

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

“2 in House Favor ’50 Detention Act: Argue Against Repeal While Supporting Revisions.” *The New York Times*, 11 September 1970: 9

This article highlighted that HUAC was in part meant to control radical groups like the Black Panthers and other civil rights organizations. HUAC also symbolized a course of action that could be taken against subversives in the time of war. This article helped me substantiate claims made by Yolanda Hall that she was probably targeted because of her role in civil rights advocacy.

“Anti-Democracy No Answer to Reds”, *Denver Post*, 4 April 1961. Reprinted in *Collection of Editorials and Resolutions in Opposition to the Un-American Activities Committee*. Los Angeles: National Committee to Abolish HUAC, 1965: 26

This article shows the consequences that the nation faces when groups like HUAC corrupt the power they are given. HUAC was initially established to preserve the Democratic ideals of America by erasing any subversive hysteria present at the time. But in turbulent times like this one, people usually give up on democracy, and they did so by giving in to HUAC. HUAC came to be the authoritarian group that controlled the public with its false policies. It harassed people, destroyed their careers, and placed limits on free speech, which is what would ultimately cause activists such as Stamler and Hall to fight HUAC in the course of the next decade.

“A List is a List.” *The New York Times*, 14 December 1970: 42

During McCarthyism, several were ‘blacklisted’ due to their red pasts. This strategy of ‘blacklisting’ continued through the height of HUAC and beyond. This article notes that keeping files on alleged Communists invades their privacy, and the use of blacklisting remained a major objection to the committee’s action. The Committee claimed to be documenting ideas and events, but there was danger in this form of compilation because of how it was used.

“Contempt for Due Process.” *The Washington Post*. Editorial, 18 Oct 1966: p. A18.

This editorial talks about the contempt charges against Stamler and Hall and the reasons why the House of Representatives should not indulge HUAC in its “petty pointless persecution” of the witnesses it summons. Most importantly, the article states that the Committee had been found to go beyond the bounds of its lawful authority, which was partly what Stamler and Hall were arguing in their civil suit.

Dies, Martin. From *Martin Dies' Story*, quoted in *Thirty Years of Treason: Excerpts from Hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1938-1968*. Ed. Eric Bentley. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press/Nation Books, 2002: xvii.

This book contains the testimony of a wide range of people who were called before HUAC over the years, and it is interesting to see how the Committee became increasingly combative and accusatory. I used a quote from Martin Dies that appeared in the foreword to the book because his quote illustrates how the Committee has set out to be fair-minded in the way it treated witnesses. Furthermore, Dies stresses that the hearings were to be conducted with decorum, which clearly was not always the case, particularly when McCarthy was in the midst of his accusations and again in the 1960s when HUAC harassed witnesses, often with little evidence to substantiate the accusations.

“Ex-Rep. Martin Dies, 71, is dead; Led Un-American Activities Unit.” *The New York Times*, 15 November 1972: 1

Martin Dies, Former Chairman of HUAC stated that HUAC's concentration ranges from investigating Socialist to Communists and that the “subversive element” in the country at one point numbered about 7 million persons. This article was important in that the Chairman's words support the fact that HUAC was an uncontrollable committee that battered lives of many people in its effort to erase “alleged” communist hysteria in the U.S.

Fisher, Dennis D. “U.S. drops Dr. Stamler's HUAC contempt charges.” *Chicago Sun-Times*, 22 Dec 1973: 12.

This article shows that Congress voted and dropped the contempt charges issued by HUAC against Stamler and Hall. This was in part a negotiated settlement to allow Stamler and Hall the right to challenge the Committee and question its political philosophy. It also demonstrated to me that HUAC's power was waning, since it could not support its resolutions against Stamler and Hall.

Hall, Yolanda. Personal interview conducted at her residence in Forest Park, IL, on February 15, 2005.

