27 preliminary designs, 27 full size cartoons, and 27 murals; and shall perform all work required for execution of the murals in the spaces provided therefor in the public lobby of the San Francisco, California, Post Office, Rincon Annex; and shall furnish an 8" by 10" negative and photograph of each of the 27 completed full size cartoons and the 27 completed murals. All of the foregoing, and all rights of the Artist therein, shall become the property of the United States and shall be delivered to the Government prior to the final payment hereunder, but the Artist may copy same with the written permission of the Commissioner or his duly authorized representative.

(b) The murals are to cover a total approximate area of 2,574 square feet and are to be located consecutively in the following order:
MISSION STREET LOBBY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7' wide by 6' 9&quot; high, 47 square feet</td>
<td>&quot;In the Beginning, Waters Covered All Earth Except Mount Diablo.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10' 4" wide by 6' 9" high, 110 square feet | "To the Caucausian There Was No Land Beyond the Bay."
| 7' wide by 6' 9" high, 47 square feet | "Mission"
| 10' 4" wide by 6' 9" high, 110 square feet | "Fort Ross—Russian Trading Post."
| 10' 4" wide by 6' 9" high, 110 square feet | "Overland Trek Westward."
| 15' 6" wide by 6' 9" high, 138 square feet | "Building the Mission Dolores."
| 3' 1" wide by 6' 9" high, 21 square feet | "Gold Rush."
| 7' 2" wide by 6' 9" high, 42 square feet | "Migration."

SPEAR STREET LOBBY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6' 5" wide by 6' 9" high, 36 square feet | "Importation of Chinese Labor."
| 15' 6" wide by 6' 9" high, 105 square feet | "Waiting for Mail."
| 3' 1" wide by 6' 9" high, 21 square feet | "Clearing the Ground."
| 20' 6" wide by 6' 9" high, 138 square feet | "Building the Union Pacific."
| 8' 9" wide by 6' 9" high, 54 square feet | "Surveyor."
| 17' 7" wide by 6' 9" high, 117 square feet | "Embarcadero."
| 7' 2" wide by 6' 9" high, 42 square feet | "Expansion of the City."

MISSION STREET LOBBY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7' 6" wide by 6' 9" high, 51 square feet | "Cable Car."
| 18' 0" wide by 6' 9" high, 125 square feet | "Luther Burbank."
| 40' wide by 6' 9" high, 213 square feet | "1906—the Great Earthquake and Fire."
| 15' wide by 6' 9" high, 105 square feet | "1910—Preparedness Day."
| 16' wide by 6' 9" high, 108 square feet | "Maritime and General Strike."
| 49' 5" wide by 6' 9" high, 223 square feet | "Oakland—the Fair, 1948."
| 20' 7" wide by 6' 9" high, 139 square feet | "1938—Building Golden Gate Bridge."

(c) The medium of the murals is to be tempera on gesso.
(d) The preliminary designs shall be in full color and in the scale of 1" to the foot. The Artist shall, without additional expense to the Government, revise the said preliminary designs until they meet the requirements of the Commissioner.
(e) The Artist shall not proceed with the execution of the murals until the Commissioner or his duly authorized representative has approved the Artist's detailed description of the method of executing the murals in place.
(f) All work under this contract shall be completed within 1,095 calendar days after the date hereof unless such time shall be extended by the Commissioner.

Article 2. Fee and Payments.—The Artist shall be paid Twenty-Six Thousand Dollars ($26,000.00) in full payment for all services rendered under this contract.

Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000.00) will be paid when seven preliminary designs in full color and twenty designs in black and white are furnished and approved by the Commissioner.

Two Thousand One Hundred Forty-Eight Dollars ($2,148.00) will be paid when twenty designs in full color are furnished and approved by the Commissioner. The murals are to be completed in such order as the Commissioner may approve or direct and the amounts specified in the following schedule will be paid when the prospective cartoon and murals (including photographs and negatives) are completed and approved by the Commissioner:
The balance of the fee, in the amount of Two Hundred Sixty Dollars ($260.00) will be paid when all services of the artist hereunder are finally completed. This payment shall constitute final acceptance of all services required under this contract to the extent that final acceptance of the whole or any part of the work has not otherwise been made in writing by the Commissioner.

Article 3. Care of the Work.—The Artist, without additional expense to the Government, shall be responsible for all damage to persons or property that may occur as the result of the Artist's fault or negligence in connection with the prosecution of the work, and shall be solely responsible for the care and protection of work performed until completion and final acceptance thereof by the Commissioner, and shall restore any work damaged prior to said final acceptance. Insurance on the work shall be carried by the Artist, without additional expense to the Government, and such evidence of same shall be furnished as may be required by the Commissioner.

Article 4. Inspection.—The Artist shall furnish at all times convenient facilities for inspection of the work by authorized representatives of the Commissioner.

Article 5. Abandonment or indefinite deferment of work.—If the Commissioner shall deem it expedient, or it shall become necessary on behalf of the United States, to abandon or indefinitely defer the work under this contract before completion of the services to be rendered thereunder, the Artist shall be entitled to such just compensation, in lieu of the fee hereinbefore stipulated, as may be agreed upon in writing at the time; provided, that in case of the inability of the parties hereto to reach such an agreement, the Commissioner shall fix the value of the services so to be specifically compensated, and his decision shall be binding upon the parties hereto, subject to written appeal by the Artist within thirty days to the Federal Works Administrator, whose decision as to the amount of such compensation shall be final and conclusive on the parties hereto; and provided, further, that the payment by the United States of such compensation shall be in full and final settlement for all work theretofore performed by the Artist, and all said work shall upon said payment become the property of the United States to the same extent as provided in Article 1 (a) above.

Article 6. Termination.—If the Artist violates any of the terms or conditions of this contract, or if, in the opinion of the Commissioner, the conduct of the Artist is such that the interests of the United States are thereby likely to be placed in jeopardy, the Commissioner may by written notice to the Artist terminate this contract, in which event all work theretofore performed by the Artist shall become the property of the United States to the same extent as provided in Article 1 (a) above; provided, however, that the Artist shall receive equitable compensation for such services as shall, in the opinion of the Commissioner, have been satisfactorily performed up to said date of termination; such compensation to be fixed by the Commissioner, whose decision shall be binding upon the parties hereto, subject to written appeal by the Artist within thirty days to the Federal Works Administrator, whose decision as to the amount of such compensation shall be final and conclusive upon the parties hereto.

Article 7. Officials not to benefit.—It is an express condition of this contract that no Member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, shall be admitted to any share or part of the contract, or to any benefit to arise therefrom.
In witness whereof, the parties hereto have executed this contract as of the
day and year first above written.

ANTON REFREGIER, Woodstock, N. Y.
The United States of America,

By NEAL A. NIELICK,
Acting Commissioner of Public Buildings, by
Direction of the Federal Works Administrator.

Witnesses:

CLARA SKINNER GUY.
ELIZABETH TERRELL.

This contract is authorized by the acts of March 31, 1930; June 22, 1936;
and June 21, 1938, as amended.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. Did Refregier have to attest to American citizen-
ship in signing the contract?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. Was he a citizen at that time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. How did he become a citizen?

Mr. REYNOLDS. He was naturalized on November 17, 1930, in New
York, with certificate No. 328-6600.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. That was about 11 years before the contest?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. What country is he a native of?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, I am speaking from memory only. I think
he was born in Moscow of French parentage.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. Who decided upon approval or rejection of a
proposed panel?

Mr. REYNOLDS. At the time that this particular selection was made
the recommendations were made by the Chief or the Assistant Chief
of the Section of Fine Arts. It had to have my approval, which you
would recognize in a case of this sort would be purely pro forma.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. Whose word was final?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My word was final, unfortunately; and that is where
I am in trouble at the present moment.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. By what standards were panels considered con-
troversial?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, there is no standard of art, as far as we know.
We have a tremendous mass of correspondence in connection with this
project, both for and against. My interpretation of art is, at least it
should be in good taste in order to be acceptable.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. What was the personnel of the Commission of
Fine Arts at the time objection was made to the development of certain
murals?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Gilmore D. Clarke of New York City was the chair-
man in those days, and Dave Finley of Washington was also a member.
He is now the present chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts.

William T. Aldrich of Boston; L. Andrew Reinhard of New York
City; Maurice Sterne, of Mount Kisco, N. Y.; Frederick V. Murphy
of Washington; Lee Lawrie of Easton, Md.

That is the full Commission.

Mr. AuCHINcLOSS. It is a fact, is it not, that some of these panels
were rejected originally by the Commission and the artist made
changes therein, and they were subsequently approved?
Mr. REYNOLDS. There were quite a number of changes. In one case the views of the Commission of Fine Arts were requested, but those changes were finally made and the murals were accepted.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Were any suggestions for changes rejected by the artist?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not think there was any outright rejection. Of course, there were differences of views between the artist and people who were objecting, but generally they were resolved.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I think that completes the questions I have. Do any members of the committee have any questions they would like to ask at this time?

Before we question Mr. Reynolds, I would like to know, do you have a statement you would like to make yourself?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No. I have given this matter a good deal of thought. Unfortunately we have no one in the Public Buildings Service as far as I know who is competent really to pass upon this question. So I begin to put myself in the position of a Member of Congress as to how he would answer this question.

I think I would be guided by two factors: One, I would not be basically concerned with the artist's background, but I would view the mural itself and determine in my own mind whether it was subversive or not. In making that determination, however, the circumstantial evidence of the background of the artist would be taken into consideration. If I felt it was subversive in character I would vote for its rejection.

I would probably also vote for rejection—and this is a very controversial question, because most artists would take an opposite view, and a great many people would—but I rather have the view that in a public building which is paid for by the taxpayers of the United States that if there is any part of that building which is in the form of art or architecture which is abhorrent to a substantial number of people living in the area, I think that would be sufficient to have it removed.

I would want to satisfy myself in voting for or against this on those two basic questions. In the latter case I am not talking about organized propaganda, but I am talking about the fact that there is a real substantial group that is opposed to it.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Reynolds, a letter has been received from the General Services Administration addressed to Mr. Dondero, the chairman of our full committee, which I would like to insert in the record at this time, unless there is objection.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington 25, D. C., April 28, 1953

Hon. George A. Dondero,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Dondero Reference is made to your letter of March 19, 1953, enclosing copy of House Joint Resolution 211, and requesting the views of the General Services Administration on the measure.

House Joint Resolution 211 would direct the Administrator of General Services to take such action as may be necessary for the prompt removal of the mural paintings on the lobby walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office Buildings, San Francisco, Calif. This direction is prefaced by recitals that it has been brought to the attention of your committee that these mural paintings have been criti-
cized by civic groups, veterans' organizations, and patriotic and fraternal societies, as well as by local newspapers and numerous individuals, as being artistically offensive and historically inaccurate; and that the murals cast a derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers and the history of the State of California.

This Administration does not believe that it should take a position on the policy question inherent in this proposed legislation. Suffice to say that, should the Congress see fit to enact the joint resolution, we would interpose no objection.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL FORBES Acting Administrator.

Mr. Auchincloss. I will not read the full letter except the third paragraph which I think is pertinent to this part of the testimony. The first paragraph merely acknowledges receipt of an inquiry from the committee. The second paragraph describes the provisions of House Joint Resolution 211. The third paragraph reads as follows:

This Administration does not believe that it should take a position on the policy question inherent in this proposed legislation. Suffice it to say that, should the Congress see fit to enact the joint resolution, we would interpose no objection. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Are there any questions the members would like to ask Mr. Reynolds?

Mr. Steed. Mr. Reynolds, is the California case the only mural or art controversy that has come to your attention?

Mr. Reynolds. There is one other. It was up in Maine. The people up there objected to a mural and offered to put one in its place. Legislation was introduced and passed which directed us to remove the present mural and accept a mural as donated by the citizens of the community.

Mr. Steed. Were many of the objections to that mural based on the feeling it was subversive?

Mr. Reynolds. Not basically there. It was more that it was out of keeping with the community itself in architecture and background, and also the architecture of the building itself. We quite agreed, or at least I did, that it should be removed, but I had no authority to do so. At that time we had no authority to accept gifts either. We do now, which arose out of that very case, as a matter of fact.

There is a bit of information in connection with this facing, or mural design, which I didn't know anything about until yesterday. I don't know whether it can be applied to these murals or not, but I was told by Mr. Finley, who is the Director of the Mellon Gallery and also the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, that there are methods of removing a painting on plaster and backing it up with lint, which I never knew before. But it is a very expensive process which in this case I would not recommend. However, there is that facet to the problem if it arises.

Mr. Steed. Has it been your feeling, or have you ever formed any opinion about this case, or any other cases in the past, that the fine arts activity was infiltrated by subversive elements, or that efforts have been made to use it?

Mr. Reynolds. At the time that this work was going on—you have to go back to the depression days and think of the WPA artists—quite a lot of money in buildings in those days was put into art embellishment of various kinds. There was an art section set up in our shop
because we were doing a lot of buildings all over America. We do not have this setup at all any more. We do not, as a matter of fact, have competitions any more. This was handled by a national competition. We now select the artists, and we are very careful to know all about their background before we enter into a contract with them.

Mr. Steed. I believe you said there were 82 contestants in this case?

Mr. Reynolds. Eighty-two. Yes.

Mr. Steed. Did they submit a sketch, or some proposal as to what their ideas were?

Mr. Reynolds. That is right.

Mr. Steed. And all this material was examined by the Commission?

Mr. Reynolds. That is right.

Mr. Scudder. Mr. Reynolds, did the artists select the titles to the pictures or were the titles developed by the committee?

Mr. Reynolds. No. In the final development of it I think the titles were selected by the artists themselves.

Mr. Scudder. In other words, all these artists who were competing had to develop their own ideas of the type of picture they were going to portray, and it was their responsibility to develop the historical facts of the pictures which they painted?

Mr. Reynolds. Well, yes. They were not tied down basically to historical facts. That is, it could be a mural depicting other things in California which would be appropriate. I have seen these murals at different times, and I have talked with people who have seen them. The general feeling is, of those who have seen them, who are not artists, that the color is very good; they question the subject matter; and that is the point of the question here. I think that no one has raised a point either for or against the technique of design, that it, the technique of application, such as coloring and things of that sort. It is the subject matter they are objecting to and the manner in which these subjects are portrayed.

Mr. Scudder. That is right. In my opening remarks I said as far as I was concerned, and I believe it is the thinking of those who are protesting the murals, it was not a matter of whether the artist was a good artist and had a good perspective of what he was doing. Our complaint is that they were injecting propaganda in the pictures which was offensive to the people who see them.

Mr. Auchinloss. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Angell. Yes. Mr. Reynolds, you say you have seen the pictures?

Mr. Reynolds. Yes.

Mr. Angell. In your judgment do they comply with the standards you have enumerated before the committee?

Mr. Reynolds. Is that an official question or a personal one?

Mr. Angell. A personal one. Your personal view, Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. Reynolds. My personal view is I do not like the murals.

Mr. Angell. And they do not comply with the standards that you have just enumerated to me?

Mr. Reynolds. It would be very questionable in my mind that they comply. Yes.

Mr. Brownson. Mr. Chairman, that is the same question I had. I found your criteria very helpful in the decision we are going to have to make.
Mr. Reynolds. I do want to reiterate that is a personal view, because I have not qualified as an artist to pass an official view on that question.

Mr. Steed. Mr. Reynolds, if it is decided that these murals are to be removed I believe you commented a minute ago on this, there is no way to remove the murals from this place to some place else? They would have to be lost in the change?

Mr. Reynolds. No. Mr. Finley told me yesterday they could be retained and put on canvas. But as I view it, if these murals are sufficiently objectionable so that they should be removed from the Rincon Annex they should not be put up in another Federal building. It might be some museum would like them, in which event there is a process, I understand, where you cover up the mural itself and then you cut out the plaster and cover it up with a canvas. You cut out the plaster and remove the plaster on the back and replace the plaster with a canvas, and then you have a fresco, or a painting on a canvas.

I never heard of the process before, but they say they can demonstrate it and have examples of it in the Mellon Gallery now.

Mr. Steed. That being true, and if some nongovernmental agency desires to do that at no expense to the Government, what recommendation would you feel like making?

Mr. Reynolds. Would you state that question again?

Mr. Steed. If some independent agency, whether a museum, or a private citizen, wanted to preserve these murals and wanted to remove them from this building with no expense to the Government, what would be your view?

Mr. Reynolds. I would be delighted if they would do that.

Mr. Steed. You would prefer that as against the proposition of having to paint over them or destroy them?

Mr. Reynolds. Yes. Because there are a lot of people that think they have great artistic value, and if some museum feels that way and wants to preserve them, I would say yes.

Mr. Auchincloss. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Steed. No, sir.

Mr. Reynolds. Can I introduce one further statement, Mr. Chairman, which I think should be given some consideration here in your determinations? There are a considerable number of these murals—too many, in fact. I think we spent too much money. Some of them there has been no objection raised to. Some of them there are rather violent objections raised to. The committee may wish to take that phase of it under consideration, also.

Mr. Auchincloss. If there is nothing more, Mr. Reynolds, thank you very much.

Mr. Brownson. In connection with that question, am I correct in thinking that what Mr. Reynolds is suggesting is that it is possible some small portions of these murals might be covered or removed and the balance left?

Mr. Reynolds. That is correct.

Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you, Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. Scudder, would you like to proceed now? You have been interrupted in your presentation.

Mr. Scudder. That is all right.

Mr. Auchincloss. Would you yield for just a minute? I was going to ask Mr. Brownson if he would take the chair, because I have an important engagement I have to keep at this time. At the con-
elusion of your statement, Mr. Scudder, I will suggest that the committee adjourn until 2 o'clock this afternoon. We will continue at that time.

Mr. Brownson. Mr. Scudder will proceed.

Mr. Scudder. Mr. Chairman, I have before me photographs of the panels in the Rincon Annex post office and desire to pass them around for review by the committee.

The No. 1 panel is entitled "In the Beginning, Waters Covered All Earth Except Mount Diablo."

It shows a very vigorous, strong Indian, with strong features, muscles, and physique, which I would imagine was the way we found the Indian in California. I believe the artist desired that it be shown that he was a strong individual. While it does not in my opinion draw a true picture of the aborigines of the West, it does show a strong physique, and I am not one who is qualified to judge art, and I dislike to make the statements I am going to make from an artistic standpoint. It is my own layman's view of what they are.

No. 2 is a picture of three Indians in a canoe.

Off the record please.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Scudder. You will note again that No. 2, entitled "To the Costanos There Was No Land Beyond the Bay," again depicts the native aborigines in the area, but I desire to call your attention to No. 6. If you will, view No. 6, which is entitled "Mission."

There you find the priest depicted as a big-bellied individual talking to some Indian maidens, while the gaunt, starved, expressionless characters who are Indians are doing the labor work at the mission. I feel there has been on the part of the artist a plan to criticize the missions and the people who were developing and formulating California.

No. 3 is "Drake." That is depicting the English people as warlike and, as the Communists would call them, warmongers who were merely exploiting the area to which they were then claiming possession.

No. 4, "Spain Claims the Bay." There again you have the warlike attitude of the Spanish, that they were conquering this area.

No. 5 is "Building the Mission Dolores." There it shows cadaverous monks who are engaged in that work, which I feel is very objectionable to people who appreciate the work done by the Franciscan Fathers and those who developed California and brought civilization to the west coast of our country.

No. 7 is "Fort Ross—Russian Trading Post." This shows a powerful big Russian sitting, and in the background is Fort Ross. Now, I know something about Fort Ross. That is the county of my birth and I was responsible for the restoration of Fort Ross. It is not a true picture of Fort Ross. This would look as if they had founded a church and that they were trading with the Indians, and it looks more like a fence about and near the buildings which were erected there. For your information I might state that the stockade at Fort Ross is square, built of large redwood trees. Instead of a building at one corner as you see, it was an actual fort, with large bastions, with gun holes for them to fire in any direction so as to intercept anyone who might be approaching that fort from any direction. It was a typical fort such as you would find constructed in those early days,
and not just a trading post where it would be thought that only friendly relations existed.

Now, No. 8, the "Overland Trek Westward." I think this is a very poor subject illustration. This picture shows that after an Indian raid—and I imagine that is what he is trying to depict—that these cadaverous, soulless Americans who were going across the continent, and were making ready most of them on their horses, were walking away and leaving their dead behind for the elements to take care of them. I do not believe that any of the pioneers who crossed the plains would have done that. They at least would have given them an honorable and Christian burial before they walked off and left them to the elements. It is a very annoying type of picture to have in any public building.

No. 9, "1847—Printing the California Star." I do not know what that endeavored to depict in that except you notice the printer has a sidearm, a pistol, which would indicate that a man had to carry a pistol in order to go to work in San Francisco. Then you have a man in full dress and who is apparently the editor and owner of the paper. Down on his knees before him is an urchin who was folding papers. I don't know whether they intended to develop that that was a slur at child labor or not, but there is that implication that developed; and many people feel that is what the artist was endeavoring to show.

No. 10, "1846—California Becomes an Independent Republic." In California we have an organization made up of American-born citizens—the Native Sons of the Golden West. From them springs a strong resentment that these characters represented our forebears who were instrumental in assisting and taking over California from Mexican rule. We take the raising of the Bear Flag as the insignia of independence and honor and the development of a better civilization. These characters represented here fall short of that which we cherish.

