

TRUE FOR WHO?

1. Discuss the statement. In what kind of situation was it made? Who made it or would make it? What were the speaker's intentions and goals? What was at stake?
2. Determine as a group how each individual would have felt about the statement. Circle the individuals who would have found this statement to be true. Cross out the individuals who would have found this statement to be false. If you think a statement could have been seen as true or false by the individual, put a question mark next to their name.
3. Write down any notes from the discussion that you feel are important and would want to remember.

Statement	True for Who?	Notes from Discussion
<p>I had much more opportunity to observe the workings of the Communist Party while I was a member of the “Hollywood Ten” than I did when I was a member of the Communist Party.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball Edward Dmytryk Paul Robeson Pete Seeger Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>We noticed that the person mentions the Hollywood Ten. That means this statement could only be true for Edward Dmytryk, because he was the only person mentioned in this list who was a member of the Hollywood Ten.</p>

<p>I will provide you with the names of the other members that I am aware of...</p>	<p>Lucille Ball Edward Dmytryk Paul Robeson Pete Seeger Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>We realized that this statement could have only been true for Edward Dmytryk as well because he was the only friendly witness whose testimony we read. Lucille Ball pretended she didn't know much about the Communist Party, so it's false for her. Robeson and Seeger were unfriendly witnesses, so it would also be false for them. As the chairman for Robeson's hearing, Rep. Walter wouldn't have said this, so it's false for him too.</p>
<p>I registered as a Communist to please my grandfather.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball Edward Dmytryk? Paul Robeson? Pete Seeger? Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>The only person this would definitely be false for is Rep. Walter, who was chairman in one of the HUAC hearings. It's possible each of these people could have joined the Communist Party to make their grandfathers happy, but the only person who specifically said this was the case was Lucille Ball. The statement is definitely true for her.</p>
<p>I would have never done that. Did I do that?</p>	<p>Lucille Ball Edward Dmytryk? Paul Robeson? Pete Seeger? Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>The only person this would definitely be false for is Rep. Walter, who was chairman in one of the HUAC hearings and would not have wanted to show uncertainty as a member of the committee. Although Dmytryk was a friendly witness, it's possible that he could have been uncertain about his past actions as he testified, so this statement could be true for him. It could also be true for Seeger and Robeson, who were unfriendly witnesses. However, this testimony sounds most similar to Ball's, as she portrayed herself as being absentminded and forgetful during her testimony even though she almost certainly knew what the Communist Party was when she registered to vote in 1936.</p>

<p>I invoke the Fifth Amendment.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball Edward Dmytryk Paul Robeson Pete Seeger Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>Since this person mentions the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, that means this statement could only be true for Paul Robeson because he was the only person mentioned in this list who “pleaded the Fifth” during his testimony.</p>
<p>This is complete nonsense.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball? Edward Dmytryk? Paul Robeson Pete Seeger? Honorable Francis E. Walter?</p>	<p>It’s possible that this expression of frustration could have been used by anyone during the hearings we read about since they often involved heated conversations between the witnesses and the committee. It is least likely to be true for Dmytryk, who was a friendly witness. It is most likely to be true for Robeson, who said something almost identical during his testimony when he was asked by HUAC to name names.</p>
<p>I have no idea what you are talking about.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball? Edward Dmytryk? Paul Robeson Pete Seeger? Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>This line probably wouldn’t have been said by Chairman Walter, so it would be false for him. It’s possible, but unlikely, that a friendly witness like Dmytryk would have made this remark. It’s more likely to be true for Seeger, Ball, and Robeson. Ball pretended she didn’t know much about communism and could have said something similar to this. This comment is most true for Robeson who said something almost identical during his testimony when he was asked by HUAC to name names.</p>

<p>You are the author of all of the bills that are going to keep all kinds of decent people out of the country.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball Edward Dmytryk Paul Robeson Pete Seeger? Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>This statement would be false for Chairman Walter who was on the committee as well as Dmytryk and Ball, who weren't confrontational when they took the witness stand. While it could possibly be true for Seeger who was an unfriendly witness, we remember it is a quote taken directly from Robeson's testimony. Robeson said this to Chairman Walter in acknowledgment of racist legislation that Walter and his colleagues had authored.</p>
<p>I refuse to answer that question whether it was a quote from the New York Times or the Vegetarian Journal.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball Edward Dmytryk Paul Robeson? Pete Seeger Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>This statement would have to come from a witness, so it is false for Chairman Walter. It is probably also false for Ball and Dmytryk who weren't confrontational during their testimony. While it could possibly be true for Robeson who was an unfriendly witness, we remember it is a quote taken directly from Seeger's testimony. Seeger made this statement after HUAC asked him to admit if he had performed for a section of the Communist Party.</p>
<p>I am not going to answer any questions as to my associations.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball Edward Dmytryk Paul Robeson? Pete Seeger Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>This statement would have to come from a witness, so it is false for Chairman Walter. It is probably also false for Ball and Dmytryk who weren't confrontational during their testimony. While it could possibly be true for Robeson who was an unfriendly witness, it is definitely true for Seeger who said something very similar when the committee asked him if he had performed at Communist Party events in the past.</p>

<p>My answer is the same as before.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball? Edward Dmytryk? Paul Robeson? Pete Seeger Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>This statement would have to come from a witness, so it is false for Chairman Walter. This statement could have been true for any one of the witnesses who could have been referring to testimony they had made earlier in the course of their hearing. However, we remember that this is true for Seeger who made this statement after HUAC repeatedly questioned him about his affiliations with the Communist Party.</p>
<p>I resent very much and very deeply the implication of being called before this committee that in some way because my opinions may be different from yours that I am less of an American.</p>	<p>Lucille Ball Edward Dmytryk Paul Robeson? Pete Seeger Honorable Francis E. Walter</p>	<p>This statement would have to come from a witness, so it is false for Chairman Walter. It is probably also false for Ball and Dmytryk who weren't confrontational during their testimony. While it could possibly be true for Robeson who was an unfriendly witness, it is definitely true for Seeger who said something very similar when the committee repeatedly questioned him about his affiliations with the Communist Party.</p>