After studying the actual testimony of Ms. Hall before HUAC, the interview confirmed for me that Ms. Hall is a courageous hero, who despite the hardships and the threat to her career, stood up and fought for her rights. Interviewing one of the individuals whose 8 year battle against HUAC helped inspire its congressional demise made the history of my project come to life before my eyes. Her powerful words about the case and her struggle against the Committee made me realize the impact the case had on the nation, socially and politically. This source was especially important to my research because I was able to document the history of my project in

the actual powerful words of Ms. Hall who experienced the intensity with which HUAC made its mark in history and then deteriorated in large part because of the watchfulness of activists willing to take a stand against the Committee. I also tried to interview Dr. Stamler, but he has been in Italy all winter and has not yet returned.

Hall, Yolanda. Personal Clipping Scrapbook. Viewed at Interview, February 15, 2005. Forest Park, Illinois.

Ms. Hall shared with me her scrapbook that holds newspaper clippings she had collected during the fight against HUAC, flyers sent out to several University faculties, lists of people who signed the petition that was sent to the House of Representatives requesting the House to abolish HUAC, pamphlets asking the public for donations, and pictures from mailing parties. This was an important source because it allowed me insight into how Stamler and Hall educated the community about their battle while the case continued in courts. The fact that Ms. Hall made and kept such a scrapbook reinforces the historical importance of the Stamler/Hall case in the fight to preserve personal liberties.

Hall, Yolanda. Open House Flyer. Received at Personal Interview, February 15, 2005. Forest Park, Illinois.

This particular flyer titled, "A time to Celebrate the Successful Conclusion," was a thank you note from Dr. Jeremiah Stamler and Ms. Yolanda Hall to those who supported their battle. The invitation was marked as an open house held at the Third Unitarian Church on Sunday, January 20th, 1974. The demise of HUAC signified to them that they had won the battle to maintain the right to communicate one's ideas.

Health Board. "Stamler gets boost in fight with HUAC." *Chicago Daily News*, June 3, 1965.

This newspaper article states that the Board of Health respects Stamler and Hall's efforts against the Committee and supports them. They saw that Dr. Stamler and Ms. Hall never behaved improperly while employed with the Health Board and hence, could not believe that they would behave in such a manner in relation to HUAC either. I learned from Thomas Sullivan, one of the attorneys, that despite its support for Stamler and Hall, the Board did place Stamler on leave during portions of the case, so the support was not always guaranteed.

"House Anti-Red Group Assailed", *Milwaukee Journal*, 26 March 1961: 30. Reprinted in *Collection of Editorials and Resolutions in Opposition to the Un-American Activities Committee*. Los Angeles: National Committee to Abolish HUAC, 1965: 39.

My research revealed that young people were often the ones most vocal in their opposition of HUAC, which is not surprising considering that many college students

were involved in civil rights and anti-Vietnam protests around the country. This article describes how the abolition of HUAC was urged at the Young Democrats' State Convention in 1961. At the convention, it was stated that the Committee should exist *only* if the operations of this committee were substantially revised so as to protect the rights of the individuals who are questioned. The article also talked about the fact that freedom is as important to democracy as is the security of the nation, and so the freedom that is granted to us should not be suppressed for the sake of national security. This article was very interesting in that I began to question if securing the country is worth everything and anything, even the rights of the citizens. It made me question if the ends justify the means when it comes to the limitation of free speech.

Hunter, Marjorie. "House Anti-Red Committee Gets a Liberal Infusion." *The New York Times*, 23 January 1969: 21.

HUAC, in an attempt to make the Committee less offensive, added four liberals to their panel, one of them being an African American. The fact that HUAC added a black person shows that the Committee wanted to downplay the comments it received of being "racists" and against all "civil liberties." Obviously, the Committee was on the defensive. Furthermore, the article explains HUAC's next target and why: Students for a Democratic Society, because they were conducting classes in sabotage and teaching violent guerilla tactics. This helps to explain that even though the Committee "appeared" a little more liberal, it was still not fully liberal. And as it started to target civil rights and other liberal organizations seeking to change the status quo, the Committee increasingly came under attack. It was not enough to bring in an African-American member to mask HUAC's tendency toward prejudice.