I might say that my grandparents came to California in 1852. One of them, by way of the Isthmus of Panama; one in an ox train across the continent. I remember my grandparents and I knew men who participated in the raising of the Bear Flag at Sonoma in my home county. I assure you it displeases me to see such characters displayed as representing those heroic, stalwart pioneers.

Then we have No. 11, "Gold Discovered at Sutter's Mill." There you have some characters I have never seen in history, with a hat that is far from the kind worn by the early pioneers. It puts them in a position where they are offering thanks to God for having given them the opportunity of discovering gold. Again you might feel that the artist's conception of these men was that they were offering thanks to God that they had been able to find this gold, depicting the thing which the Communists claim, we are only seeking the golden riches in our mode of life.

The next picture, No. 12, shows the "Gold Rush." Well, except for the characters involved I do not know but what that is all right. It shows the different types of mining, with gold panning, and dug mines, and sluice mining, but the characters are entirely objectionable as the forebears of the civilization we have in California.

The next one, No. 13, is "Migration." It shows different types of people who migrated to San Francisco and landed at the docks. Except for the hideous faces and their ill shape I could see no particular
objection to it other than that. I do not think there is any propaganda developed in that picture.

No. 14, "The First Labor Demonstration on Market Street." It is hard to tell whether it is a labor march, or what it might be. The people all have a sadist expression on their faces. This is one of the controversial art pictures in which one of the members, or one of the group, is carrying a banner. Because of the great objection they put a longer handle on the banner and put the banner out of sight. It is still there. To give you a better picture I have here photographs appearing in the People's World sent to me a couple of days ago which show the original, the present mural was developed later after objections were raised because it did stir strife.

No. 15, "Waiting for the Mail." Well, I don't know what he had in mind regarding this scene—you will notice one man in the rear of those waiting for the mail would appear to be about 6 feet 3 inches with a head about the size of a Florida grapefruit. And other characters are lying around despondent and haggard, and so forth, a sort of moronic assemblage of people that were there seeking the mail.

No. 16 shows, "The Surveyor." I can see nothing wrong with that except the type of individual and how the artist continually dwarfs the head for some reason or other in all of these characters.

No. 17, "The Building of the Union Pacific." Well, this was hard labor. I guess we have all done some hard labor, but this scene portrays that it was accomplished mostly by Chinese. A little further along you will find the reason for the depicting of this. I do not believe it is meant to develop a good relationship with our Asiatic friends. We are trying to develop better friendship with all countries of the world; we are endeavoring to assist them to rise and be self-respecting. This would rather give the impression that they were brought over more as slave laborers than anything else.

No. 18, "Clearing the Ground." Well, except for the characters that are set up I do not see any chance of them getting any propaganda into that picture.

No. 19, "The Vigilantes." This depicts two men facing one another, one about to fire a pistol at the other. It shows the vigilantes with dress suits and top hats carrying guns, and on the outside another man being hanged by the neck, and other people milling around on the street. It has a hideous effect, I believe, and while it was necessary for the vigilantes to be formed in order to preserve peace and to stop the lawlessness that developed, the people engaged in this voluntary peace movement were not all top hatted, but all decent people who were then residents of California had to enlist themselves in order to stop the reckless lawlessness that developed.

Then in No. 20 he brings in the slave issue to develop the strife between the North and the South. I do not believe the picture is well done, and it is entirely unnecessary in one of our public buildings.

The next picture, No. 21, entitled "Sand Lot Riots," depicts the beating of Chinese. I cannot for the life of me see where that is of importance nor is it realistic. One of these men, dressed in these peculiar clothes and funny hats which were not commonly worn in the days of early California, has a Chinese by the queue and is beating him over the head. To the left is another individual who has hold of another Chinese by the hair and is also beating him.
I do not believe that this ugly scene had a bearing on the development of California. I do not believe that this scene represents the development of the Golden West. If it did happen, it is similar to riots that happen every day in some country. Its purpose, I believe, was to alienate the Chinese during this critical period.

Then to the left it says, “Join the South,” and so forth, showing that they are trying to bring out those things in the history of the United States which were objectionable rather than those things which were conducive to the development of our country.

No. 22 is “Cultural Life in San Francisco.” Well, maybe that is culture. We have a peculiar looking girl over to the left and then we have a group of people who are standing about. I don’t know whether any San Franciscan will admit that this scene depicts the cultural life of San Francisco. Not as I know San Francisco or remember it as a child.

Then we have No. 23-A, “1906—The Great Earthquake and Fire.” Of course, that was a terrible thing that happened in San Francisco. I do think it was entirely responsible for the building of the beautiful city of San Francisco, that we had to have an earthquake and a fire with all the death, suffering, and confusion, in order to build our western civilization. But to aggrandize the horror that existed as the important part of the building of the great metropolis of San Francisco, I cannot subscribe to.

The next is 23-B, “1906—The Great Earthquake and Fire.” This also shows and is supposed to depict a leveling of people. It portrays that we have to have something like the earthquake and fire to level our people. It shows people helping and administering to the injured, soldiers serving soup, and so forth. We have the various people working together. Of course, all peoples work together in a catastrophe, but is that the only way that people can work together, by having to have something like that happen? I think that is what the artist endeavors to depict; that we have to have something terrible happen if we are ever to get the American people to work together in a common and useful cause.

No. 24, “1916—Preparedness Day.” Well, we all remember the bombing of the preparedness parade in San Francisco. It was done by only a couple of people who were involved in that hideous crime. We were about to engage in war and this parade was being given to arouse to the danger confronting us. Then some people who would like to have disrupted the effort and to level criticism at our Government, threw a bomb into that Preparedness Day parade. They depict Mooney and Billings being sent to jail. In the center there is a peculiarly developed man who was supposed to be the judge, with his hand on the Bible, sending these men to prison for a crime they were convicted of.

Then No. 25 is “Maritime and General Strike.” Well, I don’t know. There are various interpretations on what this shows. It shows a man taking money from the masses with one hand and passing it out to the laborers with the other. It shows the American flag in the background. It shows strikes and various other disturbances all developed in the picture. I don’t think those are the things that made California great.
No. 26 says, "Building the Golden Gate Bridge and Shipyards." Well, I remember that very well. I do not see anything particular in it, but I viewed the men working, and they did not seem to be quite of the character that is developed there.

The next picture is 26-B, "Building the Golden Gate Bridge and Shipyards," again. Other than the unrealistic individuals engaged there I can see no propaganda in that picture except possibly that we have too much while others have little.

Then No. 27 shows the Four Freedoms. They show almost a hopeless group of men and children that I do not believe existed in California, which were brought into this picture. They are rather cadaverous looking. As you notice here, you have the cannons with the British flag above the American flag, and the sickle and hammer are just below the American flag. They depict the swastika and the men are standing around the globe of the world feeling that justice has finally been done. That is the picture the newspapers have stated that the artist painted a picture of someone similar to Mr. Underwood, who voted against this artist, and he depicted him in the picture as having long mule ears, this seems to be the prerogative of an artist to put his peeves in his art.

That completes the listing. I believe a thorough study of these murals would convince most anyone that they are not historically correct. They are grotesque in their appearance. I do not believe they lend any authentic information to those who might visit the post office that would enlighten them on the history and the building of California. There seems to be nothing in these pictures that would be anything but depressing. I do not believe that one of the murals shows a smile, or the indication of a smile, or contentment, or encouragement. They are all depressing and expressionless.

What the artist was endeavoring to convey is beyond me, except that we are unemotional and unsympathetic in the development of the State of California and the building of the West.

The hour is now past 12. I have two more witnesses to appear. The chairman has stated that we would adjourn until 2 o'clock. So that concludes my statement at this time.

Mr. Brownson. Are there any questions by any members of the subcommittee that they desire to direct to Congressman Scudder before the recesses?

(No response.)

Mr. Brownson. The committee will recess and resume its hearings at 2 o'clock in this room.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the committee recessed until 2 p.m. of the same day.)

**AFTERNOON SESSION**

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2 p.m., pursuant to recess.)

Mr. Auchincloss. The committee will come to order.

I understand Mr. Fred I. Drexler desires to be heard. Is he in the room?

Please identify yourself for the record. We would be glad to hear your statement, Mr. Drexler.
STATEMENT OF FRED I. DREXLER, SR., OF MILL VALLEY, CALIF.

Mr. DREXLER. My name is Fred I. Drexler, Sr. My home is in Mill Valley, Calif., which is a suburb of San Francisco. I have lived in that area for about 25 years and in California for 43 years. I am a retired newspaperman, having owned a chain of country newspapers—a half dozen of them—over a period of years.

I am well acquainted with the Rincon post office and the paintings and have long been perturbed by them, but have been helpless, of course, to do anything about them until visiting Washington this week with my good wife on our golden anniversary. I learned that this move was in the breeze, was in the air, and I am very glad to make my statement, and I appreciate the privilege of saying my say regarding these things. I shall be very glad to know that they have been changed or removed in accordance with the request of the American Legion. I think that their communist origin is shown in details—in subtle details—that the Communists know so well how to do.

On visiting the Rincon post office one time I talked to one of the employees of the Government and he expressed his dissatisfaction with them and stated his opinion that inasmuch as he had to work there and see them every day that he worked there the Government ought to increase his pay to make up for his suffering in seeing these murals. I tended to sympathize with him and do believe that if our liberal Government, so liberal with its money, wants to it might increase his pay as a bonus for the suffering he says he has to undergo in viewing them.

While I am a member of the Society of Artists, which as an organization is taking the other side, I want to express my antagonism to the murals and my trust that they will be removed, with all their suggestiveness and their subtle communist propaganda.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Do you want to ask any questions?

Mr. Scudder. No, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much, Mr. Drexler, for your contribution.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Mr. Gordon A. Lyons, the adjutant of the California Department of the American Legion. Mr. Lyons, will you identify yourself further for the record?

STATEMENT OF GORDON A. LYONS, DEPARTMENT ADJUTANT, THE AMERICAN LEGION OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Lyons. I believe that is complete, Mr. Chairman. The only thing I might do, however, is to correct two errors in the statement which was mimeographed for distribution.

I refer in one place to Alfred Frankenstein, an art critic of the San Francisco Examiner, and that should be the San Francisco Chronicle.

Due to some misinformation, I referred to Commissioner Reynolds as the former commissioner. I was told that he was no longer with the group.

Rather than to repeat in detail everything that I said in my statement, I will just repeat the first paragraph with regard to the fact that I represent the American Legion in this position as well as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Associated Farmers of California, the Sons of the American Revolution, the Republican Women's Council,
the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the South of Market Boys Association, the Native Sons and the Native Daughters of the Golden West, the Society of Western Artists, and local newspapers and many other groups which have objected to the murals painted by the artist Refregier.

In the past there had been little success in our general objection due to the fact that most of these groups had individually expressed these objections. With this in mind we contracted various organizations and received from them supporting resolutions or letters indicating that the American Legion, department of California, might express for them their feelings with respect to these murals.

Mr. Auchincloss. Mr. Lyons, would you like to insert these communications in the record at this point?

Mr. Lyons. I think they are already in the record, because Mr. Scudder entered them as part of his evidence earlier in the testimony.

Mr. Auchincloss. All right.

Mr. Lyons. The resolutions and letters.

Mr. Scudder. Yes, except for the South of Market Boys Association.

I did not have their resolution.

Mr. Auchincloss. You may give them to the stenographer later, and proceed with your statement.

Mr. Lyons. Yes, sir.

(The information is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF GORDON A. LYONS, DEPARTMENT ADJUTANT, THE AMERICAN LEGION OF CALIFORNIA

At various times in the past 5 years organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Associated Farmers of California, Sons of the American Revolution, Republican Women's Council, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, South of Market Boys Association, Native Sons and the Native Daughters of the Golden West, the Society of Western Artists, the local newspapers and many other groups, have objected to the murals painted by Anton Refregier in the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office of San Francisco. There has been little success in the struggle to have these objectionable murals removed, mainly because there has been no coordinated effort on the part of all the organizations involved. With this in mind, we have contacted these various organizations and received from them supporting resolutions or letters indicating that the American Legion, department of California, may express for them their feelings with respect to these murals.

With this in mind, we would like to outline what our objections are to these murals.

1. Although it was supposedly their purpose, they do not reflect the glorious and romantic history of California.

2. Historically they portray, in the most part, class struggle, racial hatred and discrimination, labor strife, violence, and political corruption.

3. These murals also include very subtle ridicule of characters which are supposed to represent the American people. For example, in one panel where a roundtable group is shown, behind the central figure, representing the United States, is an extremely unnecessary shading which would indicate that this person had mulelike ears. In another panel, by chance or design, the American flag is placed in a secondary position to that of other nations illustrated.

4. By the artist's own statement in a letter written to Alfred Frankenstein, art critic of the San Francisco Examiner, he stated, "We rejected long ago, while on the Federal arts projects, the meaningless type of mural painting," and later added, "I knew I would step on some tender toes, particularly in those quarters which never raise a voice against the overwhelming emphasis in our present-day culture, permeated with brutality, mysticism, a negation of life, the degradation of man."

5. The files on the Committee of Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives will produce enough material to fill seven typewritten
years on the artist's activities with organizations affiliated with the Communist Party.

Thousands of school children are brought to the Rincon Annex annually for a tour of its facilities and for viewing these murals and we do not feel that the scenes depicted fairly illustrate to the children's minds the true history of our State.

Over the past years this protest has been placed in the hands of the former Commissioner of Public Buildings and he has continually given the excuse that we have not presented authentic copies of resolutions or copies of written reports or certificates of the bodies passing such resolutions which would empower us to act for those bodies. We feel that this is nothing more than a runaround, that the murals themselves are adequate enough proof of our feelings and that actually such material should not be necessary for the corrections to be made.

To summarize, we feel that the comment of the Society of Western Artists best describes the entire matter when they say of the murals, "They are artistically bad, historically absurd, and politically corrupt."

---

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,

GORDON A. LYONS,
Department Adjutant, Department of California, American Legion,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR COMRADE LYONS: In response to your letter of June 18, please be advised that about 3 years ago the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States were compelled to protest to the Postmaster General of the United States the fact that the murals painted by Anton Refregier in the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office unlawfully used the insignia of our organization in depicting a scene from the 1934 CIO waterfront strike. Our protest resulted in the alteration of this particular mural so that all identifying matter were removed.

At the time of our protest we objected to the general theme of the murals and did what we could to have all of them removed. We felt that there were many instances in the glorious history of the city of San Francisco and of the great State of California that could be substituted for the selections made and painted by Refregier which only depict those instances which are regarded as a blight to an auspicious past.

Although our remonstrances resulted in a full-scale investigation of these murals, they were allowed to remain with minor alterations.

We feel that these murals were communistically inspired and, in view of our long-standing fight against communism, we are happy to join with the American Legion in an effort to have all of these murals removed.

Feel free to call upon us at any time if we can be of assistance in accomplishing this objective.

Sincerely yours,

M. C. HERMANN,
Department Quartermaster-Adjutant.

---

SAN FRANCISCO, April 14, 1950.

MR. DONALD L. CLARKE,
Department Adjutant of the American Legion,
San Francisco, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. CLARKE: As a member of the Americanism committee of the Grand Parlor Native Sons of the Golden West, and as a member of the subcommittee appointed to investigate the murals in the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco, I advise as follows:

The committee opposed the murals for two good and sufficient reasons. One reason is that the murals do not reflect the romantic and inspiring history of California, and on the other hand, tend to ridicule and slander the State and its pioneers. They depict scenes which tend to develop class hatred and class warfare. They are very unfair to San Francisco and to California. These murals are not a matter of beauty or inspiration. They are depressing. There are many events in the history and development of California which could be depicted with great beauty and would tend to inspire a love and appreciation for our State.
Another very important reason is that some of the murals are communistic. The sickle and hammer, the emblem of the Soviet and of the Communists, are vividly and conspicuously displayed. Of the 3 panels on the east end of the main corridor, 1 is in reference to the Four Freedoms. The head of the family there shown wears a red tie, while the boy reads a large red-covered book. The predominate color in these three panels is red. These murals are definitely subversive and designed to spread communistic propaganda.

Sincerely yours,

WALDO F. POSTEL.

REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S COUNCIL OF SAN FRANCISCO,
SAN FRANCISCO UNIT,
San Francisco, July 5, 1951.

Mr. GORDON A. LYONS,
Department Adjutant, the American Legion,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. LYONS: Enclosed are three copies of a resolution, unanimously passed by our unit at its last regular meeting, condemning the murals on the walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco.

Incidentally, on January 29, 1951, this unit unanimously passed a motion to the effect that we would support any and all legislative action toward the removal of these murals. Letters to this effect were sent to the Honorable Hubert B. Scudder and to Mr. C. Plant.

If we can give any further assistance toward having these murals removed, please call on us.

Yours very truly,

A. ETHEL FERGUSON,
Miss A. Ethel Ferguson,
President.

MARILYN LEWIS,
Mrs. Henry Lewis,
Corresponding Secretary.

THE CALIFORNIA SOCIETY OF THE
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
San Francisco, Calif., June 20, 1951.

Mr. GORDON A. LYONS,
Department Adjutant, Department of California,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. LYONS: Your letter of June 18 with reference to the murals painted by Anton Refregier in the lobby of the Rincon Annex post office:

On January 9, 1950, the board of managers of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution voted to endorse the action taken by the American Legion's Department of California condemning the murals and urging their immediate removal.

We also wrote to the Postmaster General at that time and to Donald L. Clarke, department adjutant, Department of California, American Legion, and also notified Mr. Charles E. Plant, Rte. 2, P. O. Box 6, Mill Valley, Calif., of our action.

If further information is needed please let us know. We are very anxious to see the murals removed and will be glad to cooperate with the American Legion in this connection.

Best regards.

Cordially,

H. LEWIS MATHEWSON, President.

ASSOCIATED FARMERS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.,
San Francisco, Calif., July 16, 1951.

Mr. GORDON A. LYONS,
Department Adjutant, the American Legion,
Department of California, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. LYONS: We are in receipt of your letter of June 18, and apologize for our delayed answer. However, until recently the writer has been in Sacramento attending the legislature and since his return has been very busy clearing up the accumulation of work which piled up during his absence.
For us to go along with you in having the murals at the Rincon Annex obliterated needs no resolution from this organization. No. 1 of our basic principles is Americanism and we have fought every "ism" outside of that since our origin in 1834. Therefore, I would suggest that you prepare the necessary protest and I am sure you will have no difficulty in getting our signature to it.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. E. GIBBS, Executive Secretary.

SOCIETY OF WESTERN ARTISTS,

Mr. C. E. PLANT,
Mill Valley, Calif.

DEAR MR. PLANT: We, the undersigned officers and members of the Society of Western Artists, after long and careful study, are of the opinion that the murals now occupying the walls of the San Francisco Rincon Annex post offices are artistically bad, historically absurd, and politically corrupt, and should be removed.

Sincerely yours,

SOCIETY OF WESTERN ARTISTS.

Signed at the date of March 3, 1950, by:

RAY RADLIFF,
President of the Society of Western Artists.

NATIONAL SOCIETY,
DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION IN CALIFORNIA,
April 28, 1950.

Mr. DONALD L. CLARKE,
Department Adjutant, San Francisco, Calif.


Sincerely yours,

GLADYS H. LENSE
Mrs. Walter W. Lense,
State Corresponding Secretary.

RESOLUTION No. 11

Whereas resolution No. 39 passed by the American Legion, Department of California, has been brought to our attention, and which reads in part as follows:

"Whereas numerous members of the American Legion and other veteran groups, the Grand Parlor of Native Sons of the Golden West, fraternal and patriotic organizations, civic groups, the local newspapers, as well as public-spirited citizens, have condemned certain murals displayed on the walls of the Rincon Annex, Post Office Building, in San Francisco; and

"Whereas various committees on Americanism of these organizations have made intensive investigations of said murals and rendered reports in writing incorporating their findings that said murals do not truly depict the romance and glory of early California history, but on the contrary cast a most derogatory and improper reflection upon the character of the pioneers; and that other murals are definitely subversive and designed to spread Communist propaganda and tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare; and

"Whereas these organizations have gone on record as emphatically denouncing and opposing said murals;" Be it

Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled this 24th day of March 1950 commend and endorse this action; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the American Legion, Department of California.

(Above resolution was adopted by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the 42d annual State conference at Los Angeles on March 24, 1950.)
Whereas numerous members of the American Legion and other veterans' groups, the Grand Parlor of Native Sons of the Golden West, fraternal and patriotic organizations, civic, the local newspapers, as well as public-spirited citizens, have condemned certain murals displayed on the walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco, and

Whereas various committees on Americanism of these organizations have made intensive investigations of said murals and rendered reports in writing incorporating their findings that said murals do not truly depict the romance and glory of early California history, but on the contrary cast a most derogatory and improper reflection upon the character of the pioneers; and that other murals are definitely subversive and designed to spread communistic propaganda and tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare, and

Whereas these organizations have gone on record as emphatically denouncing and opposing said murals; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That these findings and recommendations in connection with the said murals be approved by the 31st annual convention of the American Legion, Department of California, and action be taken condemning the said murals for the reasons aforesaid, and that a communication be forwarded to the proper authorities advising of such action with the request that these murals be removed immediately; be it further

Resolved, That our Representatives in Congress from the State of California be advised of the action taken herewith and that their aid be solicited in accomplishing the objects thereof.

Resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of California, in convention assembled at Long Beach, Calif., August 14 to 17, 1949.

GORDON LYONS, Adjutant, The American Legion, Department of California.

DEAR GORDON: I have recently viewed with some concern the murals of Rincon Hill Annex Post Office, in San Francisco.

From my observation, the murals depict some of the history and events of California, and were painted during the years 1946 through 1949, by the artist, Anton Refregier.

Some of the early events and history of the settling of California were not tranquil and peaceful, but on the contrary were brutal, ugly, and tragic, we know; however we Californians know there have been many memorable and noteworthy events, accomplishments, and achievements worthy of commemoration. Great events, to be viewed by native Californians, as well as visitors from other States and other countries. We are not proud of the murals.

With but one or two exceptions, every mural on the Rincon Hill Annex post office walls is an unhappy, violent, or tragic scene; and in some cases flagrant injustices have been made. The murals in most instances are condemning.

As if this were not alarming enough, we now look at the artist.

In a seven-page report on Anton Refregier, who painted the murals, the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives, identifies him with dozens of subversive, Communist front, and Communist organizations, as far back as July 15, 1933.

This should be reason enough, to cause the complete removal of the murals from the walls of Rincon Hill Annex post office, and American Government buildings.

Those individuals responsible for the authorization of the painting of the murals by Anton Refregier, should be ashamed to have participated in this art spectacle.

Please add this, my protest, to those I know you have already received.

Sincerely,

EARLENE A. WOLF, Department Americanism Chairman.
Mr. Lyons. Generally the complaint was that although it was supposedly their purpose, they do not reflect the glorious and romantic history of California. Historically they portray, in the most part, class struggle, racial hatred and discrimination, labor strife, violence, and political corruption.

These murals also include very subtle ridicule of characters which are supposed to represent the American people. For example, in one panel where a round table group is shown, behind the central figure, representing the United States, is an extremely unnecessary shading which would indicate that this person had mulelike ears. In another panel, by chance or design, the American flag is placed in a secondary position to that of other nations.

I would like at this time to quote from articles which were written in the San Francisco Chronicle with reference to these murals. I think that these quotations are important, because it is my understanding that in the presentation of the citizens group from San Francisco they make a statement that none of the papers in San Francisco have ever objected to these murals.

Alfred Frankenstein, an art critic of the San Francisco Chronicle, wrote a series of four articles on these murals. He pointed out early in the articles that a letter was written by Mr. Born, Ernest Born, who was then retiring as president of the art association. He also says:

It is distinctly worth emphasising that Born defended Refregier entirely on artistic grounds. He noted that, "From time to time since the murals were painted they have been challenged and attacked as unfit for a public building," and he added that "It is the purpose of this letter to record with you not our objection to these attacks" but the favorable aesthetic opinion just cited.

In another portion of the article, discussing the requests for information on the murals, Mr. Frankenstein states:

I do not rake up this incident to work off a bit of ancient personal pique but because it seems to me to symbolize one of the major issues at stake in the Refregier controversy—a lack of responsibility on the part of those in charge toward the community for which the project was designed.

He goes on further to point out that only one local painter was a member of the board of judges, Victor Arnautoff, who served with the New York artists Arnold Blanch and Philip Guston, as well as Gilbert Stanley Underwood.

An article in the Fortnight magazine, a publication in California, refers to Victor Arnautoff as a graduate of the San Francisco Academy of Fine Arts and formerly an instructor of the California Labor School, and presently an assistant professor of art at Stanford University and currently pleading for the Rosenbergs for amnesty for the convicted Communist Party leadership.

Fortnight also refers to Arnold Blanch as an artist and member of the Award Board, who likewise sticks out through the shadows of many Communist Party causes over the years. He was an initiator of the American Artist Congress in 1936. The roots of this organization bridged the main stream of subversive thought in art circles at the time and still flower under another name. Blanch publicly endorsed the verdict of the Moscow trials in 1937 and followed the line after the infamous Stalin-Hitler pact.
In Mr. Frankenstein's articles further he describes each panel in detail. Although in some of the descriptions we do not agree, with regard to those where we have the greatest objection I will use his own description.

Panel No. 18:

Turmoil in the streets over the issues of the Civil War.

Panel No. 19:

Riots against the Chinese. At the bottom a paper reading, "Attacks upon the Chinese I consider unreasonable and antagonistic to the principles of American liberty. Frank Roney, 1875." (Roney was a prominent labor organizer at that time.)

Panel No. 23:

The Mooney case. At the left, the bombing of the parade, with a copy of The Chronicle dated July 22, 1916, and a headline reading "Patriots Pageant To Cry Prepared." In the center, 3 green figures, 1 a woman, 1 a hangman, and 1 a man symbolizing perjury, with a deformed hand clutching a Bible. At the right, Mooney and Billings in jail; in the background, hands holding placards reading "Free."

Panel No. 24:

Labor trouble on the waterfront. At the left, a strawboss pointing with one hand to a man in a job-seeking group, while with the other hand he accepts a bribe. In the center, a labor organizer addressing a group of workers in identical white caps.

I might interject at this point that there are two ideas which strike me personally with reference to this particular panel. One is that I am a native son myself of California, born and raised in San Francisco. At this point in California history, I was being supported by a father who made his living on the waterfront as a stevedore. Of the many things that I might have heard about the waterfront, which were not exactly complimentary, at no time did I ever hear of my father having to pay for a job or to kick back to straw bosses, as indicated here.

I also might point out at this point that the labor strike of 1934 was with the longshoremen, with the maritime unions, the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, which carried on a very definite part of this strike, although they are not depicted at all in this mural. One of the reasons they might not be depicted is that right after the strike was completed Mr. Lundberg, who is the head of that union, broke with the longshore union because of their communist and left-wing tendencies, and has fought them ever since. As a part of the testimony Mr. Scudder offered earlier this morning is a letter from him, asking for the renewal of these murals.

I had reference to Refregier's record, which was covered by Congressman Jackson earlier, which will not need repeating. I might point out that, in my experience over the 3 or 4 years I have been involved in this, very few of what I would term "representative groups," either of citizens or of art groups, have ever come to the American Legion as an organization in support of these murals. On the other hand, it has been consistent that left-wing and front organizations have carried the load of criticism or our positions.

A most recent criticism comes from the Daily People's World of San Francisco, Monday, April 13, 1953. I quote that they state:

The attempt to destroy these works of art represents an attack on organized labor. And the proof of this statement lies in the fact that the two panels most
vigorously attacked by self-appointed censors of public artworks deal with the 1934 general strike and the struggle for the freedom of Tom Mooney.

They also state:

We put Mr. Scudder * * * on notice that it is a matter of deep concern when such individuals decide that works of art belonging to the people and expressing the aspirations and struggles of the people must be destroyed * * *.

Another article in the Daily People's World of Thursday, April 9, 1953, states:

As an individual, I would like to go on record as being strongly opposed to the threatened removal of these murals.

Pardon me. I meant to preface this by saying that this is a letter they are quoting from Robert Howard, a sculptor, who declared that—

The San Francisco Art Commission should stand publicly in favor of these fine works and do all it can to prevent their loss.

I might add that the San Francisco Art Commission was told by the city attorney of San Francisco that they as a group could not express such an opinion. I will continue again:

As an individual, I would like to go on record as being strongly opposed to the threatened removal of these murals. The reasons set forth for their destruction seem totally inadequate when balanced by their tremendous value as works of art.

In closing, and without being repetitious, I can only state that the feelings of the American Legion and the feelings of the groups I represent are that we wholly endorse the criticism as outlined by Congressman Scudder earlier this morning.

In one of the statements of the Citizens Committee they say:

The murals speak for themselves.

and to that I will agree. We do not like what they say.

Mr. Auchincloss. Are there any questions? Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Lyons. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Auchincloss. Do you have any other witnesses, Mr. Scudder?

Mr. Scudder. No, Mr. Chairman. My witnesses have all been heard.

Mr. Auchincloss. Are there any other witnesses in the room who would like to testify in favor of this resolution? The Chair sees none.

I therefore declare the proponents' side of the case closed. We will now proceed with witnesses who are in opposition to the resolution. I see we have our colleagues here. Mr. Shelley, would you like to make your statement first?

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Shelley. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is John F. Shelley, Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District of California, which takes in about one-half of the city of San Francisco and in which Rincon Annex Post Office is located.

I have no prepared statement, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, but I have followed this matter for several years since I came to Congress and before that time; and, with your permission and your indulgence, I will make a statement at this point.
Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am a native San Franciscan, born in San Francisco, September 3, 1905. I lived through the San Francisco fire and earthquake, though we usually drop off the earthquake part. I was too young to remember it.

My mother was a native San Franciscan; and my father came to San Francisco many years before my birth as an emigrant from Ireland. My father worked on the San Francisco waterfront as a longshoreman until 1924, when he left the waterfront.

One question occurs to me, which I should like to put before the committee at this point. Based upon the presentation which has been made up to this point by the proponents of the resolution, are we challenging or trying the painter who painted the pictures? Are we challenging or trying history based upon the criticisms made by the author of the resolution or are we challenging or trying the authenticity of the paintings based upon the charge that they may be subversive?

My own answer to the first question is, Mr. Chairman, that I think the background of the painter has little to do with the charge that the paintings do not portray the true history of California. They were reviewed by a Commission. They were approved. And they had the final approval of the Director of the Public Buildings Administration at the time they were painted in the building.

If we are challenging history, I think that history is something which can be written as seen through many eyes, or which can be regarded in many lights by various students of history.

Over the years I have prided myself on my interest in Californiana and California history and now I have my staff over at the Library of Congress digging up some of the points in California history which I think will establish that historical authenticity of some of these murals, of practically all of these murals, and refute some of the criticisms made.

I would like just for the moment to go through some of these pictures, as was done by one of the proponents of the resolution.

Take what was termed picture No. 1, the picture of the Indian. The objection was that it showed a strong, muscular, sinewy individual. That may or may not be true. I did not live in that period. I do not know. I have seen the California Indians. They have the reputation of being, at least in the history books, a docile, quiet, and in most cases a very lazy type of Indian, who were not taken over much by conquest because very little conquest was needed.

I think the same thing applies to picture No. 2. I think it is simply an artist’s portrayal of what he visualized as being the Indians of that area at that time.

Picture No. 3 was criticized because it was supposed to show a warlike or war-mongering attitude on the part of the white race coming to California. We in the northern section of California, around San Francisco Bay, are proud of the association we have had in history with Sir Francis Drake, and the finding of Drake’s Bay. He missed San Francisco Bay.

But I think all the history books will show that the clothing depicted on Sir Francis Drake in this mural was the clothing being worn at the time by the explorers when they made ventures overland to safeguard themselves against possible attack by possible hostile natives in all sections of the world.
Picture No. 4 was criticized because it showed a warlike attitude, and I think that the history books—in fact, I know they would show this. I wish I had had the time to bring them over here and dig the material out, so that I could quote from the history books, including one of the most conservative histories, which is also one of the most true histories of California, Bancroft on California. History books indicate that the western country of California was invaded, if we want to call it that, by exploration parties; or was entered by exploration parties, who came up from Mexico, along the coast by ship to northern California. This scene probably depicts Portola’s view out over the San Francisco Bay and Golden Gate from the high lofty peak in San Mateo County, from which San Francisco Bay was first seen. In all of the local history there, in all the history books written about that episode, it is indicated that the explorers wore armor; also armor has been found, or pieces of armor and pieces of spears and adzes have been found around this high hilltop from which this view was seen, where the encampment was made by Portola; also, an old helmet was found several years ago over in Marin County, in Congressman Scudder’s district, which was supposed to have been a relic of the conquering Spaniards of years ago.

Now, murals 5 and 6, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, depict the monks. In one the monks are at manual work. In the other, one of the monks is obviously teaching some Indian maidens.

The Franciscan Order of Friars, led by Father Junipero Serra, pioneered the missions from Mexico clear up to Sonoma Mission in northern California, and established a chain of missions, all of which I have visited and all of which I have been through. I happen to be a Catholic myself, and as a Catholic I certainly take no offense at this depiction of the monks. I have had no Catholic prelate or representative say to me that he takes any offense.

I might point out that one of the criticisms was that in one case the monk was “pot bellied” and in the other case the monks were “cadaverous,” lean and emaciated. I do not know which type of monk the gentleman prefers. You could have both. Either you have well-fed, healthy looking monks, or you have lean, thin, hard-working looking monks; but here you have both depicted. One is working at manual labor, chopping down the trees, the other is teaching. The history of California and the history of the missions will show that the monks did work manually and physically in building the missions, and then addressed themselves, after the missions were built, to teaching the Indians, training them in trades and crafts and the use of tooling leather and in the planting and growing of crops. The Indians did do that work. One of the reasons for the success of the missions in California, as against the missions in some of the eastern and midwestern sections of the country in the early days of those areas, was that the Indians in California were not generally by nature warlike Indians and they were adaptable to agriculture. The biggest problem that the padres had was to instill a spirit of get up and go in the Indians.

I think the criticism there, by the way, is not well founded, because it tries to go both ways. I have seen lean and thin monks and priests, and I have seen fat and healthy-looking monks and priests. That is not the way I judge them or judge their part in history. It is this: Have they done well the job to which they have dedicated themselves?
I think the missionaries who came in under Father Junipero Serra did a real job, and we are very proud of that history in California.

By the way, the Mission Dolores is also in my district, and I have attended mass there on any number of occasions, and I have attended the weddings and funerals of my friends there.

Fort Ross: I might say the criticism as to the portrayal of the structure is well founded. I have seen Fort Ross many times. I have been in it. It is simply a blockhouse with an overhanging upper story with gun slots with a square redwood stake wall around it. But I am willing to allow some artist's license in that simple departure from accuracy. However, I do not think that the portrayal substantiates any charge of subversiveness or subtle subversiveness in the pictures.

Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we come to mural No. 8. It was stated that this depicted some of the early pioneers leaving some of their confreres and colleagues in the trip across the country on the plains, after a possible Indian attack, and driving on. In my mind, and I say this to show you the difference a viewer of art may have, as well as the difference which may exist between judges of art—and I am no judge of art, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee—to me this depicts one of the very terrible but very factual points in the history of California.

This mural, and I have seen the mural, always raises in my mind the incident of the Donner party at Donner Pass on the Nevada-California border. The great majority of this party was frozen to death and starved to death in one of the very bitter winters, when they were just on the verge of success and coming into the green golden valley of northern California and the upper Sacramento Valley. All but several of them starved and died during that winter and a monument has been erected at the site by the Native Sons of the Golden West to commemorate the incident.

There are any number of cases in history where parties who had trekked across the plains met that situation. I fail to see anything subversive, Mr. Chairman, in depicting the cadaver of a horse and the bodies of a couple of men who have possibly been frozen, lying on the ground, because it happened and we cannot, simply because we might not like the artist, say, "This did not happen."

An early newspaper office, San Francisco. History indicates, yes; that there were two newspapers in San Francisco. I fail to see the criticism, or the basis for criticism made here. One of those papers, in the days of the vigilantes, was even raided and its printing presses destroyed, history shows. That could explain the sidearms on one figure. Every history book I have read of San Francisco and California relates that occurrence. Small boys were used as printer's devils in the oldtime printing shops regularly. There was no legislation against child labor in those days. It was the common occurrence to employ children to fold papers.

During one period of my own life I helped myself through high school by helping fold papers. Sometimes I was sitting, sometimes kneeling, and sometimes standing, in the pressroom of the San Francisco Examiner in San Francisco.

The people of California and the Native Sons of the Golden West—of which I am a member, by the way, since I belong to the south San Francisco parlor and have belonged for some number of years. I
have a California flag in my office which I am very proud of, which they presented to me. The bear flag was raised in Sonoma in 1846, and in collusion with the American forces which had landed at Monterey, the Americans in Sonoma banded together and declared a rebellion against the Mexican Government, thereby establishing the California Republic. I was not there. We heard the testimony about tall, gaunt men with long faces. I have seen pictures in history books, which were authentic and well-accepted history books, showing the men wearing boots, showing them wearing corduroys, which show them wearing vests, which show them wearing the flat hats, which were objected to; hats which were called the California miners' hats. My own old grandfather, who died in 1913, wore one to the day of his death. It was a flat-topped black hat with a large brim, which was so typical of the oldtimers in California.

Again, I do not see anything subversive in the picture No. 10.

Picture No. 11. One man has a patch on his eye. I think men in those days probably wore patches on their eyes, as some gentlemen today might have to wear patches on their eyes. They were hard-working men. They were industrious spirits. They were men willing to take a chance. They fought nature. They fought the earth. They fought people who tried to maraud them and rob them and they became very strong, independent, invincible souls who showed ruggedness in their character, in my humble opinion; and I think these pictures depict that time in the history of California.

The panning of gold. Nobody got gold in those early days without working hard. It was panned out of streams. It was sluiced out of streams. A great deal of it was dug down deep into the earth for. I do not think any of those men sat on a chair rocking on a porch with a top hat and a long coat and a lace dickey on their front, to get the gold which made California a State, the gold which came to the benefit of this Nation and which helped this Nation preserve the Union in the Civil War.

The torchlight procession, No. 14. Some people refer to that as the first labor parade.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it happens that prior to my coming to Congress I was very active in the labor movement in California. My father before me had been active in the old riggers and stevedores union in San Francisco. My grandfather had been active in the street paving men's union of San Francisco. I come from several generations of labor people in San Francisco. I was the president and secretary for some 13 years of the San Francisco Central Labor Council and president of the California State Federation of Labor at the time I was elected to Congress.

Many an argument I have had or discussion and conversation with some of the oldtimers about the early San Francisco labor history. The first case for the organizing of labor in San Francisco was under the aegis of one Dennis Kearney, who organized the white workers, on the basis that the Chinese must go. Chinese were being imported in droves at the time. They were being used for labor. It is a factual point in California history that this fight went on. And in the building of the transcontinental railroad the Chinese were used from the West up to Utah and then the Irish gangs, hired in the East, came out from the East to the point where they met. The railroad was finally
finished mostly by Irish road crews who drove the Chinese off. It is recorded in practically every history of the time.

I come from Irish parentage and Irish background. I come from a labor background. I have been active in the labor movement. I do not think anybody with either the background of Irish parentage or labor would challenge or criticize the factual portrayal of these things, or deny they were a part of history. I still fail to have heard anything that was pointed to in that picture as being subversive.

Now, all through these pictures I could make the same comment. There are things in some of them I do not like, things some of us might not be proud of. But they are factual according to my reading of history. If there are subversive things in them let them be pointed out in particular.

There was one criticism made which I think there may be some foundation for. That was the last one of the subtlety of trying to make it appear that there are donkey’s ears on one man. I think that can be painted out or blocked out without destroying all these murals.

The fire of 1906. Picture 23. I lived through that. I was only 7 or 8 months old, so my memory of it is nil, except for what I have heard from my family. I know that for some 4 months after the fire of 1906, my father, my mother, and myself as a young infant camped in a tent issued by the United States Army in what is known as Mission Park, out at 18th and Dolores Streets, for 4 months until they could get a refugee shack built by the city government to live in for a year or so after the fire. The destruction of San Francisco was terrific, and that is a fact.

No. 19 is the vigilante days. That is probably a portrayal of what took place at old Fort Gunnybags, on Montgomery Street in San Francisco, when there was a hanging, when the citizens did mobilize with the vigilantes. At the ringing of the fire bells they would gather when these trials were held. It is historical. People to this day still argue whether it was the right or wrong thing to do. People, no matter how they argue as to whether it was right or wrong, agree that there was lawlessness and a basis for some action. But this is, in my opinion, again, humbly, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a factual portrayal of what happened. Now, I do not see anything subversive in it. At least, it has not been pointed out to my attention here today.

I will say this: The cold factual portrayal of history in any history, the history of any State, any city, of any nation of any incident anywhere at any given time, may be pleasing to some and repugnant to others, but if it is factual you cannot change history or a picture of history or a portrayal of it by saying, “But I do not like that.”

If we get into that, Mr. Chairman, then we are definitely contributing to thought control and trying to build a Nation of conformists. We have achieved our place in the sun as a Nation by not being regimented to conform uniformly to the ideas of others.

The Mooney case. Mr. Chairman, that is a very factual case in the history of California, and in the recordings of its courts and its legal history. Mr. Mooney was pardoned by a governor of California. Preceding the pardon there were several protracted trials. It was always a matter of controversy, as to whether he had been properly convicted and whether or not there had been perjury committed by
prosecution witnesses. But it happened. The Mooney case happened. Mooney was pardoned in 1939 and Billings was later released from Folsom Penitentiary.

It displays the aftermath of the 1917 Preparedness Day parade. By the way, that bombing happened just about a few minutes after I had marched past in that parade, at the very place depicted down at Stewart and Market Street. I was a boy about 11 or 12 at the time, and I was taking a part in the parade with the Sea Scouts. The parade almost broke up when the bomb went off and word came along that some people were killed. I later took part in some of the Tom Mooney freedom activity with the labor movement in California. I know that is a part of California history. Now, maybe it is not pleasant to some people to be reminded of it, but it is a part of history. This committee may have to decide, if the proponents wish to put their arguments that way, that simply because this is displeasing to some then this investment in the paintings by the Government, in the painting of factual things, should be destroyed and the money thrown away which was put into them.