Hunter, Marjorie. "House Security Unit gets \$475,000 for Inquiries." *The New York Times*, 2 April 1974: 78.

This article provided me with information that two Democrats, in an attempt to cripple HUAC, denied the Committee investigative funds because the Committee was asking to investigate those who simply attended a Socialist meeting and showed no other records of affiliation with the Communist Party. The Chairman of HUAC, however, disagreed stating that it was proper for the panel to investigate groups seeking to overthrow the Government. Such opposing viewpoints show that HUAC targeted even those who were not full-fledged communists, and that members of the House increasingly scrutinized HUAC's activities.

Hunter, Marjorie. "Unit on Un-American Activities Gets a New Name in House Vote." *The New York Times*, 19 February 1969: 20.

Chairman of HUAC, Richard H. Ichord, vowed to improve the Committee's image when he questioned, "What *is* Un-American?" This article shows that HUAC was actually the smallest of all Congressional committees, but the damage it did was

bigger than any other. It had targeted communists, educators, actors, peace leaders, and even instigators of the riots at the Democratic National Convention. The author points out that a name change does not alter the fundamental nature of the way in which the organization conducts its business.

“Justices Bar Challenge.” *The New York Times*, 14 January 1969: 33.

This article shows that Stamler and Hall were not the only subpoenaed activists who tried to challenge the legality of the Committee. In 1969, two New Yorkers, Dr. Allen Krebs and Walter Darwin, tried to challenge the constitutionality of HUAC but were denied a hearing by the court. This helped me understand that the mere fact that Stamler and Hall were determined not to give in and made appeals to be heard in courts distinguishes their case from any other.

“Justice Bars Suit over House Panel: Challenge to Un-American Activities Unit Dismissed.” *The New York Times*, 26 November 1968: 16

After being dismissed by Judge Hoffman in the District Court, Dr. Stamler and Hall took their case to the Seventh Circuit Court where Judges Walter J. Cummings and Kiley presided over the trial. Stamler and Hall lost, but Judge Cummings wrote in his dissent: “The Congress has no more right to abridge the First Amendment freedoms of the people than do the other branches of government.” This article was really important because it showed that even in times of opposition by the public and invasion of people’s privacy by HUAC, there were still some who placed the value of the First Amendment above the idea of investigating citizens’ “alleged” subversive pasts.

Kinoy, Arthur. *Rights on Trial: The Odyssey of People’s Lawyer*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983

This book is written by Stamler and Hall’s lawyer, describing notable cases he has prosecuted. His words are particularly meaningful in that he recounts his personal experiences with the case and makes Stamler and Hall’s struggle against the Committee that much more significant in the context of the protection of one’s freedoms. He speaks of how Stamler and Hall contacted him after receiving subpoenas from HUAC and their decision to fight the Committee, as well as his own feelings regarding his duty to defend civil liberties. The book also contains descriptions of the legal strategies he utilized in the *Dombrowski* case, which he and the other attorneys for Stamler and Hall used as they planned the case to challenge HUAC’s constitutionality.

Kleckner S. Robert. "No valid reason to dismiss Dr. Stamler, Board Asserts." *Chicago Sun-Times*, 3 Jun 1965 (4).

This newspaper article shows that the Board of Health could not find any reason to dismiss Stamler or Hall. This decision was made on the basis of the fact that neither had misbehaved while employed with the Board or in front of HUAC, against which they fought for 8 years. It was meaningful for me that losing their jobs had been a distinct possibility, yet both Stamler and Hall chose to fight rather than testify because of the strength of their convictions regarding what they were doing.

Langer, Elinor. "Stamler vs. HUAC: Heart Specialist called by Committee, Responds by Challenging HUAC's Legality." *Science* 149, no. 3682 (July 23, 1965).

This article gives a history of Dr. Stamler and his achievements in the field of science. It also discusses an important aspect of his life: receiving a subpoena from HUAC and the fact that the Committee was unconstitutional because the rule under which it was established violated the U.S. Constitution, especially the freedom of speech granted to citizens. It further talks about Stamler and Hall collecting money for the case they filed against HUAC. This source reinforced the oral history provided by Yolanda Hall during the course of my interview with her.