The waterfront strike of 1934 happened. My father worked on the waterfront until 1924, from the day he came to this country. I worked on the waterfront between trips to sea. I know men were picked out by lining up in the shape-up. I have heard stories discussed right in my own home of the payoff to gang bosses that existed prior to the setting up of the hiring halls.

The criticism about the white caps in the 1934 strike, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, is not warranted. I was on the executive committee of the Central Labor Council of San Francisco that conducted the negotiations which brought about a termination of the waterfront strike and which conducted and terminated the general strike of 1934. At that time all of the strikers on the San Francisco waterfront wore white caps. The longshoremen, it is my recollection of the situation, the sailors, the marine cooks and stewards, the engineers and all of them that were on strike wore white caps. And the other unions, the teamsters and those that went on strike after the general strike was called, or some of them, wore white caps. To this day it is traditional in the waterfront unions that they wear white caps. They wear them because they buy them cheaply. They get soiled in their work. They throw them away easily. Most of the longshoremen wear cheap white linen caps. Most of the sailors wear cheap white linen caps. Harry Lundberg sometimes wears himself. The cap is sort of traditional with waterfront workers. I do not think this view depicts any one individual, whether it is Mr. Bridges, Mr. Lundberg, Mr. Furaseth or any of the characters who took part, or even Mike Casey of the teamsters. But the picture as such does indicate a strike meeting, and I do not think that anybody can argue that such did not take place, with very much benefit resulting to the seafaring men after the strike.

I could go on down through these pictures, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, and in fact I could point out maybe 1 or 2 places where the pictures are objectionable to me. And I will do so now.

In picture No. 20. I just want to say if there is something subtly subversive in any mural I would pick that one.

Mr. Auchincloss. Would you excuse me for interrupting? Would you indicate picture No. 20 by its title?
Mr. Shelley. The title I have is "Civil War Issues"

Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you.

Mr. Shelley. I noticed this morning that Congressman Scudder used some different titles on some of them.

Mr. Scudder. These are official, Mr. Shelley. I was reading from the official list.

Mr. Shelley. May I just comment, Mr. Chairman, that at the time of the Civil War, the War Between the States, or the unpleasantness within the Nation, California was a very key State. Every single history of California records the fact that there was great contention between proponents for the Northern cause and proponents for the Southern cause, and that the governments of the United States of America and of the Confederated States of America both had agents in California trying to win the people of California and their gold to that cause, and great public discussions were held and torchlight parades were held. So I see nothing wrong with a portrayal of it. Riots were engaged in.

But down in the lower left-hand corner one of the most prominent things in the picture is a clenched fist sticking out, the symbol and the salute of the Communists is the clenched fist. It has gotten, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, so that a public speaker has to be very careful that he in emphasizing and accentuating each point he makes nowadays by pounding out to his audience to give emphasis or something, does not have somebody who might take a picture of him in that position, and later put it in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee and say, "Here is a picture of a man with a clenched fist, which might indicate he is a criminal."

Mr. McGregor. Will the gentleman yield? Do you know of any instance which has ever taken place like the one you describe?

Mr. Shelley. No, I do not. I say one should be very careful.

Mr. McGregor. But you know of no instance such as you have described with a clenched fist?

Mr. Shelley. I did not describe any actual instance, Mr. McGregor.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, putting the clenched fist out so prominently in the picture might be some subtle propaganda for the Communist cause, but I do not think that is a basis for adopting a resolution calling for the destruction of and destroying of all of these murals. I think that fist, with some advice by people who know art, could be painted out or covered over, and the rest of the picture which is simply factual left untouched.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say I have failed to hear made point-by-point yet today any actual statement of where each picture may be subversive. The placing of the British flag above the American flag was mentioned. That is a criticism I will agree with. Possibly I never like to see the British flag above the American flag because of my Irish ancestry. I think that might be corrected, and the American flag placed in its proper position.

I think that the charge that these do not portray the true history of California can be easily controverted by a study by this committee before they come to a conclusion of the history of California. I recommend some of the most conservative histories, including Bancroft on California, which is accepted as one of the most accurate over a period of years.
I have any number of letters, Mr. Chairman, some of which just came in and which I have not had an opportunity to sort over, which I will make available to the committee clerk after this meeting, after I have a chance to go over them and sort them out.

Mr. Auchincloss. Would you permit an interruption?

Mr. Shelley. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Auchincloss. We have a great many letters pro and con on this subject.

Mr. Shelley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Auchincloss. I am going to suggest to the committee that in the interest of keeping the record within reasonable bounds we will entertain the insertion by title or just by the name of the signer of the letter for the record. Anybody who would like to refer to them then will have an opportunity to do so in the committee files.

Mr. Shelley. Fine.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal in the last several weeks from people in San Francisco and from some very eminent people, whom I am sure nobody would criticize as being subversive, being fellow travelers, or being Communist sympathizers. I have heard from the publisher of the San Francisco Chronicle. I have heard from the publisher of the San Francisco Examiner. I have heard from the members of the San Francisco Arts Commission. I have heard from any number of people opposing the destruction of these murals. The people of San Francisco generally are proud of the murals. Some will make a minor criticism of this point or that, but they feel it would be wrong to destroy the murals.

There are those who have criticized the murals over a number of years, and a great many of those who make the criticisms have not seen the murals. They have just blindly supported the resolution presented to an organization, by someone who said they saw them, and gave their own opinions of the pictures.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that it would be wrong to adopt a resolution that calls for the destruction and removal of these murals when a great many people feel the murals are not offensive until, first, a real cause is made that they are subversive or they are completely contrary to California's history; then if a case is made against only one or two pictures, it would seem to me, No. 1, that it would be far more economical, far more in keeping with the history of California and the broad traditions of San Francisco, and more pleasing to most of the people who have taken an interest in this, if those one or two points were corrected rather than destroying all these murals.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee for the time that you have allowed.

Mr. Auchincloss. We thank you very much, Mr. Shelley.

I wonder if there is anyone who has any questions.

Mr. McGregor. Do you know of any veterans' organizations or patriotic groups that favor these murals being retained?

Mr. Shelley. I have not heard of any, Mr. McGregor. The only one that I heard of was the Legion's position against them and the Veterans of Foreign Wars' opposition. I had not heard of the AMVETS.

Mr. McGregor. The AMVETS, the Legion, and others. You differ with those organizations?

Mr. Shelley. Yes, I do on this matter, Mr. McGregor.
I do not take anybody's views bindly. There are times when I agree with them. There are times when I disagree with them.

Mr. McGregor. Generally, from a patriotic point of view, the veterans' organizations are pretty patriotic and very loyal, are they not?

Mr. Shelley. Generally so; yes.

Mr. Auchincloss. In conjunction with that, I understand your position is that you do not, yourself, agree with all these murals and that you would approve some changes in them?

Mr. Shelley. I think that a very close examination should be made as to what changes, if any, are necessary. The fact that I disagree with some of the things does not mean that they should be destroyed. That is what I mean.

Mr. Brownson. Mr. Shelley, I take it that your position is that you are interested in these murals as art as such and not so much in the antecedents or affiliations of the painter who painted the particular panels?

Mr. Shelley. That is true.

Mr. Brownson. You will agree it does appear unfortunate that the commission who made the final selection of the paintings happened to have as members two men who were listed by the Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. Shelley. I think that that is a very unfortunate situation.

Mr. Brownson. Your position then is that this matter be judged as art in a public building alone, and not on the basis of history, or the unfortunate connections of the man who painted it, or the two members of the commission who awarded the commission?

Mr. George. And do you not consider these pictures a distortion of the early history of California?

Mr. Shelley. I do not consider them a distortion of the early days of California.

Mr. George. I do not mean the historical events; I mean the individuals.

Mr. Shelley. That is a pretty hard question to answer, Mr. George. I was not alive at the time of the early days and do not know what the individuals looked like. All I can do is to take the pictures and the prints and the reproductions that I have seen in other picture books.

Mr. George. You and I might be able to qualify as far as the heads are concerned of most of these folks, but I doubt if the average American did even in the early days. I have only seen the smaller pictures, and knowing that you have seen the originals, I was just wondering if you considered there was any distortion in the human element painted into the picture.

Mr. Shelley. Lord knows, I know nothing about art at all; I do not claim to be an art critic or authority. I enjoy certain types of art and there are other types of art that do not interest me, but I think that this artistic technique was probably the type of art that blocks out things, because even the fingers have a square appearance. The shoulders are square, and every article in there is sort of squared off. I do not know the type of art they call that. That is something somebody else will have to discuss.

Mr. George. They almost all more or less follow the same pattern.

Mr. Shelley. Through all the murals.
Mr. George. I am a printer by trade and not a longshoreman. That is a minor art, I guess.

Mr. Shelley. The printer or the longshoreman?

Mr. George. The printer.

Mr. Shelley. I would not say so.

Mr. George. Looking at these pictures, it just appears to me that California has certainly improved a lot since those days. It may be because we have sent people to California from the Middle West.

Mr. Shelley. We are happy to have the people. They have made good Californians.

Mr. Scherer. What was the cost of the murals?

Mr. Scudder. $26,000.

Mr. Scherer. Was that just the fee to the artist, or was it the artist's fee and the cost of producing the murals? What was the total cost?

Mr. Angell. $26,000.

Mr. Scherer. Is this Rincon annex post office an annex or a main post office?

Mr. Shelley. They call it the Rincon annex post office. It is down just off the main commercial center, the banking center, the insurance center, and on the edge of the industrial warehousing district and shipping center. It is used 90 percent by the big business offices. It is about a block away from the main Southern Pacific Railway Building, which takes in a whole city block. Its main use is by commercial business and banking houses immediately adjacent thereto. It is called an annex technically to the old Ferry post office, which is about four blocks away, a building which has been condemned, but a building they still have to use.

Mr. Scherer. I am just a freshman Member of Congress. I was wondering whether you men who have been on this subcommittee of the Public Works Committee dealing with buildings know whether we have had these types of murals in post-office buildings all over the country that were built during that era. Have we had murals before?

Mr. Scudder. I believe the testimony this morning showed there were some in Maine that were taken out. It was a made-work job to support these art schools. They were WPA projects, many of them, and created this type of work. They developed in the latter part of the thirties and the early forties.

Mr. Shelley. If I may comment, I think that this job came along in 1940-41. That is when the contract was let for the building of the post office, and the post office was under construction and close to completion before the murals were painted. The murals were not a part of the WPA program. The murals were a part of the construction.

They set up a contest, as I remember, of artists all over the country to submit their ideas, and then Refregier was selected by a jury as having the best idea of design, and there was a price negotiated with him, but it was not a part of a WPA program.

Mr. Scherer. Were these accepted in 1948?

Mr. Scudder. The awards were let for the contract on April 12, 1941, so they advertised for the composition on April 12, 1941. Evidently, it was in the making prior to that time.
Mr. Scherer. What comes to my mind is whether or not the Federal Government should be spending large sums like this for murals, good or bad, in post offices.

Mr. Brownson. Is it not a fact that at that time under the Public Buildings Act there was a provision that at least 1 percent of the money spent on the buildings should be spent on murals, or other interior artistic decorations? I believe that was in the law at that time in an effort to encourage American muralists, sculptors, and other American artists. I think they were complying with the law.

Mr. Scherer. I do not question that.

Mr. Auchincloss. I think that Mr. Reynolds testified at this time there was an effort being made to provide a certain amount of work for these artists, and the compensation was arranged for.

Mr. Brownson. This is always a subject for debate. I personally happen to think that 1 percent of the overall cost of these buildings represents a very minimum amount for the development of American art and the ornamentation of these public buildings. I think that our buildings should include art forms.

Mr. Scherer. That is in dispute—when is it an American art form?

Mr. Brownson. I am not speaking of these particular murals; I am saying that public buildings should include art forms.

Mr. Scudder. Mr. Shelley, you and I both belong to the Native Sons of the Golden West and we are very proud of our ancestry and the development of the State of California. We have such organizations as the Native Sons that wholeheartedly condemn the murals; also the various veteran organizations, and it does seem that those groups would not advocate the destruction of these murals unless they saw in them something that was not regular and did not come up to the standard suitable for public buildings, and you are not in accord, as you have admitted, with these murals as a whole. Some of them were redone because they were much worse than they are now.

Mr. Shelley. Surely.

Mr. Scudder. It would seem to me that in a public building there should be better types of scenery developed rather than taking the negative in the compilation of these. We should have constructive thought in public buildings. We have a grape industry and a wine industry that could be depicted, the orange industry, stock raising, our water development, and the beauty of San Francisco. The bridges could be depicted, the better things in life could be woven into the history of California.

I had one party write me—and I quote, “You have to take the bitter with the sweet.” I do not think we have to take the bitter with the sweet. I do not think that is a proper approach. I believe that the fraternal and patriotic organizations that advocate the removal of these murals feel our State has been slandered, and if paintings are to adorn the walls of public buildings they should be pleasing and not the argumentative side of the issue. We know the history of the world has not always been sweet, but I do feel that we should glorify the best in life. Progress is made by the better things, not the worst things in history, and that is the thought I believe that generated the feeling among these people and caused me to introduce the resolution.

Mr. Shelley. Mr. Scudder, I do not wish to argue with you about it, but I can certainly appreciate your feeling about wishing to por-
tray the sweet things, because by nature you are so sweet and generous yourself. I assume that you would look at it in that light. Perhaps I do not have that same nature. I do know in my lifetime there has been bitterness and sweetness, and I think the history of California was that way, too—some of each.

Today, particularly around the San Francisco Bay area we have a marvelous community, a marvelous area that we are proud of. We have a city that grew up out of ashes rebuilt by enterprising people, but they might not have developed that spirit of fight and win over everything if they had not gone through some hardships. We know that such a background was there.

I think that sometimes some of the bitter must be shown to encourage generations coming behind us, to educate them that everything in life is not sweet and easy and that you have to work hard to get things.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Thank you very much.

We will now hear from our colleague, Mr. Mailliard.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MAILLIARD. I am William S. Mailliard, representing the Fourth District of California, which is the other half of San Francisco. I have been here listening to the arguments this afternoon and this morning. I do not think that it would serve any useful purpose for me to express my personal views on them, mural by mural, so if I may I would just like to read a prepared statement and answer any questions that there might be.

Let me say at the outset, as we have discovered here, the subject of this resolution has become controversial in my home community.

In answering my mail concerning the subject, I have repeatedly stated that I would make my own decision as to what action to take after careful inquiry had been made. However, determined and highly vocal groups on both sides have presented arguments so emotionally charged that it has become increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to make a fair and impartial decision in the matter.

Those for the removal of the murals have voiced opposition to (1) the political views of the painter; (2) the style of painting, and (3) the subject matter of the murals.

Those against removal believe that the paintings are valuable because (1) they represent a part of the coastal heritage of San Francisco, and (2) they are artistically excellent, and (3) because they provide a pictorial representation of our historic past.

Many of these arguments seem to me to be without validity in this case. In my opinion, the question should be judged solely on the following points: First, are the murals suitable to decorate a Federal building? Or are they offensive to the public that uses the building? If they are offensive, what steps are necessary to make them suitable?

Judging either the painter or the style of art used would be putting the Congress in the same position as the totalitarian governments who refused to allow music to be played if the composer's politics do not suit them.

I believe it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to respect, as far as is reasonable, the wishes of even a small portion of the public
when a question of personal offense is involved. I do not believe it is appropriate, however, for the Congress to prejudge a matter which is eventually a problem for the executive department concerned and thus to tie the hands of that department to a particular solution of the problem.

Now, since many responsible groups and individuals, including a very competent art critic of the San Francisco Chronicle, and including most of the principal art associations and all the principal museums and their boards of trustees and directors who are among our most highly respected and responsible citizens, have testified to the great value of these paintings as work of art, and I sincerely feel that it would be a mistake to arbitrarily direct their destruction.

If this committee decides, after hearing all the arguments, that action is necessary, I urge that the Scudder resolution be so modified to permit the responsible executive department full discretion as to what steps must be taken to render these murals inoffensive. To destroy all of them by congressional decree because of questionable suitability of a few panels is, in my opinion, wholly unjustified. I must, therefore, oppose the Scudder resolution in its present form.

Mr. AUCHINLOSS. Thank you very much. We appreciate your coming here.

I received a letter from you enclosing some petitions signed by individuals favoring retention of the murals.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Yes.

Mr. AUCHINLOSS. Do you wish them inserted in the record at the appropriate place?

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, they are arriving in my office in such large quantities I doubt whether there is any particular purpose served in filling the record with them,

Mr. AUCHINLOSS. We will have them referred to so that anybody who wishes to look at them can find them in the committee's files.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BROWNSON. I have great respect for the Congressman's knowledge of what the people in his district are thinking. That essential knowledge is how most of us keep in the business of representing our districts. Could you give us any sort of idea, percentagewise, as to the number of people in your district who would object to these murals.

I know that you cannot put in an accurate percentage, but do you have a feeling of how large the group is to whom the murals have been objectionable?

Mr. MAILLIARD. That is a very difficult question to answer. I would like to give you my opinion on this whole matter as to what has happened.

This controversy has been going on, it has flared up from time to time ever since these paintings were first put up there, and it has been my opinion right along—and I cannot prove this and I could be wrong—that there have been a few people who have become upset by these murals more because they do not like them than anything else. They have gone way out of their way to look for trouble. I agree with Mr. Shelley there are things in the murals which are highly questionable. I think they are rather minor, but I think when you are looking for trouble in any painting, book or any other work of art, you can find it if you look hard enough. I do not think it is sur-
prising in these organizations that if one or two of their members come in and make a strong enough plea against these paintings—and the chances are that most of the members have never seen the paintings—there is a tendency to go along and perhaps resolve against them in the full belief that they are doing the right thing, but I do not believe that it represents their independent judgment. I think it represents their acceptance of the views of a few people who feel very strongly.

It is my opinion, to answer your question, that the people who actually feel strongly against these paintings are very few in number.

Mr. Scherer. Would not that same reasoning apply to the group on the other side?

Mr. Mailliard. I do not think so. They have come along only when the pictures were threatened. In other words, most of them are reacting again, not so much on their individual judgment as far as the merits of the pictures are concerned, I think they are reacting more on the principle of destroying something which is pretty generally recognized as fine art.

Mr. McGregor. I have been getting a lot of letters from artists here in the East, and I got a telephone call a few minutes ago. I asked that individual if she had even seen the murals, and she said, "No," but that she had been requested by artists on the west coast to contact members of the committee to tell them not to remove the murals.

Mr. Mailliard. I believe that that is going on. People who have devoted their lives as patrons of the arts say that they are fine paintings and therefore these people feel that destroying them is a pretty serious thing. It sort of smacks of book burning and that sort of thing. If there are things in them that need to be eliminated or corrected, I do not think you would find any particular objection from these people—certainly none from me.

Mr. Neal. Assuming that the Communist association and the record of the painter in the first place is true, what do you think would be the average effect upon the individual mind who looks at those pictures today, with his knowledge of past California history? What percentage of the people who view those paintings today would be inspired in any way whatsoever to become sympathetic to communist ideas?

Mr. Mailliard. I should think none at all. I cannot quite see, even granting certain things which I think are objectionable in these paintings, how it is going to subvert anybody's mind to look at them.

Mr. George. I am willing to concede that the pictures are historically sound, but in viewing the pictures I cannot get over the distortion of the figures of the people of that early period, even those of California.

Mr. Scherer. It is modern art.

Mr. Mailliard. May I say something on that? You mentioned that before. It is my opinion that an artist is entitled to a certain amount of license as far as portrayal is concerned. In other words, where distortion of the human figure is involved, I think it is intended to convey qualities of certain kinds: ruggedness, thinness, or starvation, and that is an artist's license. You are not asking an artist to put on the wall a photographic representation.
Mr. George. Would the artist's background make him have any tendency to paint as he did as far as early American history is concerned?

Mr. Mailliard. I certainly cannot answer that. I do feel that we should not judge them in the light of their background, but judge them in the light of what we see when we look at what they painted.

I submit, sir, a Communist could write a beautiful piece of music that had no political significance. A Communist could write a beautiful poem or paint a great picture. He might put propaganda into it and he might not.

Mr. George. There is no beauty in these pictures as we view them. Maybe there is in the coloring. I cannot find beauty at all.

Mr. Mailliard. There is a great deal of strength in these pictures. People who are art lovers find they are beautiful. The power of the people represented has an appeal that is a sort of beauty in the minds of a great many people.

Mr. Scudder. I am advised by the NSGW that it is not uncommon for the schoolteachers to take their classes down to this office so the youngsters can view the murals.

Mr. Mailliard. That is right.

Mr. Scudder. The young minds are right for an impression. From the information I received and from the testimony this morning, it would show that this man was a contributing artist for the New Masses. The New Masses has been cited as a Communist periodical, and for him to paint murals in this post office without putting some of his technique into those pictures would not be a natural thing. People who have made a study of these murals feel he has injected his personal feelings, and from my own observation I think that he has given our ancestors a bad break in depicting them in the form he has in those murals.

Mr. Mailliard. Your opinion to that effect has been clearly stated here. I do not feel quite the same way about it. Let me point out also Refregier has painted a great many paintings for various purposes, and has been recently commissioned by the Grace Lines and the American President Lines to do murals in their main salons in their ships. I somehow do not think those corporations are going to be happy with subversion on the walls of their main rooms where the paying passengers go. I dare say he is a workman who would not necessarily have to convey propaganda in his work. I do not say he does not. I think that Mr. Shelley pointed out the clenched fist. I think that is a sly effort. I do not think it is going to subvert anybody to see that clenched fist. I think it is an indication of something we probably should not have on the walls of a Federal building. I believe those things could be corrected without destruction of the paintings.

Mr. McGregor. Did the hammer and sickle appear in any of these murals?

Mr. Mailliard. The hammer and sickle appear in that one case of the Four Freedoms. As far as I know, that is the only place. I do believe that there was another case in some of the original drafts that were rejected.

Mr. McGregor. Don't you think that is a little unusual in a United States post office paid for by the taxpayers of the country?
Mr. MAILLIARD. I think it is highly unusual, and as I understand it, it was rejected. The hammer and sickle on the Four Freedoms is certainly not questionable when you have the Big Four—Britain, the United States, Russia, and China indicated. There is nothing unusual about that.

Mr. STEED. According to this picture here it appears twice in the last panel on the gun barrel.

Mr. MAILLIARD. That is correct.

Mr. STEED. It is rather dim on the picture, but it is there, nevertheless.

Mr. MAILLIARD. That is correct, in the last panel it appears in the left-hand section on the gun and in the right-hand section of the panel on the globe. That is indicating the Allied Powers, so I do not see anything subversive about it being there.

Mr. McGREGOR. You do not consider that they are an Allied Power now?

Mr. MAILLIARD. When the paintings were done.

Mr. McGREGOR. Times have changed and maybe we should change the paintings.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Probably we should destroy the works of Michelangelo and those of a few other people.

Mr. McGREGOR. I have a high regard for the people of California, but certainly these murals do not depict the early settlers of California. I think that the committee must decide whether or not these murals have a good influence on the general public—do they characterize the early settlers or do they promote propaganda. I do not think it is art, but I am no artist.

Mr. MAILLIARD. A great many people will agree with you on that. Those who have spent the most time in the field of art, and in whose judgment in that field I have the most confidence, say it is great art. I hold no personal brief for these paintings. I have never been particularly fond of them. But the people who do know art and the people in whose judgment I have confidence say that they are fine works of art. I must accept their judgment.

Mr. McGREGOR. On the other hand, I accept the judgment of these patriotic organizations of which I happen to be a member. They certainly know what is propaganda and what is dangerous to our freedom.

Mr. MAILLIARD. That is your privilege.

Mr. McGREGOR. I refer to the boys who fought in the front lines that we might have and enjoy the freedoms we do; I agree with them more than I would with some people who might give us their views on art, especially when they paint the communistic inclinations that we have seen in these pictures. You and I evidently differ.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I belong to some of these same organizations, but in this case it is just a difference of opinion.

Mr. SCHERER. Was it developed this morning how the gentleman that produced these murals obtained the job?

Mr. Auchincloss. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Two of the members of the panel who selected this artist had their loyalty to America questioned. I am informed they belonged to subversive organizations.

Mr. NEAL. If you were engaging an artist today to decorate a building in which you were interested for the effect that it might have on
present and future generations, would you be willing to trust that creation to a man with a reputation such as this man seems to have had?

Mr. Mailiiard. No, sir; I would not. I think the selection of this painter under the circumstances at the time was a very serious error in judgment on the part of the responsible officials, but that is not quite what we are faced with here. We have these paintings. People who ought to know say they are fine works of art, and it is very difficult for me to justify the destruction of them if there is any way of making them inoffensive and retaining them as works of art.

Mr. NeaL. There is a sordid picture there which is very unfortunate. It would seem to me that they would be bad for youngsters. The pictures represent the cartoonist's way of doing things.

Mr. Mailiiard. I cannot defend them. I am not an art critic myself. I have become convinced because of the people who are experts in the field, who say that they do have great artistic merit; therefore, I think that we should be extremely reluctant to destroy them.

Mr. Scherer. You said in your testimony that you were not referring to this particular artist. You said generally you did not feel a man who is a part of the Communist Party, or conspiracy, reflects the party line in his creative works of art.

Mr. Mailiiard. Yes; I said that I did not think that automatically followed. I think it would be quite likely, but I do not think that it would necessarily be so.

Mr. Scherer. I happen to be a member of the Un-American Activities Committee. The evidence is rather conclusive that in most instances the men who are a part of the party do reflect the Communist Party line.

Mr. Mailiiard. I am quite sure that is true.

Mr. Scherer. The party line requires that they do so, and not only in the field of art.

Mr. Mailiiard. Nobody has established that Mr. Refregier was actually a Communist. We know he was somewhat suspect.

Mr. Scherer. We would not want to say that. I was just quoting you.

Mr. Brownson. If the gentleman will yield, I think the witness made that statement in regard to music and modified the statement when it came to art and writing. He said that he could not see where you could put much subversive content in music.

Mr. Mailiiard. The gentleman is correct. I said that I felt that you could not be certain that just because this particular painter was somewhat suspect as far as his connections were concerned, that proves, therefore, the paintings are Communist propaganda. They may be. I do not think that you could jump to that conclusion. I think that they must be examined on their individual merits.

Mr. Auchinncoss. I wish to make a statement. I think it only fair to note that the proponents of this measure consumed 2 hours and 11 minutes. Under our rules the opponents are given an equal opportunity. They have already consumed 1 hour and 2 minutes. We have witnesses before us who have come all the way from California. I think it is only fair that we should give them an opportunity to present their case. I do not want to cut off debate. I do not want to cut off any statements, but I think it is only fair to bring that to the attention of the committee.
Mr. McGregor. I am in accord with that. The witness made the statement that he somewhat suspected that the artist belonged to some subversive activity.

Mr. Mailiard. May I correct that, sir. No, I said that the man is suspect. We have not proved that he was a Communist. We have proved that he has been associated with a Communist-front organization.

Mr. McGregor. And he was an instructor in a Communist-front organization, was he not?

Mr. Mailiard. There is no argument on that score.

Mr. McGregor. I refer to the Congressional Record; it is a part of the Record that he was an instructor in a Communist organization.

Mr. Mailiard. That is correct.

Mr. Scherer. What kind of an instructor?

Mr. McGregor. He was an instructor in the John Reed Club, and the Un-American Activities Committee says, and I quote:

The John Reed Club is a revolutionary organization of artists and writers in the United States. It was organized by the Communists in memory of the American Bolshevik, who was deported to Russia and died there. His remains were placed beside those of Lenin in Moscow. All of the John Reed Club leaders are engaged in revolutionary activities either in propaganda and agitation, or in organizational work.

That is part of the Congressional Record that I am quoting from.

Mr. Scherer. What subject did he instruct? Did he instruct in art?

Mr. McGregor. I would have to check that. It is in the Record.

Mr. Auchincloss. Now, we have before us Mr. Thomas Carr Howe, Jr., and Mr. Chauncey McKeever.

Mr. Howe and Mr. McKeever appear for the San Francisco Bay Regions Citizens Committee for defense of Rincon annex post office murals, the board of trustees of the San Francisco Museum of Art; associated art groups of the bay area, comprising San Francisco Art Association, San Francisco Planning and Housing Association, San Francisco Society of Women Artists, Women’s Board of San Francisco Museum of Art, Marin County Society of Artists and Metal Art Guild. Do you represent anything more?

Mr. McKeever. Not today.

STATEMENTS OF CARR HOWE, JR., AND CHAUNCEY McKEEVER

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION CITIZENS’ COMMITTEE FOR DEFENSE OF THE RINCON ANNEX POST OFFICE MURALS

The following is filed with the above subcommittee as being the expression of the position of the above-entitled citizens’ committee toward House Joint Resolution 211.

House Joint Resolution 211 seeks to remove the murals presently adorning the walls of the Rincon Post Office in San Francisco, Calif. on the grounds:

1. That they “have been criticized by civic groups, veterans’ organizations, and patriotic and fraternal organizations, as well as by local newspapers and numerous individuals, as being artistically offensive and historically inaccurate.”

2. That they “cast a derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers of California.”

3. That they “cast a derogatory reflection on the history of California.”

These last 2 grounds can logically be combined into 1, since the history of the State of California necessarily embraces the reputations of the pioneers who helped to build the State.
Although the resolution, by its phraseology, gives only two basic reasons for the removal of the murals, to any San Franciscan—or for that matter, to any American—another unexpressed implication underlying the desire to remove the murals is clearly visible, namely, that works of art on Federal property should henceforth be subject to destruction by legislative action (though they comply fully with all the requirements of duly appointed and qualified authorities of the Federal Government charged with the supervision of the creation of such decorative accomplishments) if they encounter the criticism of articulate pressure groups; and that the citizens of any city in the United States may thus be deprived by legislative action of any art treasure in their city that happens to be on Federal property.

Thus, in essence, the attack on the murals is aimed at three separate fields of what may be designated our American heritage:

1. Freedom of expression and opinion (in this case, that of the artist);
2. Whether history can be the subject of legislative action;
3. Whether the acknowledged artistic authorities of the community where Federal works of art happen to be are not the final arbiters of the cultural value of such works of art; whether the acknowledged historical experts are not the final arbiters of any alleged implications against the moral character of the progenitors of the community.

I

Freedom of expression and opinion is solidly built into the Constitution of the United States. Americans rightly regard book-burning, iconoclasm, and vandalism as being solely within the province of nations that disavow these freedoms.

This subcommittee has already received notice of the attitude of citizens and cultural groups all over the country with respect to the principle of censorship of art, so that no more need be said on this point.

II

History is something that no two experts will agree upon. If they did, there would be only one text on each historical era. The resolution before the subcommittee states that the murals are "historically inaccurate." (Photographs of the 29 murals are attached hereto as appendix A.)

The statement that they are historically inaccurate can only mean that each of the 29 panels of the murals depicts an event that never took place, or that each event is so distorted as to bear little or no resemblance to the facts. It could possibly mean that the 29 events depicted are not truly representative of the pageant of California history.

Whether or not the murals represent the 29 salient points of California history is not the issue. That is something that any group of historians is unlikely to agree upon.

The manner in which the topics were selected and by whom, is set forth, together with other pertinent factual matter, in appendix B.

The events depicted, however, have a basis in the records of California history, and apart from some minor anachronisms and faulty technical detail, depict in forceful form events that most Californians have reason to believe took place.

Appended to this statement is a statement by Mr. Warren Howell, recognized as the leading expert on California pictorial history, a member and director of the California Historical Society. This statement indicates his opinion of the probable source of material used by the artist in designing the murals. It is marked "Appendix C."

This citizens' committee can find in these murals no derogatory reflection on the character of the pioneers or the history of the great State of which they are proud to be citizens. The resolution states that the "murals have been criticized" by several groups, organizations, and patriotic and fraternal sources, and so forth, as being "artistically offensive and historically inaccurate."

Have any of these groups the qualifications to pass on the artistic merit of the murals?

Have any of these groups the support of such authoritative bodies as the Society of California Pioneers or the California Historical Society as to the alleged historical inaccuracies?

The three great art museums of San Francisco are solidly against this resolution (see appendix D) and the two leading historical societies have not seen fit to support this resolution in any way.
The resolution speaks of local newspapers as criticizing the murals. Not one of the four San Francisco daily newspapers has ever criticized these murals.

Where does the support for the resolution come from? The designation "patriotic societies" is used in the text of the resolution. Perhaps this is significant, although the Attorney General of the United States would be glad to learn of any "unpatriotic societies." We must assume, failing evidence to the contrary, that all societies and organizations in the United States are patriotic; but where does that leave other cultural organizations and societies that happen to disagree with the criticisms of these murals and the supporters of this resolution. Are they necessarily unpatriotic?

The murals have become one of the art treasures of the city of San Francisco. Unfortunately, they are not on the beaten path of the average San Franciscan. Any San Francisco museum with the necessary space available would be glad to house these murals, so that more people could see them. The fact that some individuals and groups criticize them, can hardly be proof that the murals have no value artistically or historically, or are of inferior quality.

An artist's work is judged by the ages, and not be prejudice. The history of art has innumerable instances of contemporary adverse criticism of a work of art that has, in the course of time, become a masterpiece.

This citizens' committee does not, by implication, characterize these murals as masterpieces, but is content to state that they are unusually fine and forceful examples of contemporary mural technique, and an art acquisition of which the city of San Francisco is proud.

Who are the judges of the "improper and derogatory reflection on the character of the pioneers of California"? The population of California is currently estimated at over 11 million, few of whom are descended from the personalities depicted in these murals or even from the contemporaries of those personalities.

Probably the only point on which historians would agree is that the history of California has been, from time to time, touched with physical violence. The murals depict violence in some of the panels, and any serious student of California history will acknowledge that the violence depicted actually took place. Does this means that the "character of the pioneers" is impugned? Historically, desperate situations have demanded desperate action, and the descendants of the participants of a strenuous era are not normally the persons to complain that a pictorial record of the history of their State depicts violence.

In conclusion, the San Francisco Bay Region Citizens' Committee for Defense of the Rincon Annex Post Office murals believes that House Joint Resolution 211 is-

1. An attempt to suppress freedom of artistic expression;
2. An attempt to destroy valuable cultural material on the grounds of bias and prejudice by uninformed pressure groups;
3. A fearful precedent, if passed;
4. A shameful measure; in its essence, vandalism;
5. Unworthy of affirmative action by the honorable members of this subcommittee.

It is the earnest desire of this citizens' committee, which comprises hundreds of residents of San Francisco and the bay area, and which is more truly representative of the cultural and civic attitude of the community than any of the organizations supporting the adoption of this resolution, that this resolution receive the negative vote of the subcommittee.

APPENDIX B. FACTS ON THE RINCON ANNEX MURALS

Painted by Anton Refregier.

Professional qualifications: Artist is a graduate of the Rhode Island School of Design and has studied extensively in France and Germany.

Commissions for the Federal Government include murals in the post offices in San Francisco and in Plainsfield, N. J. Private mural projects were executed for the Matson Steamship Co., the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn., a synagogue on Long Island, New York City's Cafe Society restaurant, and many others. He has done work for Fortune magazine and the Hallmark Co.

Sponsor for the project: The former National Fine Arts Commission, a department of the Federal Government now under the jurisdiction of the Public Buildings Administration of the Department of Public Works.

How artist was selected: By national competition. Many hundreds of entries were received. Entries were submitted and judged anonymously.

Time required to complete murals: 8 years. The artist received his commission in November 1940. Some final sketches were approved before the war, but actual work on the walls did not begin until 1946. The work was accepted as complete in 1948.

How much was paid for the work: $26,000. This was the largest single commission awarded under the fine-arts program.

Who accepted and approved the material used: Authorization was given for work to proceed according to approved sketches by the Federal Public Buildings Administration. Completed panels were accepted and progress payments were made based on record-photographs. Several accepted panels were revised by the artist at the direction of the Public Buildings Administrator as the result of demands made by various local groups. After revisions were made, work was rephotographed and checked for compliance with demands before final acceptance.

In the fall of 1948 final inspection was made and the entire project was rechecked. The work was deemed completed and the artist was paid the remainder of his commission.

(Note. This factual statement has been compiled to afford a brief history of the Rincon Annex murals without editorializing or comment. The murals will speak for themselves.)

Appendix C. Statement of Warren Howell, 434 Post Street, San Francisco

To the San Francisco Bay Region Citizens' Committee for Defense of the Rincon Annex Post Office Murals:

I have examined the murals that decorate the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco.

I consider that these murals depict some of the important episodes in the history of San Francisco and California. They appear to be based on recognizable sources which are authoritative and authentic.

For example, I would consider the source of the murals "Indians by the Golden Gate" and "Preaching and Farming at Mission Dolores" to be lithographs made from the original sketches of Louis Choris, who came to San Francisco in 1817. These lithographs were published in Paris in 1822.

The mural "Sir Francis Drake" appears to be based on engraved portraits by Jodocus Hondius Crispin van de Passe and Janssen.

The panel "Miners Panning Gold" is based on the well-known lettersheets of the period of the Gold Rush.


The mural "Vigilante Days" appears to be a composite of four newsletter sheets published in San Francisco in 1856. The preponderance of tophats in the mural is justified by reference to the newsletter sheets.

There are abundant photographic sources for most of the later murals.

A few anachronisms appear. For example, the soldier's uniform in the panel "Reconstruction After the Fire" is incorrect, and so is the color of the monks' habits in the mural "Monks Building the Missions." There are some historical inaccuracies, but they are all of a minor nature.

Appendix D. Statements of Directors of San Francisco's Three Art Museums

As director of San Francisco's largest and oldest art museum, I join the many cultural leaders of our community who are seriously worried about the contemplated removal of the mural paintings in the Rincon Annex post office in San Francisco. These murals by Refregier are important art works in which I fail to detect any truly offensive or seriously subversive propaganda. Their removal would undoubtedly create an ominous threat to the liberty of the arts and humanities in the United States.

WALTER HEIL,
Director, De Young Memorial Museum.
After making a careful examination of the murals by Anton Refregier in the Rincon annex post office here, I am of the opinion that they are admirable examples of wall decoration, as successful as any contemporary work I know of in the country with regard to composition, space, color, and content.

I find no evidence of "sinister" propaganda in the episodes the artist has chosen to depict, and it is my personal conviction that to object to certain of the incidents portrayed is to indulge in a form of "witch hunting" which is properly regarded in this country as undesirably un-American.

Thomas Carr Howe, Jr.,
Director, California Palace of the Legion of Honor.

As director of a museum specializing in contemporary art, I find the murals in the Rincon annex post office fine in quality and suitable in style, ranking high among the distinguished American murals of recent years.

Museums are concerned with conservation or art treasures: it is unthinkable that a work of art, accepted generally by competent art experts, as fine should be threatened by destruction because some group or other finds style or content not to its taste. As a second-generation Californian, informed on the State's history, I find nothing derogatory nor offensive in the subject matter, and there is no evidence of subversive symbolism or reference.

Grace L. McCann Morley,
Director, San Francisco Museum of Art.

Mr. McGregor. Would the witness put the officers of the organizations in the hearings?

Mr. McKeever. I do not have them with me.

You have saved me the trouble of telling you whom I represent.

My residence is in Marin County, of which Mr. Scudder represents the constituents. I feel that my work has already been done for me by our two able Congressmen from San Francisco, Mr. Shelley and Mr. Mailliard. They have covered the ground thoroughly and fully and with great conviction.

I have filed with the committee a statement on behalf of the San Francisco Bay Region Citizens’ Committee for defense of the Rincon annex post office murals. This statement includes pictures of the murals which I think we have all seen. It also has a factual sheet as appendix B, which speaks of the manner in which the murals were selected, the professional qualifications of the artist, who sponsored the project, the names of the jurors, the time required to complete the work, the amount paid, and who accepted the various sketches that are now adorning the walls of the post office.

Then there is appended a statement of Warren Howell, who is recognized in historical circles in San Francisco, Calif., as being the leading authority on California pictorial history. He is more of an art dealer than a historian. He has handled more pictures and prints and lithographs of California than anyone in the country.

I would like to draw your attention to this synopsis. He states in a letter to this committee:

I have examined the murals that decorate the lobby of the Rincon annex post office in San Francisco.

I consider that these murals depict some of the important episodes in the history of San Francisco and California. They appear to be based on recognizable sources which are authoritative and authentic.

For example, I would consider the source of the mural Indians by the Golden Gate and Preaching and Farming at Mission Dolores to be lithographs made from the original sketches of Louis Choris, who came to San Francisco in 1817. These lithographs were published in Paris in 1822.

The mural Sir Francis Drake appears to be based on engraved portraits by Jodocus Hondius Crispin van De Passe and Janssena.

The panel Miners Panning Gold is based on the well-known portraits of the period of the gold rush.

The mural Vigilante Days appears to be a composite of four newsletter sheets published in San Francisco in 1856. The preponderance of top hats in the mural is justified by reference to the newsletter sheets.

There are abundant photographic sources for most of the later murals.

A few anachronisms appear. For example, the soldier's uniform in the panel Reconstruction After the Fire is incorrect, and so is the color of the monks' habits in the mural Monks Building the Mission. There are some historical inaccuracies, but they are all of a minor nature.

The point of approach I wish to present to the committee follows the terminology, or phraseology, of the resolution, House Resolution 211, and in essence this resolution seeks to destroy the murals on the grounds (1) that they have been criticized by civic groups, veterans' organizations, and patriotic and fraternal organizations, as well as by local newspapers and numerous individuals as being artistically offensive and historically inaccurate; (2) that they cast derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers of California; (3) that they cast a derogatory reflection on the history of California.

Now, if you can put those last two together, for the history of California must necessarily embrace the character of the pioneers who made the history. Of course, there is this underlying implication that we all have to face, that is, are works of art recognized as such by experts going to be subject to destruction by the wish, the expressed wish, and legislative action by groups who happen to disagree as to their aesthetic value?

We have to confine ourselves to the artistic offensiveness or lack of offensiveness and historical accuracy.

Congressman Shelley has given you almost a first-hand account of his impression of the historical accuracy, and he has referred you to standard works on California history that should bear out his general impression that historically these events took place.

The statement that the panels are historically inaccurate to my mind means that either each of those murals is depicting something that never took place, or that the depiction is so far from what actually happened that it bears little or no resemblance to the truth. It could mean that of the 29 panels others would pick 29 other events. That is something for historians of a much later generation to decide.