Lyons, Richard D. "Search for Subversives: Dwindling, but not Dead." *The New York Times*, 20 October, 1974: 63.

This article gives more insight into the Committee's final attempts to justify its purpose through the words of its Chairman, Richard Ichord. He states that many oppose HUAC, but that he disagrees. The Chairman was still convinced that HUAC was constitutional, claiming that, "HUAC is an obstacle committee acting as a permanent unit." This article also states that HUAC believed that all riots had been enflamed by revolutionary groups and that the communist party could be a real threat if the country had an economic depression of the 1930s type.

Lyons, Richard D. "House Democrats Vote for Abolition of Anti-Red Panel." *The New York Times*, 14 January, 1975: 1

By the 1970s, the Democratic composition of the House Committee to Abolish HUAC was changing. More and more Democrats were willing to sit on the committee and this composition impacted the functions and existence of HUAC, now known as the Internal Security Committee. Those members who were seeking to abolish the Internal Security Committee and then transferring its functions [investigating files on Americans] to the Judiciary Committee won the additional backing of 75 new Democratic Representatives in the House in 1975. This was, as the article suggests, an important moment in history.

Operation Abolition: The Campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, The Government Security Program. Washington: Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and its Affiliates, 1957.

Emergency Civil Liberties was a committee that was organized to abolish HUAC. In this particular book, members of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee sign a petition and organize personal letters, legal challenges, and an abolition campaign report, requesting Congress to once and for all disband the Committee it had established, HUAC. This source showed me that opposition to HUAC was not only in the shape of protestors outside Federal buildings, but also in shape of Committees now being established to put an end to HUAC forever.

Petition to the House of Representatives, 89th Congress. Faculty Members: December 4, 1964. Yolanda Hall's personal scrapbook.

A petition sent by University faculties to the House of Representatives 89th Congress respectfully requesting the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. This piece of information was essentially important to my research because it showed that many people responded to Stamler and Hall's education campaigns and supported their fight against HUAC.

“Professors Seek to End House Unit: Law Experts Ask Congress to Abolish Security Panel.” *The New York Times*, 3 January, 1973: 29.

Stamler and Hall shared their battle with HUAC through their community and across the country. 365 renowned professors from 94 law schools met to petition the new 93d Congress to abolish HUAC. The petition charged that the Committee served no useful purpose in the governmental structure. This article also reveals that since the Committee changed its name in 1969, its new targets have included investigations of the Black Panthers, Students for a Democratic Society, and anti-war organizations as opposed to earlier targets in search of subversion in the motion picture industry, universities, and the government itself.

Stamler, Jeremiah. “A Landmark Decision.” *Transaction* (February, 1970). Yolanda Hall's personal scrapbook.

This advertisement was supported by the Jeremiah Stamler Legal Aid Fund and gave the public a general view of the case itself, asking for people's moral and financial support. This was yet another proof for me that Dr. Stamler and Yolanda Hall made efforts to share their battle with their communities, simply because it wasn't *their* battle alone, but an attack on the rights of every citizen of America.

***Stamler v. Willis*, Nos. 17406, 17407, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT, 371 F. 2d 413; 5 August, 1969**

***Stamler v. Willis*, Nos. 15268, 15269, 15668, 15669, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT, 371 F. 2d 413; 13 February, 1967.**

These court documents provide head notes and opinions from the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in regard to the Stamler-Hall case, legally cited as *Stamler v. Willis*. Ultimately, Stamler and Hall were told that if they could prove that HUAC was unconstitutional, they could continue their case. The wording that was most beneficial for my paper was found in the August 5, 1969, ruling, which said that no branch of government could abridge people's First Amendment rights.

“Sit in to stop HUAC” flyer. 1965. One of the exhibits documented as part of the U.S. 89th Congress House Committee Hearings, Senate Library. Testimony of Ms. Yolanda Hall, v 2103, Section 5 (1965): cards 11-14.