Mr. Shelley spoke of the natural disagreement among historians. There must be disagreement among historians. If there were no disagreements there would only be one textbook on every historical era, so we have to have controversy about historical matters, and there will always be controversy by artists about artistic facts.

I am in no position to speak of artistic values, but I have with me Mr. Thomas Carr Howe, who is the director of the California Palace of the Legion of Honor, and he knows a great deal about art. He has also consulted with eminent artists, critics in the field, and colleagues of his, and he will supplement the void in my statement as to the artistic value of the murals.

I am really concerned to know where the support for this resolution comes from. The resolution states that various patriotic societies have voiced criticism. I do not know of unpatriotic societies. I do not belong to the veterans but I am a veteran. I disagree with their
view on this matter. Does that make me unpatriotic? They also state that the San Francisco local newspapers have criticized these murals. That is not a fact. A careful check of the editorial position of the four great daily papers of San Francisco shows that they have never taken any position on this. The Argonaut has been mentioned several times as a proponent of this measure. The Argonaut is a weekly magazine with a small circulation. It has a large art section which is written by a man closely identified with this resolution.

The text that was quoted by Mr. Lyon was an expression in the Sunday supplement, the art section of the Chronicle, and was quoted very poorly out of context. That art critic right at the beginning said these are fine works of art, and then to spread out and pad the article he made many of the statements that were read to you. He made many others. I do not think it is fair to read excerpts of an article of criticism and attribute that to the policy of the newspapers. There is absolutely no support for this resolution from any recognized historical society. There are two very well-known historical societies in California. There is the California Historical Society of which Mr. Howell, by the way, is a director and a member, and then there is the Society of California Pioneers, which has existed in the State since 1850.

Now those historical societies, those bodies, do not support this resolution; yet supporters of the resolution are listed as civic groups, veterans' organizations, patriotic and fraternal organizations. Are those organizations, per se, experts on art and experts on history? The point that I wish to make is; are not the proper judges of the artistic values of works of art those recognized authorities in the field, and are not the proper judges of the historical accuracy of the pictorial work of art the historical experts? They are not Legion posts, not marching and chowder clubs, but the experts. We have to take our information from the experts. You do not ask a barber what is the proper way to have an operation performed. Why should you ask a patriotic society to approve the artistic value of the murals?

The last point I wish to make is we must stick to the terms of the resolution. There is no mention in the resolution that the politics of the painter were in question. We listened this morning for 45 minutes to a Congressman reading from the records of the Un-American Activities Committee. It was very interesting, but to my mind completely beyond the point.

If the resolution had stated, "Whereas this organization, or these fraternal organizations, believe that Anton Refregier is a Communist, or a subversive, and whereas—and so on" then we would have another issue to meet, but you haven't. The resolution simply states that they "have been criticized by civic and other groups because of their artistic offensiveness and their historical inaccuracy."

I would like to turn over what remaining time there is to Mr. Howe.

Mr. SCUDER. Mr. Chairman, just before Mr. McKeever leaves the floor, there is no attack by me, or from the organizations supporting this resolution, as to the artisticness of the murals. We are not disputing the artist's ability to paint. However, in this resolution calling for the removal of the murals, the background of the artist and what
he is trying to put across in these murals is of significance to the patriotic organizations, and I really think that the Native Sons of the Golden West in San Francisco have some of the most outstanding local citizens in their organization, which is true as to the Disabled Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Amvets, the Young Democrats, the Republican Women’s Council, and other groups and individuals who are supporting this resolution whether they are judges of art, I do not know—but surely in my opinion they should be pretty fair judges of what does appeal to the American and what the American children should study in their formative years.

We are not disputing that the artist could paint. But we are calling for their removal and I would be willing to leave this matter in the hands of a committee in San Francisco selected by the Native Sons of the Golden West, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other patriotic organizations.

Mr. Auchincloss. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Scudder. Yes.

Mr. Auchincloss. Our time is limited.

Mr. Scudder. I just wanted to make that point clear.

Mr. Auchincloss. Yes.

Mr. McKeever. Mr. Scudder, I must reply by saying the only information I have on this resolution is the text, and the text states, if you will look at it, that these murals should be removed because they have been criticized by various groups as being artistically offensive and historically inaccurate.

Mr. Scudder. That is what these people say they are.

Mr. McKeever. I have tried to put the point over that people who know something about art and history should be the ones to be consulted.

Mr. Scudder. I believe that the people in these organizations knew what they did in arriving at their conclusion. I appreciate your viewpoint.

Mr. McKeever. I do not wish to take any more of your valuable time. I thank you very much for the opportunity to appear.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS CARR HOWE, JR., DIRECTOR, CALIFORNIA PALACE OF THE LEGION OF HONOR

Mr. Howe. I am Mr. Howe, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I come today with Mr. McKeever representing one of the three museums in San Francisco. My museum, the California Palace of the Legion of Honor, of which I am director, is one of the city’s 2 municipal museums. There is also a third and very active art museum in San Francisco, the San Francisco Museum of Art.

If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I would like to condense what I have to say and make it as brief as possible. To that end, with your permission, may I read 3 brief statements, 1 made by myself and 1 made by each of my 2 colleagues. The first statement that I would like to read was made by Dr. Walter Heil, director of the De Young Memorial Museum:

As director of San Francisco’s largest and oldest art museum, I join the many cultural leaders of our community who are seriously worried about the contemplated removal of the mural paintings in the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco. These murals by Refregier are important artworks in which
fail to detect any truly offensive or seriously subversive propaganda. Their removal would undoubtedly create an ominous threat to the liberty of the arts and humanities in the United States.

The second statement is by Dr. Morley of the San Francisco Museum of Art, and reads as follows:

As director of a museum specializing in contemporary art, I find the murals in the Rincon Annex Post Office fine in quality and suitable in style, ranking high among the distinguished American murals of recent years. Museums are concerned with conservation of art treasures: It is unthinkable that a work of art accepted generally by competent art experts as fine should be threatened by destruction because some group or other finds style or content not to its taste. As a second-generation Californian, informed on the State's history, I find nothing derogatory nor offensive in the subject matter, and there is no evidence of subversive symbolism or reference.

My own statement follows:

After making a careful examination of the murals by Anton Refregier in the Rincon Annex Post Office here, I am of the opinion that they are admirable examples of wall decoration, as successful as any contemporary work I know of in the country with regard to composition, space, color, and content. I personally find no evidence of "sinister" propaganda in the episodes the artist has chosen to depict, and it is my personal conviction that to object to certain of the incidents portrayed is to indulge in a form of "witch hunting" which is properly regarded in this country as undesirably un-American.

The question was mentioned a moment ago by Mr. McKeever about the removal of the murals. May I say a word on that score technically? This morning evidence was submitted indicating that Mr. David Finley, my good friend and colleague at the National Gallery of Art here, had suggested that it would be possible to remove the frescoes without damaging them. I venture to differ with that opinion for the reason that these wall decorations are not what is called true frescoes sunk into the wall, in which case they can be removed or taken off, although it is a very expensive and difficult process. On the other hand, they are made in the egg-tempera technique. It is a very delicate and fragile method of painting on a finely pulverized plaster base.

To give you an idea of the difficulty involved in attempting to remove works of art of this character, I might add, from my own experience in the museum, I obtained onetime a small panel, measuring about 11 by 14 inches, of 15th-century Italian workmanship. It was necessary to transfer that panel to canvas to preserve it because of certain inherent damages in the wood panel behind the base. To effect the transfer of that small picture involved the museum in an expenditure of $1,500.

To contemplate removing these frescoes is a rather ambitious undertaking and one that would undoubtedly entail very great expense.

On the question of preserving works of art—and it is this point which is of the greatest personal concern to me—I would like to add that just at the close of the war, in 1945, I had the good fortune to participate in the Government's program involving the rescue and restitution of many of the works of art that had been looted and sequestered by the Nazis. That project engaged the attention and time of a large group of men who, in their professional life, were associated with the arts.

In my case I was a museum director. Others were architects, art historians, and so on.
It was our particular and welcome task to restore some order out of the great chaos which the Nazis had brought about. We performed an altruistic task in saving for the countries overseas, most of whom had been our allies, their important art treasures of the past.

It seems to me that it is in the true American tradition to preserve a great cultural heritage, whether that is our own or of another country, if it is deserving of preservation; and in this instance the work we were doing I think deserved carrying on as an important and valuable piece of preservation work.

In conclusion I would like to make one point with regard to the comment made by Congressman Scudder about the character of the murals in the Rincon Post Office, with reference to the fact that they are not as pleasant and agreeable in character as they might be.

I feel that that is a question of taste. Some like it and some do not. However, I think it should be pointed out that there does exist in San Francisco a large and important cycle of frescoes depicting the constructive and important industrial side of California life in the form of the frescoes which were executed at the Coit Memorial Tower on Telegraph Hill.

Also, I think that the amount of attention that is paid to the murals has perhaps been overstated. My colleague, Dr. Heil, when going again to look at the works in the Rincon Annex Post Office, and reviewing his own opinion about them, said that during the half or three quarters of an hour that he stood looking at the murals he felt there must have been an estimated 800 people going through, and he greatly regretted that not one person even looked at the murals. That is not a very good point for the development of mural decoration in this country but I do think it serves to offset a little bit the importance that might attach to the pathetic case of the postal employee who felt his pay should be raised in order to suffer the difficulty of being confronted with those murals.

Also, I think it is only fair to point out that all employees of the post office, so far as I know, sit behind a solid wall which effectively prevents their seeing the murals unless they deliberately go out into the lobby to look at them.

We have one statement which is already in your hands, Mr. Chairman, but I would like in closing to make reference to the long list of organizations, both museums and universities and their art departments throughout the country who have submitted strenuous objection to the proposed removal of the frescoes. Since these are, I believe, to be made a part of the record an enumeration of the institutions would be beside the point. But one statement was so very effectively expressed that I would like to read it.

It is by Mr. John Hay Whitney who is one of the most distinguished Americans and a great patron of the arts, and head of the board of trustees of one of New York's top museums. Mr. Whitney has written:

I am disturbed to hear of proposed destruction of murals in Rincon Post Office in San Francisco. Their recognized excellence as works of art would make their destruction an act of vandalism unworthy of the United States. As chairman of the board of trustees of the Museum of Modern Art I am glad to join the trustees of the San Francisco Museum and the executives of the three leading art museums of San Francisco in a strong protest against this proposed willful action.

John Hay Whitney.
Mr. McGregor. Will you yield for a question? Do you think Mr. Whitney has ever seen the murals?

Mr. Howe. To my knowledge Mr. Whitney has.

Mr. Auchincloss. I can testify to that because I also received a telegram from Mr. Whitney to that effect, which I have placed in the record.

(The telegram is as follows:)

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Hon. James Coats Auchincloss,
House of Representatives:

I am disturbed to hear of proposed destruction of murals in Rincon post office in San Francisco. Their recognized excellence as works of art would make their destruction an act of vandalism unworthy of the United States. As chairman of the board of trustees of the Museum of Modern Art, I am glad to join the trustees of the San Francisco Museum and the executives of the three leading art museums of San Francisco in a strong protest against this proposed willful action.

JOHN HAY WHITNEY.

Mr. McGregor. That he has seen them?

Mr. Auchincloss. That he has seen them.

Mr. Howe. May I add one P. S., if it is not out of order? I think it has not been stressed to the group here, and it is a very important point: In looking at these murals if you do not see the color you are not getting a faithful or true impression of them. The color is very distinguished and it is very dramatic.

Mr. Scherer. That brings me to a question. You saw the murals, of course.

Mr. Howe. I am very familiar with them.

Mr. Scherer. I would be interested, because these photographs we have here do not show color; if the witness could tell me whether the man, the back of whose head we see in this vigilante picture, is actually a Negro or not. It appears to be a Negro.

Mr. Howe. My impression is that it is not.

Mr. Scherer. That is the reason why I asked. It appears in the photograph he is a Negro.

Mr. George. There weren’t any in California at the time.

Mr. Howe. He may have been a Latin.

Mr. George. The impression we got is he was a colored man, and there were none in California during the vigilante days. Of course, with the background of the painter, if that was implied or even colored enough, we would naturally suspect the motive.

Mr. Scherer. You recall that individual mural now?

Mr. Howe. Reasonably well. In seeing it in the better photograph you have than the one which is attached to the papers here.

Mr. Scherer. I am not asking you about the photograph, but from your own recollection of having seen that mural, could you tell this committee now whether or not anybody looking at it would gather the impression that it was a Negro?

Mr. Howe. I would think not, Mr. Scherer. My impression is it would be someone of Latin extraction, with very dark hair, but not Negro.

Mr. George. Dark neck?

Mr. Howe. Dark neck and hair.

Mr. Scherer. It appears though, to anyone looking at this large photograph that he is a Negro.
Mr. Howe. I think the color is a very important factor in the determination of the esthetic value.

Mr. George. There would not be anything implied in that connection in this mural, would there?

Mr. Howe. I think not.

Mr. George. When all the rest of the people in the picture are absolutely white?

Mr. Scherer. The backs of the necks of the so-called vigilantes or capitalists with the top hats all appear white, and it is easily distinguishable they are white.

Mr. Brownson. I would like to ask the witness one question that has nothing to do with this. We have a very great high school called the Thomas Carr Howe High School, in Indiana. Is that named after one of your family?

Mr. Howe. That was my father. I am Indiana born but I have lived in California 22 years. I had a great-grandfather who was there in 1848. So I am a maverick.

Mr. Scherer. We do have Negroes in San Francisco today.

Mr. Howe. Oh, indeed so.

Mr. Steed. For the purpose of the record, and since you appear here I take it as an expert, I wonder if you would mind giving us a brief statement as to your background and what makes you an expert. I think maybe that would give a little bit more weight to your comments.

Mr. Howe. Very good. I am a graduate of Harvard College, class of 1926. The major portion of my undergraduate studies was devoted to the fine arts. I remained at Harvard taking post graduate work in the fine arts, for a period of 3½ years, supplementing my studies there with intensive study abroad during the period of my undergraduate and post graduate days. Thereafter I accepted a post as assistant director of the California Palace of the Legion of Honor in 1931 and I have been connected with that museum ever since. I became director of the museum late in 1939.

Mr. Shelley. Just one point on the question raised by some members of the committee about this particular panel of the vigilante episode.

When this matter was first called to my attention about 3 years ago by a gentleman who visited me in my office at San Francisco, I told him I had not seen the murals and could not make up my mind on them and had a perfectly open mind.

I went through these same photographs that I thing Mr. Scudder presented, or similar prints from the same shots and I made a critical comment regarding the one with the clenched fist about which I spoke earlier. Amongst those I criticized was the one just mentioned about the vigilantes all being very outstandingly white and the gentleman with the noose around his neck being dark to the point that the immediate reaction when you view that picture is that he was colored. My recollection of history is that there were very few if any Negroes in California at that time.

Since then I have several times gone down and seen the mural itself; and you get a completely different impression when you see the mural. Not that it is a colored Negro gentleman, but that it may have been somebody of Spanish or Mexican extraction. The color on the wall of the mural does not give you the same reaction as do these photographs.
Mr. Scherer. You get the impression he is different from the rest of the men in the picture, and coming from some minority group.

Mr. Shelley. That is possible, because the predominant people in California at that time were the Mexican and Spanish-descent people.

Mr. Auchincloss. Have you anything further, Mr. Howe?

Mr. Howe. I have nothing further.

Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you very much, sir. Mr. Faulkner, you are counsel for Mr. Refregier?

Mr. Faulkner. Yes, sir. Unfortunately my name is on the list as a witness. I was merely in communication with the committee so that I could attend the hearings and observe the testimony; but not to attend as a witness.

Mr. Auchincloss. Not as a witness?

Mr. Faulkner. No.

Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you very much.

Mr. Scudder. Do you mean that Mr. Refregier is not here?

Mr. Faulkner. No, sir. He is busy painting and is not here. As a matter of fact, he is painting murals for a synagogue.

Mr. Auchincloss. Our next witness is Mr. Bonner. According to the time schedule, Mr. Bonner, we will make it a very rough 15 minutes we can give you.

STATEMENT OF PAUL HYDE BONNER, TRUSTEE, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF ARTS

Mr. Bonner. I do not think I shall require that, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been asked by the board of trustees of the American Federation of Arts to come here today to say just one brief thing. The American Federation of Arts is an association whose chapter members are the museums of art and the college art museum and associations of the United States. There are some 390 chapter members in all States of the Union, including Hawaii.

The trustees have asked me to say to you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that in their belief no decision should be taken concerning the destruction of the Refregier murals in the Rincon annex post office without consulting the United States Fine Arts Commission, which was established by Congress to give advice and judgment on art and art matters in public buildings of the Federal Government.

Mr. Auchincloss. Will you file with the committee as soon as you conveniently can a list of the directors and officers of the American Federation of Arts?

Mr. Bonner. Indeed I shall.

Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bonner. I am representing the American Federation of Arts.

Mr. Auchincloss. Are there any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you very much. We have a statement, gentleman, from Henry Schnakenberg on behalf of the Artists Equity Association.

The notation I have here is that this statement will be introduced for the record. Have we such a statement on file here? I have
not seen it. I take it there is no objection and this will be included at the appropriate place in the record.

(The statement by the Artists Equity Association is as follows:)

STATEMENT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 211 BY ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, N. Y

Artists Equity Association comprises over 2,000 professional artists in 13 chapters from coast to coast. These artists have joined together in order to protect their professional interests and develop economic opportunities.

The association feels that House Joint Resolution 211, which proposes the removal of murals by Anton Refregier from the Rincon annex post office, San Francisco, Calif., is a serious threat to the interests of professional artists generally and violates a principle the association is pledged to defend.

Since these murals are made in the fresco technique, "removal" would require their destruction. To destroy such a large work, representing probably the greatest single achievement of the artist's career, would constitute a blow to his artistic personality which no member of the profession can countenance.

Our opposition to wanton or partisan destruction of works of art has been a principle of the organization since its beginning and was formulated in the following resolution last spring:

"Whereas monumental works of painting or sculpture are peculiarly vulnerable because each example thereof is unique; and whereas, the destruction of such a work of art can obliterate in a day the fruits of an artist's best years; and whereas such destruction entails equally destructive consequences to the artist's economic status and professional reputation: Therefore, It is

Resolved, That Artists Equity Association condemns unconditionally the conscious destruction of works of art, whether painting or sculpture, and whether by private or Government agency, that recompense to the artist cannot be considered payment for such destruction, and that Artists Equity Association shall oppose such destruction at all times through all means at its disposal.

The association feels that this bill should be opposed also because of the light in which it places the culture of the United States in the eyes of other countries of the world.

Many leading citizens, including representatives of the Government, are anxious to build up the cultural representation of the United States abroad. About a year ago Mr. Barrett, of the State Department, addressing a group of prominent industrialists at the Institute for International Relations, urged them to make private and corporate funds available for this purpose since such items are not included in the Federal budget.

Recently a large grant, to make possible exhibitions of American art in foreign countries during the next 5 years, was announced by the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation. However, there are not many such activities, and the United States lags far behind many lesser nations in this respect.

The bill under consideration would deal an irreparable blow to the cultural representation of the United States abroad. In fact, it might even seem calculated and hypocritical to spend sizable sums circulating exhibitions throughout the world at the same time that an outstanding monument of cultural expressions is destroyed at home.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, just for the record, I have read the statement by the Artists Equity Association. I have read the statement and no specific observation is made relative to the panels in the Rincon post office. The statement does not even say that the association has seen the panels. A statement of principle is made, and that is all; but the association states it is not relevant to the point at issue.

I do not believe any American organization would advocate that the communistic program should be placed on display in public buildings of the United States, and I do not believe that the Artists Equity Association advocates the adoption of such a policy. I would like that statement to be made.

Mr. Auchinloss. Do you object to the introduction?

Mr. Scudder. No. I am perfectly willing, with that statement.
Mr. Auchincloss. There being no objection, it will be introduced in the record with that explanation from Mr. Scudder. Is that correct, Mr. Scudder?

Mr. Scudder. That is right. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to put in some statements at this point.

Mr. Auchincloss. Without objection permission is granted to Mr. Scudder to put some statements into the record at this point.

(The statements by Mr. Scudder are as follows:)

[From the Congressional Record of March 17, 1952]

**USUAL FANFARE PRECEDES ORGANIZATION**

This Artists Equity Association was launched amid fanfare and publicity as an organization of painters, sculptors, and graphic artists, formed to serve the economic interests of artists, in April of 1947, at a gala affair at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, attended by a couple of hundred artists and museum men.

Artist Equity Association has printed the names of its 54 founding members. William Gropper, Communist organizer, is present again as one of the founders of AEA. He is joined by seven members of the Communist John Reed Club. They are Louis Guglielmi, Raphael Soyer, Adolph Dehn, the late John Sloan, Reginald Marsh, Ben Shahn, and Nicolai Cikovsky. This is a nucleus of experienced organizers.

Then I find the late Jo Davidson who since the days of the Armory Show of 1913 has been active in radical art causes. His record as an organizer I will read from the Un-American Activities Committee report of July 21, 1947: "The ICC-ASP was of Communist origin. It was set up by the Reds in January 1945 through their frontman Jo Davidson."

Davidson was cochairman of the NC-ASP, the organization that staged the Waldorf so-called peace conference, and 11 founding members of AEA were sponsors of that notorious Red propaganda stunt. Five of them were organizers and teachers of the John Reed Club mentioned before. Additional Red sponsors were Aaron Bohrod, Paul Burlin, Chaim Gross, Robert Gwathmey, Jack Levine, and Max Weber. Every one of these men has been loud and clamorous in the disloyal Communist cultural bund. The majority of the founders have been connected with Communists, Communist-front organizations, or Communist publications.

Artist Equity Association as an organization has passed the first requirement of a Communist front. It has Red organizers, left sympathizers, and just enough innocents to meet the requirements. Now who is placed as secretary of this artists outfit? None other than Mr. Frank Kleinholz, one-time teacher at the Communist Jefferson School in New York.

[From the May 1952 issue of American Artist]

**A QUESTION OF DEMOCRACY**

An editorial

Once again the question of the inviolability of works of art has been raised, this time by the New York Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions in connection with the proposal to destroy a mural by Anton Refregier in the Rincon Hill branch post office in San Francisco.

A letter from the council addressed to "Fellow Artists" asking them to join in a protest against the destruction of the murals explains that the mural was painted by Anton Refregier after winning a national competition and acceptance of his sketches by a Government-sponsored body. During the painting of the mural the American Legion of San Francisco, we are told, attempted unsuccessfully to block its completion and is now trying to effect its destruction.

In its letter the Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions quotes the following resolution recently passed by Artists Equity:

"Whereas monumental works of painting or sculpture are peculiarly vulnerable because each example thereof is unique; and
“Whereas the destruction of such a work of art can obliterate in a day the fruit of an artist’s best years; and
Whereas such destruction entails equally destructive consequences to the artist’s economic status and professional reputation Therefore, it is
Resolved, That Artists Equity Association condemns unconditionally the conscious destruction of works of art, whether painting or sculpture, and whether by private or Government agency, that recompense to the artist cannot be considered payment for such destruction, and that Artists Equity Association shall oppose such destruction at all times through all means at its disposal.”

“We artists,” the ASP letter goes on to say, “believe that at the completion and after payment for monumental works of art, such works of art become the property of the people and that neither the Government nor any private individual has the right to censor or destroy it.”

Many readers will recall the controversy over the destruction in 1942 of a mural in fresco by Alfred Crimi in the Rutgers Presbyterian Church in New York. Crimi took the case to court. He lost his suit, the mural was destroyed. The court denied the artist’s claim to inviolability, denied the painter’s rights to his work after it has been unconditionally sold. The judgment, in effect, upheld the principle of property rights, a principle that is a cornerstone of democratic government.

Although I greatly regretted the destruction of Crimi’s mural which, in my opinion and that of other critics, was a splendid work of art, I can only concur in the court’s judgment because I believe in democracy.

Great as any work of art may be, its importance is insignificant compared with the preservation of human rights. Artists Equity’s resolution, if observed, would prohibit the removal of buildings—works of art—in rapidly growing cities to make way for larger and more adequate structures; it would give perpetual life to numberless hideous monuments and murals, commissioned during an era of low taste, or foisted upon the public by political pressure.

It would have prevented the destruction of Diego Rivera’s Radio City mural which turned out to be communistic propaganda. It would prevent the removal of a banal mural in a public library—one probably considered good art—by a bad painter long dead and forgotten, to make room for a more appropriate work by a contemporary artist. The resolution, put in effect, would be a disservice to artists themselves rather than a protection.

I have seen neither the original Reffiger mural nor a reproduction of it. My interest in the matter has nothing to do with the art merit of the painting which, being a Reffiger, I suspect is considerable. Presumably the American Legion is objecting to the picture’s message rather than to its esthetic character.

What is at stake here is the preservation of the democratic process. The ASP refers to the American Legion as a “pressure group,” yet it has setup its own “pressure group.” Now this should not be a fight between two pressure groups. The ASP admits that “such works of art become the property of the people.” Why then does it canvass the opinion of the people in this postal district who are most concerned, the public which can logically be said to “own” the picture? They, not artists all over the Nation, are the people whose pleasure should decide the issue. It is they whom the picture is intended to serve.

To the American Legion we offer the same advice. Let the two “pressure groups,” if they really stand for democracy, get together in the taking of a poll of citizens who visit that post office during a single week. Give them their freedom to decide what they do or do not wish to live with and what kind of an influence they wish to set before their children. Let the citizens decide. Even though they may make an unwise choice, let us remember that in a democracy people have even the privilege of choosing what may not be best for them—as they do on many an election day. As to the effect of the picture’s destruction upon the artist’s reputation, it is a weak reputation indeed that could not survive an incident of that kind.

ERNEST W. WATSON.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I have a statement here from the AMVETS signed by James J. Kehoe, AMVET Bay Area Council commander, 510 Chelmsford Road, Hillsborough, San Mateo, P. O. delivery.

I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the record at the appropriate point. It was on my desk here and I am afraid we overlooked it.

(The statement by the AMVETS referred to above is as follows:)

RINCON ANNEX MURALS—SAN FRANCISCO 75
AMVETS

The Bay Area Council of the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, held a special meeting on April 14, 1953, at the Marine Memorial Club, San Francisco, Calif., and it was unanimously voted and passed by the membership and agreed upon by the resolution committee that the following resolution be approved and submitted to our representatives in Congress for consideration, Whereas the membership of the AMVETS in the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., has opposed to mural painting now displayed in the Rincon annex post office, San Francisco, Calif.;

Whereas the painting consists of a priest holding a red Bible in his hand, a set of guns from a naval battleship pointing out and the American flag being misplaced with flags of other nations; representing a communistic painting,

Whereas the Post Office Department is a Government agency supported by the American people who are in the battle against communism;

Whereas the Post Office Department represents the Government of the United States and its citizens: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Bay Area Council AMVETS in the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., That we are opposed to the mural paintings in the Rincon annex post office, San Francisco, and request that their removal be enforced by necessary legislation in the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully submitted for consideration and approval by the California congressional delegation.

JAMES J. KEHOE,
AMVET Bay Area Council Commander.

Mr. Auchincloss. Are there any other witnesses who wish to be heard briefly?

STATEMENT OF H. D. WALKER, REPRESENTING ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION

Mr. Walker. Mr. Chairman, I can be very brief. I do represent Artists Equity Association. Mr. Schnakenberg could not come. My name is Hudson D. Walker. I would like to read a part of this statement.

Mr. Auchincloss. You have about 7 minutes.

Mr. Walker. I won't take that long, sir. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I was just going to read out of this statement that has been introduced into the record, a part of a letter that the artist received from Julian Huxley, the outstanding cultural leader in Great Britain, who used to be the Director General of UNESCO:

* * * * * * * * *

Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you very much. Are there any questions? (No response.)

Mr. Auchincloss. Mr. Faulkner, would you come forward for a minute? I would like to ask you just one question. I understand your reluctance to testify as a witness. Can you testify as to where Anton Refregier was born?

STANLEY FAULKNER, COUNSEL FOR ANTON REFREGIER

Mr. Faulkner. The only knowledge I have is that he was born outside the United States as evidenced by the record of this committee, but that he is a naturalized citizen—I think that was proven and established—as of about 1930, I believe. I never inquired into it except I do know he is foreign born. He did tell me he is an American citizen, and he was very much affected by the statement that had been issued to the press by Congressman Scudder to the effect that
Mr. Refregier is not an American citizen. I think there was some statement made, if I am correct, on that.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I made a statement that was taken from a newspaper article when I introduced the resolution, and that is the reason why I started my statement today giving the actual place of birth and when he was naturalized. I apologized for having made the statement, which was supposedly authentic.

Mr. FAULKNER. Unfortunately the damage is severely done once such a statement is made, and it takes many apologies to correct a statement like that.

Mr. SCUDDER. Well, it was in the newspapers.

Mr. Auchinloss. I did not ask you to step up to go into all of that. I want to ask you one more question. That is, Do you know if Mr. Refregier at any time changed his name from his original name?

Mr. FAULKNER. No. That I do not know.

Mr. Auchinloss. Thank you very much.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I had to leave the room before the other witness finished. That witness put into the record a quote from a gentleman from Great Britain in which he is certainly making a statement against a Member of Congress which I am not in accord with. I will certainly bring it up before the executive meeting of the committee to strike from the record. I quote the statement:

* * * actions like that of Representative Scudder are trying to introduce a similar tyranny into your great country.

I do not like to have people from Great Britain putting things in the hearing and making statements like that against a Member of Congress when the person making the statements is not here to answer a few questions that we would like to ask him. Certainly our colleague is a good American and believes in law and order and is a defender of American freedom.

Mr. Auchinloss. If there are no further witnesses I declare this hearing closed.

Mr. McKEEVER. Mr. Chairman, you asked me to provide the names of the officers and directors of the various organizations I represent. I would like to enter into the record a compilation of the names of the citizens' committee. I have 35 copies here and I would ask permission to have that inserted. They are not broken down into offices but they represent rather a distinguished list of citizens, all of whom are part of this committee. Would you so order?

Mr. Auchinloss. If there is no objection, we will insert it.

(The citizens' committee list is as follows:)

STATEMENT FOR THE Citizens' Committee

A joint resolution of Congress is under consideration declaring that the Anton Refregier murals in the Rincon Annex post office in San Francisco "cast a derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers and the history of the great State of California" and should be promptly removed.

The designs for the murals and the completed murals were approved by the Federal Building Administration after all revisions required had been fully complied with and final approval granted.

Competent nationally recognized art authorities have attested to the aesthetic quality of the murals and the episodes are based on historic fact.

If works of art are to be destroyed or eliminated whenever they cease to conform to the taste of an art society, a fraternal organization, or any other group, the status of durable art in America is subverted.
Good citizens will resent this intrusion into the field of art and freedom of artistic expression.

You are urged to make your opposition know to Members of Congress (list attached) by writing or wiring an expression of your views.

This statement was drafted on April 14 by Lloyd Ackerman, attorney; I. R. Fromer, artist and architect; Michael Goodman, architect and professor; Erle Loran, artist, writer, and teacher; Charles Mattox, artist, businessman; Dr. Grace Morley, art lecturer and writer, director, San Francisco Museum of Art; Ernest Mundt, artist, teacher, director, California School of Fine Arts; Mrs. Henry Potter Russell, philanthropist and civic leader; Ferdinand Smith, businessman, resident partner, Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane; Martin Snapper, artist and teacher, director, San Francisco Art Festival, 1951 and 1952; Sidney Walton, business executive, civic leader, philanthropist; Mrs. Grete Williams, art expert and dealer; J. D. Zellerbach, businessman, president, Crown Zellerbach Corp.

The following are among those, up to this date, who have endorsed the statement:

Lloyd Ackerman, 111 Sutter, San Francisco
Louise Ackerman, 3080 Pacific, San Francisco
Elizabeth Banning, 173 Maiden Lane, San Francisco
Theodore Bernardi, Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons, 402 Jackson, San Francisco
Charles Blyth, Blyth & Co., Russ Building, San Francisco and Redington Road, Burlingame
Ernest Born, 730 Montgomery, San Francisco
Ellen Bransten (Mrs. Joseph), 230 Sea Cliff, San Francisco
Gabrielle M Bradley (Mrs. John L.), 711 Hayne Road, San Mateo
Mrs. Henry H. Brigham, 2602 Pacific, San Francisco
Phoebe Brown, 135th Avenue, San Francisco
Mrs. Cabot Brown, 2040 Gough, San Francisco
John Campbell, 456 Vallejo, San Francisco
Nell Chidester (Mrs. Drew), 2222 Hyde, San Francisco
Barnaby Conrad, 844 Bay, San Francisco
E. Morris Cox, Dodge & Cox, Mills Tower, San Francisco
Margaret S. Cox, 2361 Broadway, San Francisco
Helen G. Cross (Mrs. Robert D.), 541 Salvatierra, Stanford
Gardiner Dailey, 442 Post, San Francisco
Elizabeth Pope Davis (Mrs. John Parks), 2714 Pacific, San Francisco
Elizabeth McG. Dunne (Mrs. Arthur B.), 2000 Vallejo, San Francisco
Paul Elbel, 371 California, San Francisco
Mrs. Paul Elbel, 2423 Leavenworth, San Francisco
Donn Emmons, Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons, 402 Jackson, San Francisco
Forrest Engelhart, Alamo, Calif.
Mrs. Milton H. Esberg, Ross and 13th Green, San Francisco
Dr. Earl W. Escher, 2086 Pacific, San Francisco
Beulah W. Wood, Sheehy, Box 554, Kentfield
Charles Griffin, 585 Columbus, San Francisco
Dr. Ray Faulkner, Stanford University, Stanford
Dr. William Faulkner, 20 San Rafael Way, San Francisco
Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Fay, 2740 Divisadero, San Francisco
I. R. Fromer, 1932 Cabrillo, San Francisco
Mrs. Mortimer Fleishhacker, 2418 Pacific Avenue, San Francisco
Phoebe Galgiani (Mrs. John V.), 2626 Larkin, San Francisco
Michael Goodman, 29 Northgate Avenue, Berkeley
Elizabeth Hamilton (Mrs. Noble), 2901 Scott, San Francisco
Leah Runne Hamilton (Mrs. Joseph), 1141 Filbert, San Francisco
Dr. Walter Heil, De Young Memorial Museum and 2674 Broadway, San Francisco
Prof. H. C. Heffner, 1550 Waverley, Palo Alto
George W. Hellyer, Jr., 261 Filbert, San Francisco
Mrs. Fentress Hill, 540 Powell, San Francisco
Thomas C. Howe, Jr., California Palace of the Legion of Honor and 2345 Hyde, San Francisco
Sergeant Johnson, 1507 Grant, San Francisco
Donald Kirby, Beach, Kirby Mulvin, 109 Stevenson and 29 Alta, San Francisco
Mrs. Donald Kirby, 29 Alta, San Francisco
Daniel E. Kosland, Levi Strauss & Co., 98 Battery, San Francisco
Squire Knowles, 730 Montgomery, San Francisco
Marcella Labaudt, 1407 Gough, San Francisco
James K. Lockhead, Crocker First National Bank, San Francisco
Ward Lockwood, 1636 LaLoma Avenue, Berkeley
Erie Loran, 10 Kenilworth Court, Berkeley
Garrett McEnerey II, McEnerey & Jacobs, Hobart Building, San Francisco
J. D. McEvy, 99 27th Avenue, San Francisco
Caroline Martin (Mrs. Charles O.), 2521 Broadway, San Francisco
Charles Mattox, the Louvre, 719A Chestnut, San Francisco
Rev. William J. Monihan, S. J., University of San Francisco, San Francisco
Eric Mendelssohn, 627 Commercial and 2423 Leavenworth, San Francisco
Natalie O. M. Merrill (Mrs. John L.), 1940 Broadway, San Francisco
Dr. Grace Morley, San Francisco Museum of Art, Civic Center, and 1145 Green, San Francisco
Ernest Mundt, California School of Fine Arts, 800 Chestnut, San Francisco
Stephen C. Pepper, 2718 Buena Vista Way, Berkeley
Helen Crocker Russell, 1 Montgomery, San Francisco, and 555 Eucalyptus, Burlingame
Leon Russell, 401 Phelan Building, San Francisco
Rudolph Schaeffer, Rudolph Schaeffer School of Design, 350 Union, San Francisco
Neil Sinton (Mrs. Stanley H.), 2520 Divisadero
Ferdinand Smith, Merrill Lynch, Pierce Fenner & Beane, 301 Montgomery, San Francisco
Margery Hoffman Smith, 825 Francisco, San Francisco
Martin Snipper, 18 Edith, San Francisco
Antonio Sotomayor, 3 Le Roy Place, San Francisco
Jeanette Dyer Spencer (Mrs. Eldridge T.), 1050 Vallejo, San Francisco
Ann Sterling (Mrs. J. E. Wallace), 623 Mirada Road, Palo Alto
Wallace Sterling, Stanford University, Stanford
Josephine Sullivan (Mrs. Jerd), 944 Chestnut, San Francisco
Jerd Sullivan, Crocker First National Bank, San Francisco, and 944 Chestnut, San Francisco
Mrs. Powers Symington, 834 Grove, San Francisco
Gene Tepper, 802 Montgomery, San Francisco
Ruth Cravath Wakefield, 716 Montgomery, San Francisco
Sidney Walton, 1725 Kearney, San Francisco
Michael Well, White House, San Francisco
Lynn White, Mills College, Oakland
Brayton Wilbur, Wilbur-Ellis Co., 320 California, San Francisco
W. W. Wurster, 1451 LeRoy Avenue, Berkeley, Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons, 402 Jackson, San Francisco
J. D. Zellerbach, 348 Sansome, San Francisco

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED BY CHAUNCY MCKEEVER

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING AND HOUSING ASSOCIATION, 210 POST ST., SAN FRANCISCO

Herbert Bartholomew, president
Michael Well, first vice president
George W. Johns, Jr., second vice president
John Bolles, third vice president
Benjamin H. Swig, treasurer
Mrs. Jessie C. Coleman, secretary
Miss Alice Griffith, honorary president

SAN FRANCISCO ART ASSOCIATION, 800 CHESTNUT STREET, SAN FRANCISCO

Francis V. Keesling, Jr., president
John E. Cushing, first vice president
Mrs. Joseph Bransten, second vice president
William W. Crocker, treasurer
Mrs. Stanley Sinton, secretary

METAL ARTS GUILD, 1335 M'ALLISTER STREET, SAN FRANCISCO

Caroline Rosene, president
RINCON ANNEX MURALS—SAN FRANCISCO

MARIN SOCIETY OF ARTISTS, MARIN ART & GARDEN, ROSS, CALIF.

Ray Strong, president

SAN FRANCISCO WOMEN ARTISTS, 2238 HYDE STREET, SAN FRANCISCO

Frances Baldwin, president
Mrs. Charles S. James, treasurer
Elizabeth Mailliard, membership
Marcia Fee, executive business secretary

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUSEUM OF ART

W. W. Crocker, chairman of the board, Crocker First National Bank, San Francisco.
Brayton Wilbur, president of the board, 320 California Street, San Francisco.
Robert C. Harris, secretary, Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe, attorneys 14 Montgomery Street, San Francisco.

WOMEN'S BOARD, 1953, SAN FRANCISCO MUSEUM OF ART

Mrs. Jerd Sullivan, president, 944 Chestnut Street, San Francisco.
Mrs. Clarence Lindner, first vice president, 283 Telegraph Hill Boulevard, San Francisco.
Mrs. John L. Merrill, second vice president, 1940 Broadway, San Francisco.
Mrs. Walter A. Haas, secretary, 2100 Pacific Avenue, San Francisco.

LIST FAVORING ADOPTION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 211

James J. Kehoe, commander, AMVET Bay Area Council, 510 Chelmsford Road, Hillsborough, San Mateo P. O. Delivery, California
R. A. Cahalan, 2111 Hyde Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Mr. Cahalan's letter exceptional)
F. M. Brett, 174 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
H. D. Pischel, 15 Sixth Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Elmer Booth, 1133 Estates Drive, Lafayette, Calif.
Mrs. Clark M. Johnson, 2834 Divisadero Street, San Francisco 23, Calif.
Eldred L. Meyer, Chairman, Grand Parlor Americanism Committee, Native Sons of the Golden West, 833 Rowan Building, Los Angeles 13, Calif.
Dr. Herbert McKnight Doyle, 2507 Pine Street, San Francisco 15, Calif.
Brother Cornelius, St. Mary's College, St. Mary's College, Calif.
Dr. Harry B. Hambly, Jr., 2215 Chestnut Street, San Francisco 23, Calif.
Alfred M. Silva, 660 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Thomas C. Leighton, president, Society of Western Artists, 1170 Phelan Building, San Francisco, Calif.
Ernest B. Hillstrom, 151 23d Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
(Above list shows names of those who have communicated with committee as of June 4, 1953, urging adoption of H. J. Res. 211.)