This flyer showed common opposition against the Committee and was usually handed out to the public during the hearings.

Sullivan, Thomas. One of the Attorneys representing Stamler and Hall. Personal interview conducted via phone to New Mexico, on May 20, 2005.

In an attempt to follow the logistics of the Stamler-Hall case with respect to the legal process, I happened to notice the names of the two living Chicago lawyers who represented Stamler and Hall during their eight year legal battle, Thomas Sullivan and Chester Kamin. I knew that they are both still affiliated with one of Chicago's most prominent law firms, Jenner and Block, and I contacted both of them. The interview with Mr. Sullivan was very beneficial to my research in that it helped me understand how the Stamler-Hall case was processed through the courts, how many times it was dismissed or denied a hearing, and what the ultimate result was. During our conversation on the phone, Mr. Sullivan mentioned that Dr. Stamler did not decide to challenge HUAC based on what was going on around the country at the time [anti-government sentiments]. It was Dr. Stamler's own beliefs and principles about liberty which fostered his determination to fight HUAC for however long it would take. Mr. Sullivan also touched on the fact that Albert E. Jenner, another prominent lawyer on the legal team, felt strongly about civil liberties and did not want let this case go by. Frankly, every other law firm in Chicago was afraid to take this case because it was radical to challenge the House Un-American Activities Committee. This interview provided me with both information on the Stamler-Hall case and a powerful perspective from an attorney who along with others, took this case all the way to victory.

“The Chicago Story: New Tide of Protest hits HUAC.” *The People’s World*. June 5, 1965.

This article gives a report on how HUAC regretted coming to Chicago because there were several impressive protests against the hearings-- the most notable being on the first day with an estimated 1000 marchers and 300 standing in line to get in the hearings. It also shows a picture of a young protester against HUAC being hauled away by the Chicago Police.

“To House Investigation Unit.” *The New York Times*, 4 February 1969: 39

This article gives one more insight into as to why Federal District Judge Julius Hoffman dismissed Stamler and Hall’s case. According to the Judge, the Chicago hearings, conducted by the committee, were within the legal provision of the committee and that members of Congress were not required to answer in courts for any speech or debate that occurred during the hearings. Based on these grounds, the court denied Stamler and Hall’s appeals to quash the subpoena and challenge the legality of the Committee.

“Un-American by Any Name.” *The New York Times*, 14 January 1969: 33

In 1969, HUAC was trying to change the name of its Committee without doing anything about its character. The only change that needed to be made was the abolition of this Committee. These viewpoints helped me understand that even though the Committee wanted to justify its function by changing its name to the Internal Security Committee, its true motives and targets would remain the same, with little change, if any at all.

U.S. 89th Congress House Committee Hearings, Senate Library. Testimony of Ms. Yolanda Hall, v 2103, Section 5 (1965): cards 11-14

This source is the actual testimony of Ms. Yolanda Hall that was taken during the hearings held in front of HUAC. This testimony was significantly beneficial to my paper because it allowed me to read the words of both the Chairman and Jenner, Hall’s lawyer, which further helped me understand the course of events and the environment created by HUAC. This testimony was a confirmation of the fact that the Committee did not allow Hall or any defense party, for that matter, to cross examine the witnesses or evidence.

Von Hoffman, Nicholas. “Dr. Stamler vs. Internal Security Unit.” *Chicago Sun-Times*, Editorial Page, 10 Dec 1971: 19.

This article details the particulars of the Stamler/Hall case. It talks about the number of hearings the Committee held and the types of questions it asked. This article is

important because it also discusses the danger the lawyers that represented Stamler and Hall faced and how they won the case.

Wehrwein C. Austin. "17 Pickets are seized at House Hearing in Chicago." *The New York Times*, 26 May 1965: 29.

This article helped me to see how HUAC mapped its next targets. Chairman Edwin Willis stated that the Communist party concentrated on large cities that were centers of industry, transportation, communication, learning, and so forth. It was only logical for HUAC to investigate the communist infiltration in these large cities, such as Chicago, which is where Stamler and Hall were working at the time they were called before the Committee.