LIST OPPOSING ADOPTION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 211

Catherine B. Heckman, San Francisco, Calif.
Glo. Perman, 426 Filmore Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. Jalareo, San Francisco, Calif.
Melvin B. Johnson, San Francisco, Calif.
E. J. Woodner, San Francisco, Calif.
Q. McCleary, San Francisco, Calif.
Jane Barnes, San Francisco, Calif.
Charles R. Blyth, San Francisco, Calif.
Edith Swanson, 1478 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Elizabeth Randall, 645 Eighth Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
J. E. Wallace Sterling, 623 Mirada, Stanford University, California.
Allan Schoener, San Francisco, Calif.
Walter Heil, San Francisco, Calif.
Bruce and Grace Kelham, San Francisco, Calif.
Lloyd S. Ackerman, 111 Sutter Building, San Francisco, Calif.
E. Morris Cox, San Francisco, Calif.
Gardner Dailey, American Institute of Architects, San Francisco, Calif.
J. D. McEvoy, 1900 Russ Building, San Francisco 4, Calif.
L. P. Job, 2695 Sacramento Street, San Francisco 15, Calif.
Judith Kerner, 2114 Baker Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Ferdinand C. Smith, San Francisco, Calif.
Don Blum, 1055 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Joseph A. Moore, Jr., 2590 Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Noble Hamilton, 2901 Scott Street, San Francisco 23, Calif.
Grover A. Magnin, apartment A, St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Stanley H. Sinton, Jr., 2520 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Dr. Paul J. Moses, M. D., 2006 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Miss Arthur G. Dunne, 2090 Vallejo Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Charles O. Martin, 2521 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
Henry Mayer, M. D.; W. L. Minkowski, M. D.; Elam Latimer, Redwood, Calif.,
Walter W. Horn, James Ackermann, Earl Lorin, John Haley, Ward Lockwood,
Berkeley, Calif.
William W. Wurster, architect, Berkeley, Calif.
Abraham Rothstein, 3820 Harrison Street, Oakland, Calif.
Karl Kasten, 1232 Pleasant Hill Road, Lafayette, Calif.
Ed Conness, 2013 Washburne Avenue, Chicago 8, Ill.
C. C. Cunningham, director, Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Conn.
David Durst, 857 Fairview, Fayetteville, Ark.
Ernest Mundt, director, California School of Fine Arts, 800 Chestnut Street, San
Francisco, Calif.
Grave L. McCann Morley, director, San Francisco Museum of Art and vice presi-
dent of American Association of Art Museum Directors, San Francisco.
Michel D. Weill, president, De Young Museum Society, San Francisco, Calif.
John W. Dodds, Stanford University, California.
Ray Faulkner, Department of Art and Architecture, Stanford University, Cali-
ifornia.
Hubert Heffner, Department of Speech and Drama, Stanford University, Cali-
ifornia.
Mrs. Wallace Sterling, the President's House, Stanford University, California.
John P. Leeper, director, Pasadena Art Institute, 46 North Los Robles, Pasadena,
Calif.
Richard F. Howard, director, Birmingham Museum of Art, Birmingham, Ala.
James Chillman, Jr., director, Museum Fine Arts, Houston 5, Tex.
Eleanor Onderdonk, Witte Memorial Museum, San Antonio, Tex.
Perry T. Rathbone, director, City Art Museum of St. Louis, Mo.
Edmund Yaghjian, Department of Fine Arts, University of South Carolina,
Columbia, S. C.
Henry R. Hope, Fine Arts Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
William M. Milliken, director, Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, Ohio.
John C. Galloway, Department of Art, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
Adelyn D. Breeskin, director, Baltimore Museum of Art, Baltimore, Md.
Lynn White, Jr., president, Mills College, Mills College, California.
Esther I. Seaver, director, the Dayton Art Institute, Dayton 6, Ohio.
Lamar Dodd, Department of Art, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Justus Bier, History of Arts, University of Louisville, Louisville 8, Ky.
Richard B. Freeman, Department of Art, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
Alden F. Megrew, Fine Arts Department, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
Lynn R. Wolfe, Department of Fine Arts, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
Edward S. King, director, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore 1, Md.
Joseph T. Fraser, Jr., director, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia,
Pa.
Stanley Faulkner, counselor at law, 9 East 40th Street, New York 16, N. Y.
Paul Hyde Bonner, American Federation of Arts, Washington, D. C.
Brayton Wilbur, president, and W. W. Crocker, chairman of board, Gardner
Dailey, Hector Escobosa, Robert C. Harris, Mrs. E. S. Keller, Charles Page,
Mrs. Henry Potter Russell, Leon Russell, Albert E. Schlesinger, trustees of
San Francisco Museum of Art, San Francisco, Calif.
J. D. Zellerbach, president of Crown Zellerbach Corp. and trustee of San Francisco Museum of Art, San Francisco, Calif.
Helen Clowder Russell, 1 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Thomas C. Howe, Jr., director, California Palace of Legion of Honor, San Francisco.
Lincoln Rothschild, executive director, Artists Equity Association, New York, N. Y.
C. Barber, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Patricia Peake, art librarian, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Esther Gordon, department of art, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Agnes R. Claflin, director of art gallery, chairman, Art Department, Vassar College, New York.
Herman More, director, Whitney Museum of American Art, 10 West Eighth Street, New York, N. Y.
Alfred H. Barr, Jr., director, Museum of Modern Art, 11 West 53rd Street, New York, N. Y.
Edgar C. Schenck, director, Buffalo Fine Arts Academy, Buffalo 22, N. Y.
Linda Weinberg, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Mr. Miller McDaniel, manager, Miller McDaniel Co., Santa Cruz, Calif.
Richard F. Fuller, president and director, Seattle Art Museum, Seattle, Wash.
Victor D'Amico, director, department of education, Museum of Modern Art, New York, N. Y.
Mrs. Aline Gunst, 2786 Vallejo Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Daniel C. Rich, Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Barbara Parrott, San Mateo, Calif.
Alfred Neumeyer, Mills College, California
Roger Wurtz, Kentfield, Calif.
Charles Porter and Robert Steinwedell, 304 Greenwich Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Paul E. Firden, 1059 Union Street, San Francisco 11, Calif.
Miss Mary E. Haggerty, 1444 16th Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Anne H. Rockwell, 45 Scenic Way, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Edward J. Buckley, 30 San Anselmo Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Arthur L. Bloomfield, 245 Locust Street, San Francisco 18, Calif.
Rene d'Harnoncourt, Museum of Modern Art, 11 West 53rd Street, New York 19, N. Y.
Dorothy Ely, 50 Scenic Way, San Francisco 21, Calif.
Elizabeth Banning, American Institute of Decorators, 173 Madison Lane, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Milton H. Esberg, Ross, Calif.
Lloyd Goodrich, Whitney Museum of American Art, 10 West Eighth Street, New York, N. Y.
S. Lane Faison, Jr., president, College Art Association of America, 625 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Hamilton Brown, president, Allied Arts Association, Houston, Tex.
Herbert Bartholomew, president, San Francisco Planning and Housing Association, 210 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Olive Clove, 171 San Marcos Avenue, San Francisco 16, Calif.
Mr. and Mrs. Leo Gilbert, 2127 21st Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Morse Erskine, 233 Chestnut Street, San Francisco 11, Calif.
Mrs. John V. Galgiani, 2126 Larkin Street, San Francisco 9, Calif.
Richard B. Freeman, department of art, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
Edgar A. Albin, 1930 Cleveland Avenue, Fayetteville, Ark.
Phyllis Brome and Arthur Bell, San Francisco, Calif.
Joseph S. Thompson, San Francisco, Calif.
E. P. Richardson, director, Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. D. A. Gardnukel, 1347 37th Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Gaylen Von Pyle, Route 4, Fayetteville, Ark.
John Waiden Myer, director, Museum of City of New York, 5th Avenue, 103d and 104th Streets, New York 29, N. Y.
Irving Adler, national director, National Council of Arts, Sciences and Professions, Inc., 35 West 64th Street, New York 23, N. Y.
The women's board, San Francisco Museum of Art, San Francisco, Calif.
Charles Mattox, chairman, and Ferdinand Smith, secretary, San Francisco Bay Region Citizens Committee, San Francisco, Calif.
G. Ellis Burcaw, director, Neville Public Museum, Green Bay, Wis.
Frank H. Rodin, M D., 490 Post Street, San Francisco 2, Calif.
Mrs. Perry Biestman, 2520 Diossadero, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs William G. Gilmore, 2950 Vallejo Street, San Francisco 23, Calif.
Hans Huth, research director, Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Eugene Kingman, director, Joslyn Art Museum, 2218 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
S. Lane Faison, Jr., president Art Association of America, 625 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
James C. Reisinger, 712 Bay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. A. Grubb, San Francisco, Calif.
Roger D. Lapham, San Francisco, Calif
Adaline W. and V P Fuller, Jr., San Mateo, Calif.
Mrs. Hervey Parke Clarke, Woodside, Calif.
Edith Heath, Paradise Drive, Tiburon, Calif.
Lawrence Livingston, Jr., planning consultant, San Francisco, Calif.
Elaine Rothenberg, 30 Bedford Street, New York 14, N. Y.
Mr. and Mrs. Harry E. Butler, Jr., Berkeley, Calif.
Thomas S. Page, 2940 Pierce Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Wellesley College, Department of Art, Wellesley, Mass.
Henry F Grady, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. John L Bradley, 711 Hayne Road, San Mateo, Calif.
Mrs. Robert P. Brand, 2801 Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Daniel E. Koshland, San Francisco, Calif.
Charles Mattox, secretary for the Citizens Committee, San Francisco, Calif.
Dore Battey, 210 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Helen Silver, 48 West 93d Street, New York, N. Y.
Alexander Rimley, San Francisco, Calif.
Pauline Sabin Davis, Washington, D. C.
Irwin Rosenhouse, 328 East 34th Street, New York, N. Y.
American section of the International Association of Art Critics, New York, N. Y.
Robert Cronbach, Harold M. Ambellan, 192 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Philip Reisman, 567 6th Avenue, and Harry Shoulberg, Gerrit Hon dus, New York City.
Joseph Kaplan, Remo Farruggion, Henry Kallen, Henry Rothman, 161 West 22d New York, N. Y.
Mrs. Norman M. Dunlop, 2801-B Fulton Street, Berkeley 5, Calif.
Miss Elma M Wilkins, 6493 Parallon Way, Oakland 11, Calif.
Mrs. Glenn A Stockhouse, 2068 Vallejo Street, San Francisco 23, Calif.
Mrs. E. Gordon, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Edward Macaulay, 40 Florence Street, San Francisco 11, Calif.
Henry Mayer and William L. Minkowski, 945 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, Calif.
John S. Thacher, director, 1703 32d Street, Washington 7, D. C.
George Heard Hamilton, Department of the History of Art, New Haven, Conn.
Arthur B. Simon, 3550 Baker Street, San Francisco 23, Calif.
Rosanda Holmes, 551 Francisco Street, San Francisco 11, Calif.
Mildred H Barish, 1885 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Bernice G. Lovett, 1177 Cragmont Avenue, Berkeley 8, Calif.
George Stimmel, 660 Market Street, San Francisco 4, Calif.
Georgina Penwick, 1252 Filbert Street, San Francisco 9, Calif.
Mrs. Edward Topham, Jr. (No address).
Dr. Manuel F. Allende, 2259 Vallejo Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Stanley Brooks, 544 Market Street, San Francisco 4, Calif.
Mills College, Department of Art, Katherine F. Caldwell, Mills College, Calif.
Mrs. Francis F. Owen, Box 716, Kentfield, Calif.
Alfred Neumeyer, director, Mills College Art Gallery, Mills College, Calif.
D. G. Byrd, director, Kalamazoo Institute of Arts, 421 West South Street, Kalamazoo, Mich.
P. H. Baker, 55 Fremont Road, San Rafael, Calif.
R. V. Carrell, 256 Third Avenue, San Francisco 18, Calif.
J. C. Foster, 1719 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Kolf Eissler, M D., 2107 Van Ness Ave, San Francisco 9, Calif.
R. M. Church, director, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa 5, Okla.
Mrs. Norbert P. O'Brien, 68 Post Street, San Francisco 4, Calif.
Alexander M. Bing, 18 East 48th Street, New York 17, N Y.
Samuel M. Kootz Gallery, 600 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.
Ira S Lillick, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Jean Paul Slusser, Museum of Art, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Evelett P. Lesley, Jr., 190 East End Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Alice Baldwin, 424 West 23rd Street, New York, N. Y.
Alciss E. Erskine, 55 East 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
Jean E. Mailey, 424 West 23rd Street, New York, N. Y.
S. Lane Faison, Jr., president, College Art Association, 625 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
James S. Plaut, director, Institute of Contemporary Art, 138 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass.
Rhoda Monks, 33 Castle Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. W. Huebsch, Viking Press, Inc., 18 East 48th Street, New York 17, N. Y.
Daniel L. Boyd, 44 Fifth Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Frank W. Applebee, head, Department of Art, Auburn, Ala.
Calvin S. Hathaway, 50 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y.
Helen L. Weinstein, 3834 Washington Street, San Francisco 18, Calif.
Dr. and Mrs.二氧化碳 G. Campbell, 160 Palo Alto Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
L. BeMeKeen, 79 Pleasant Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D S. Ofenbaker, director, Fort Worth Art Museum, Fort Worth, Tex.
Joan J. L. San Francisco, Calif.

gerson, director, Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Robert M. Church, director, Philbrook Art Center, 2727 South Rockford Road, Tulsa, Okla.
Mr. and Mrs. Geo. R. Oppenheim, 453 20th Avenue, San Francisco 21, Calif.
Professor of Architecture, University of California, Sacramento, Calif.
John L. Leslie, Stanford Court, 901 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
S. G. Sanson, 1200 41st Street, Sacramento, Calif.
E. M. Jacobson, 168 8th Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
T. M. Anger, 4230-20th Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Eno Gunther, director, University of Washington, Seattle 5, Wash.
LaVerne Krause, 1514 Southeast Marion Street, Portland 2, Oreg.
P. M. Bolton, president, 302 Dallas Avenue, Houston 3, Tex.
Sidney J. Gallery, 15 East 57th Street, New York 22, N. Y.
Robert M. Bennett, president, Carmel, Calif.
W. D. Lindsay, 349 Liberty Street, San Francisco, Calif.
August B. Rothschild, 155 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
John C. Campbell, San Francisco Museum of Art, San Francisco 11, Calif.
Holland Roberts, director, California Labor School, San Francisco 17, Calif.
Elizabeth Randull, 645 Eighth Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Jerry Bywaters, director, Dallas Museum of Fine Arts, Dallas 10, Tex.
Edith A. Standen, 63 Riverside Drive, New York 24, N. Y.
H. H. Arnason, director, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mary Shore, 55 Summer Street, Gloucester, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Paul Lebaun, 1850 Bough Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Samuel W. Heatweich, director, Municipal Art, 2300 East Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, Calif.
Kalman Kibunyi, president, New England Artists Equity Association, 55 Summer Street, Gloucester, Mass.
Marie S. Toaquin, Sutter County, Marysville, Calif.
Sidney W. Little, dean, School of Architecture and Allied Arts, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.
Art Department Staff, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
Mr. and Mrs. Michele Russo, 7342 N. E. Couch Street, Portland 16, Oreg.
Mr. Fiske Kimball, director, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia, Pa.
Board of Trustees, Portland Art Association, Portland, Oreg.
Mrs. Ransom Carver, 1215 La Canada Road, San Mateo, Calif.
Mr. A. E. Manuel, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
Mrs. Ugo M. Tavella, 1487 Greenwich Street, San Francisco, Calif.
J. Craig Sheppard, chairman, department of art, University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
Harry Sheer, 58 11th Street, Oakland, Calif.
William N. Eisendrath, Jr., assistant to the director, City Art Museum of St. Louis, Mo.
Peter H. Odegard, chairman, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Mrs. Clara E. Stukey, Rural Route 2, Box 2615, Paradise, Calif.
Mrs. Gary J. Torre, 65 Evergreen Lane, Berkeley, Calif.
James D. Hart, 740 San Luis Road, Berkeley, Calif.
Chester J. Villabba, 2656 Webster Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Jean Saiz, Oakland, Calif.
Frank A. Quinn, 1668 Hayes Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Edith Swanson, 1478 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Ruth Hammer, San Francisco, Calif.
Miss Hazel Hanson, Calle Santo Domingo, San Miguel Allende, Guanajuato, Mexico.
Mrs. Leonard Rosenman, 3950 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Mr. Walter Geistel, 2400 Haste Street, Berkeley, Calif.
Stanley Marcus, Neiman-Marcus, Dallas, Tex.
Fleta Panchot, 1230 A Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Frank M. Winfield H. Rice, 2546 Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
T. C. Lawrence, 2605 Etna Street, Berkeley, Calif.
Dr. and Mrs. M. Felton, 123 14th Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Anna Wetherill Olmsted, director, Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts, Syracuse, N. Y.
Mrs. Ruby I. Ruden, 1083 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Millard Meiss, Briar Brae Road, Stamford, Conn.
Edward Biberman, 3322 Deronda Drive, Hollywood, Calif.
Laura Robins Dornbach, Belvedere, Calif.
Irina Attndge, 9319 Hazen Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.
Paul Oppermann, 427 Gonzales Drive, San Francisco, Calif.
John E. Hewitt, San Francisco, Calif.
Frank M. Henry, San Francisco, Calif.
Jean Paul Slusser, chairman pro tempore, Museum of Art, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
C. E. Stossland, 322 W. Vine Street, Oxford, Ohio.
Victor L. Sutherland, 754 Church Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Margaret Geller, 1320 Henry Street, Berkeley, Calif.
Julie Poekman, 121 21st Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Allen Smith, 2160 Geary, San Francisco, Calif.
Paul Nani, 375 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Kenneth A. Grennon, 4057 24th Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Henry J. Skilling, 2 Brazil, San Francisco, Calif.
A. Malcolm, 1005 Noe Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. Whaley, 672 Lyon, San Francisco, Calif.
R. M. Ariss, 2040 Mayview Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.
Osabelle Chaikoff, 1595 La Vereda, Berkeley, Calif.
Albert Lehman, 438 State Avenue, Oakland, Calif.
Julie E. Schneider, 2120 Woolsey Street, Berkeley, Calif.
Mrs. Marion Kronfeld, 333 Frederick Street, San Francisco, Calif.
James M. Miller, Post Office Box 1495, Sacramento, Calif.
Ruth Hope, 819 Calmar Avenue, Oakland, Calif.
Lloyd J. Reynolds, professor of art, art department, Reed College, Portland, Oreg.
Robert Mallary, 3531 Meier Street, Venice, Calif.
Mrs. L. F. Abadie, 5932 Estates Drive, Oakland, Calif.
Mrs. Eleanor D. Breed, 77 Panoramic Way, Berkeley, Calif.
Mr. and Mrs. Jay J. Blayney, 366 San Carlos Avenue, Piedmont, Calif.
Grace Langstroth, 4321 Bridgeview Drive, Oakland, Calif.
Florence A. Galt, 150 Ready Road, Concord, Calif.
E. J. Martin, 43 Riverton Drive, San Francisco, Calif.
Donald Short, secretary, Artists Club of San Francisco, 252 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. P. Castello, 2101 Loguna Street, San Francisco 15, Calif.

E. N. Nelson, 524 Vista Court, Millbrae, Calif.

Lenore M. Collor, 90 Miller Avenue, Mill Valley, Calif.

W. Pryor, San Francisco, Calif.

Ann Maclean, 985 S Eldorado Street, San Mateo, Calif.

Francis A. Lockwood, 402 Jackson, San Francisco, Calif.

Frances S. Baldwin, 2283 Hyde Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Hildegardt Haas, 2541 Dwight Way, Berkeley 4, Calif.

S. Griswold Morley, 2635 Elta Street, Berkeley 4, Calif.

Miss Ruth Sweeney, 1379 Vallejo Street, San Francisco 9, Calif.

Mr. and Mrs. Ed Holmes, 1401 Hudson Avenue, St. Helena, Calif.

Clifford Haley, 3205 Army Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Susan Chambers, 470 Day Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Mrs. L. B. Denniss, 2911 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. B. Ruddacin, 151 Buena Vista Road, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Wm. C. Casperson, curator, Paterson Museum, 268 Summer Street, Paterson, N. J.

Nedra B. Bello, 18 Delmar, Berkeley 8, Calif.

Susan H. Peters, 422 Spruce Street, San Francisco 18, Calif.

Marian B. Davis, San Francisco, Calif.

(Above list contains names of those who have communicated with committee as of June 4, 1953.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 28, 1953.

HON. J. C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With regard to the hearings on House Joint Resolution 211 scheduled to begin Friday, May 1, 1953, I respectfully submit two petitions signed by individuals favoring retention of the Regriger murals in the Rincon annex post office building, San Francisco, Calif., for inclusion in the official record of the hearings.

Respectfully,

W. S. MAILLIARD, M. C.

PETITION

APRIL 25, 1953.

TO HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,
Fourth District, California, House of Representatives,
WASHINGTON, D. C.:

We the undersigned who are familiar with the Rincon annex murals in the post office in San Francisco, Calif., believe these works to represent one of the art treasures of our city. We do not believe the murals to "cast a derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers and the history of the great State of California."

We are counting on you to take every means at your command to prevent destruction of a part of the artistic assets of our city, from legislative action that is not only aimed at the destruction of these murals, but which would set an appalling precedent for censorship in artistic and cultural fields.

Stella Chen, Marguerite L. Segal, Byron Merendez, Helen Heick, Vera Allison, Robert Randolph, Margaret Randolph, Orran J. Grossman, Trena Brynor, Viktor Ries, Nancy Jane McRae, Sally Wilson, Florence Resnikoff, Caroline Rogers, Jean M. Leslie, Byron Wilson, and O. F. Meissner.
Petition

April 17, 1953.

To Hon William S. Mailliard,
Fourth District, California, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, who are familiar with the Rincon annex murals in the post office in San Francisco, Calif., believe these works to represent one of the art treasures of our city. We do not believe the murals to "cast a derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers and the history of the great State of California."

We are counting on you to take every means at your command to prevent destruction of a part of the artistic assets of our city from legislative action that is not only aimed at the destruction of these murals, but which would set an appalling precedent for censorship in artistic and cultural fields.


Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,

Hon. James C. Auchincloss,
New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Colleague: At the hearing on the Scudder resolution, House Joint Resolution 211, last Friday, a statement was made to the effect that the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce was in favor of the Scudder resolution.

This statement is not correct and I would like the record corrected. I am enclosing a telegram from J. W. Mailliard III, president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce to verify the correction.

Sincerely,

W. S. Mailliard, M. C.

Hon. William S. Mailliard,
New House Office Building:

Re telegram, chamber has taken no position on Scudder resolution and my personal feeling is strongly that resolution is out of order.

J. W. Mailliard III,
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Auchincloss. There being no further witnesses, I declare this hearing closed.
(Whereupon, at 4:20 p. m., the hearing was closed.)

X