Wehrwein C. Austin. "U.S. Court Bars Suit to Enjoin Un-American Activities Panel." *The New York Times*, 25 May 1965: 16.

This article provided me with an important quote from Jeremiah Stamler which helped me see why he was pursuing a case against HUAC rather than simply testifying as he had been requested to do. I could not reach him for comment because he is out the country at the moment, but adding his own words to my paper helps me tell the story more effectively. Wehrwein also discusses how HUAC was a widespread virus that went anywhere and everywhere, and how it targeted Hall in particular because of her civil rights activities. In addition to this, the article shows that several other civil liberties and civil rights organizations were in favor to abolish HUAC. These organizations protested with no fear and made their opposition heard. Nevertheless, the court under Julius Hoffman at first rejected the case because of potential violations of Article I of the Constitution, which states that members of Congress cannot be sued for actions they take while performing their duties.

Wehrwein C. Austin. "13 More are Seized at House Hearing in Chicago." *The New York Times*, 27 May 1965: 20

HUAC was criticized by the public because of the way it functioned, regulated its hearings, and harassed people. On May 27, 1965, outside of the Federal Court of Appeals, protesters gathered. This helps to show that people were proactive, voiced their opinions, and let the nation know that they did not welcome the harassment that HUAC imparted on its witnesses. Furthermore, this article helps to show that HUAC did not allow its opposing party to cross examine the witnesses or object to the arguments presented during the hearings. Mr. Sullivan, Stamler and Hall's attorney, was forced to sit down by two marshals when he objected to the mention of Ms. Hall's name. Mr. Sullivan settled, requesting the Committee to treat him and his clients like citizens. Stamler and Hall ended up filing an appeal to the U.S. District Court for an injunction against the Committee.

Wehrwein C. Austin. "39 held in Melee at Red Hearings." *The New York Times*, 28 May 1965: 36

The negativity of HUAC's hearings resulted in many young people standing outside with picket signs, shouting and protesting, making the world aware of their opposition to such a Committee. These groups who opposed HUAC were young activists who could not bear the existence of a Committee that targeted peace, housing, youth, civil rights and political organizations while claiming to search for subversives. This article was important in that it showed me that by 1965, many people were voicing their opinions, seeing for themselves what this Committee really stood for rather than what it advocated its genuine motives to be.

Secondary Sources:

Buhle, Paul. "Halting McCarthyism: The Stamler Case in History." *Monthly Review* 51, no. 5 (October 1999): 44-49

This article provides information about the Stamler/Hall fight against HUAC, and it was the first source I consulted as I began my research so I could get an overall sense of the importance of the case. It explains how HUAC resurfaced in the 1960s and came to Chicago, where it demanded that Dr. Stamler and Ms. Hall testify about their supposed connections to the Red Party. Buhle further talks about how Stamler and Hall challenged the Committee, which later led to its congressional demise in 1974-75. He stresses the novelty of the argument made by the defense team: namely, challenging the existence of the Committee in the first place rather than advising Stamler and Hall to invoke the Fifth Amendment right to self-incrimination, as had usually been done by others seeking to resist HUAC's interrogations.

Dmytryk, Edward. *Odd Man Out: A Memoir of the Hollywood Ten*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1996.

This book talks about how the infamous Hollywood Ten were subpoenaed, and when they refused to testify, they were jailed for a six months or a year term for standing up for their rights. Dmytryk was one of the Hollywood Ten, and his story gave me a sense of how powerless it must have felt to come before a Committee which had so much control over your destiny, since HUAC would ultimately punish and then blacklist the Hollywood Ten, often ruining their potential for future careers in the movie industry. Because I used his book mostly for historical background on the period leading up to the Stamler/Hall case, I am placing it in the secondary source category.

Fariello, Griffin. *Red Scare: Memories of the American Inquisition*. New York, London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995.

This book provided me with general information about HUAC and the Hollywood Ten. It showed the targets and how they were put on trial. Also, this book made it clear that the Hollywood Ten denied to speak in the hearings, which earned them either one year or 6 months in jail. This source reinforces that the Hollywood Ten pleaded the 5th Amendment, which implies guilt, whereas Stamler and Hall would base their case on the unconstitutionality of HUAC asking questions in the first place.

Fried, Richard M. *Nightmare in Red: The McCarthy Era in Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Tracing the roots of McCarthyism and how the Red Scare progressed, this book allowed me to create a general overview of the time period and explain how people's lives were impacted by the accusations made against them. Descriptions of scenes in the hearings underscored how uncomfortable it must have been to be questioned with the media and others watching. Fried also discusses the changing composition of the Supreme Court as well as people's activism in the 1960s as factors that helped put an end to HUAC and other restrictions on free speech.

Goodman, Walter. *The Committee: The extraordinary career of the HUAC*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux Inc., 1968.

This source plunges deep into the roots of the Committee itself: its origins, targets, and connections with Stamler and Hall. This book helped me to see that from the very beginning, some people had questioned whether creating such a committee might not be giving too much power to Congress in that any unpopular idea could be branded un-American. Also, my newspaper research was yielding a lot of articles from the early 1960s and had been wondering why there was such an explosion of protest against HUAC at this time. Reading this book helped me to understand the unrest of the 1960s better, and it also informed me about the movie *Operation Abolition* which HUAC produced, but which actually made the committee more unpopular than ever. It also helped me understand the grounds under which HUAC subpoenaed Stamler and Hall and reinforced the events of the story as told me by Yolanda Hall. From this book, I also learned that another plaintiff named Milton Cohen joined the Stamler/Hall case, but there is very little information about him in other sources.

Isaacs, Jeremy, and Taylor Downing. *Cold War: An Illustrated History, 1945-1991*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1998.

This book provided me with a good overview of events in the Cold War, particularly about the story of the Hollywood Ten and McCarthyism. This allowed me to more

clearly place events in sequence and understand the political and social climate of the changing times as the Cold War and HUAC progressed.

Kovel, Joel. *Red Hunting in the Promised Land*. New York: BasicBooks, 1994.

This book gave me information on Joseph McCarthy and how he charged that the State Department was infected with scores of communists, listed specific people as communists, and experienced an eventual downfall because he was not able to prove his accusations.

Leffler, Melvyn P. *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War*. New York: Harper Collins Ltd., 1994.

Melvyn describes the Cold War and the build up of anticommunist hysteria as Soviets expanded their territory. Furthermore, this book focuses on what the public was feeling, and how the government reacted to a potential communist invasion, among other things. This book really helped me develop an understanding of the 1930s and 1940s time period and how events occurring during that time period contributed to the introduction of HUAC.

Nicodemus, Charles. "Close Stamler case; Red-hunt era ends." *Chicago Daily News*, Dec 22-23: 1973.

This article discusses the beginning of the Stamler/Hall case, how many times it went to court, contempt charges against Stamler and Hall, and the end of their eight year battle. It gave me an overall perspective on the case as well as dates to reference when I was working to put the sequence of events together. Because so much of the discussion is of events almost ten years before, I am placing this in the secondary source category. The article seems designed to provide a more historical overview of the case rather than just a reflection of people's feelings in 1973.

Rickenbacker, William F. "A Short History of the Committee." *The Committee and Its Critics: A Calm Review of the House Committee on Un-American Activities* by William Buckley, Jr., and the editors of the *National Review*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1962: 90-117.

This chapter in a larger overview of HUAC was particularly beneficial when read in conjunction with Goodman's *The Committee*. It provides a concise summary of some of the highlights in HUAC's history, making it easier to identify important events in a manageable fashion and then read about them in much greater depth in Goodman's analysis. Another key way that this source helped me is that it made me aware that Chicago continued to be visited throughout the 1950s. Originally, I had thought that when McCarthyism waned, the Committee did not experience much activity until the 1960s, but this reading showed me that this was not the case.