



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #1: The Venona Project

**Directions:** Read the following excerpts from documents related to the Venona Project (<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/venona.htm>). Use the questions on the worksheet to guide your reading.

(Note: asterisks [\*\*\*\*\*] indicate a section of text that remains classified by the U.S. Government. In many cases it can be assumed to be the term “Venona.”)

Memorandum from FBI Special Agent L.V. Boardman to Alan H. Belmont (head of the FBI’s Internal Security Section), February 1, 1956

Purpose of the attached summary is to consider possibilities of using \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] information for prosecution. In order to view this matter in the proper perspective it was believed necessary to set forth exactly what \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] information is as well as to briefly review the origin and history of how the Bureau came to receive this traffic...

There is no question that justice would be properly served if Judith Coplon and the Silvermaster-Perlo groups [suspected of espionage] could be successfully prosecuted for their crimes against the United States. The introduction into evidence of \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] information could be the turning point in the successful prosecution of these subjects; however, a careful study of all factors involved compels the conclusion that it would not be in the best interests of the U.S. or the Bureau to attempt to use \*\*\*\*\* [Venona] information for prosecution...

Based on information developed from \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] traffic, there has been prosecution of Judith Coplon, Valentin Gubitchev, Emil Klaus Fuchs, Harry Gold, Alfred Dean Slack, Abraham Brothman, Miriam Moskowitz, David Greenglass, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Morton Sobell and William Perl. All of these cases were investigations instituted by us directly or indirectly from \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] information. These prosecutions were instituted without using \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] information in court....

### **I. Explanation and History of \*\*\*\*\* Information**

\*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] is a small group of cryptographers attached to National Security Agency (NSA) who work on deciphering certain Soviet intelligence messages covering the period 1942-46. These Soviet messages are made up of telegrams and cables and radio messages sent between Soviet intelligence operators in the United States and Moscow. Consequently, this material falls within the category of communications intelligence information and as such it is subject to the most stringent regulations governing dissemination on a “need-to-know” basis....Interceptions of the \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] messages were made by the U.S. Army. The intercepted messages consist of a series of numbers. These numbers are placed on work sheets by \*\*\*\*\* and efforts are then made to arrive at the additive (the enciphering

process). Once the additive is correctly determined the message can be read by using the MGB [The main intelligence bureau of the Soviet Union from 1946-1953; it was later renamed the KGB] code book which has been partially reconstructed by NSA. The chief problem is to develop the additive. This requires painstaking effort by experienced cryptographers who can also translate Russian....

The first report received by the Bureau [the FBI] on MGB deciphered traffic was received from Army Security Agency (predecessor of NSA) 4/16/48. Colonel L.R. Forney, Intelligence Division of the Army, advised at that time that the messages given to the Bureau were dated 1944 but the decodes had just been accomplished....

### **III. Nature of \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] Messages and use of Cover Names**

The messages \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] furnishes the Bureau are, for the most part, very fragmentary and full of gaps. Some parts of the messages can never be recovered again because during the actual intercept the complete message was not obtained. Other portions can be recovered only through the skill of the cryptographers and with the Bureau's assistance. Frequently, through an examination of the messages and from a review Bureau files, the Bureau can offer suspects for individuals involved. When \*\*\*\*\* breaks out a part of the message and reads it to the point where it is determined that reference is being made to certain information derived from U.S. Government records or documents, the Bureau conducts investigation to locate such records on documents. When located, these records are furnished to \*\*\*\*\* and if it turns out to be the correct document, \*\*\*\*\* uses it as a "crib" and thus is able to read previously unrecovered portions of the message. It must be realized that the \*\*\*\*\* cryptographers make certain assumptions as to meanings when deciphering these messages and thereafter the proper translation of Russian idioms can become a problem. It is for such reasons that \*\*\*\*\* has indicated that almost anything included in a translation of one of these deciphered messages may in the future be radically revised.

Another very important factor to be considered when discussing the accuracy of these deciphered messages is the extensive use of cover names noted in this traffic. Once an individual was considered for recruitment as an agent by the Soviets, sufficient background data on him was sent to headquarters in Moscow. Thereafter, he was given a cover name and his true name was not mentioned again. This makes positive identifications most difficult since we seldom receive the initial message which states that agent "so and so" (true name) will henceforth be known as "\_\_\_\_\_" (cover name). Also, cover names were changed rather frequently and the cover name "Henry" might apply to two different individuals, depending upon the date it was used. Cover names were used for places and organizations as well as for persons, as witnessed by the fact that New York City was "Tyre" and the FBI was "Hata." All of the above factors make difficult a correct reading of the messages and point up the tentative nature of many identifications. For example, among the first messages we received in 1948 was one concerning an individual with the cover name "Antenna." The message was dated 5/5/44 and it set forth information indicating that "Antenna" was 25 years of age, a "fellow countryman" (member of C[ommunist] P[arty], USA), lived in "Tyre" (New York), took a course at Cooper Union in 1940, worked in the Signal Corps at Ft. Monmouth, and had a wife named Ethel. We made a tentative identification of "Antenna" as Joseph Weichbrod since the background of Weichbrod corresponded with the information known about "Antenna." Weichbrod was about the right age, had a Communist background, lived in NYC, attended Cooper Union in 1939, worked at the Signal Corps, Ft. Monmouth, and his wife's name was Ethel. He was a good suspect for "Antenna" until sometime later when we definitely established through investigation that "Antenna" was Julius Rosenberg.

Cover names were used not only to designate Soviet agents but other people mentioned in the messages were given cover names. For example, "Kapitan" (Captain) was former President F.D. Roosevelt. A

survey of the traffic as a whole suggests that a cover name like “Kapitan” serves a different purpose than cover names assigned to agents operating for the Soviets in an intelligence capacity. The latter type of cover names are presumably designed to protect the person of the agent directly. The “Kapitan” type of cover name merely obscures the sense and thereby affords indirect protection to the agent and at the same time is calculated to baffle foreign intelligence organizations as to just what intelligence is being transmitted....

### **Advantages [of using the decrypts as evidence to prosecute Soviet agents]**

The advantages of using \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] information for prosecutive benefits (assuming it would be admitted into evidence) are obvious. It would corroborate Elizabeth Bentley [a confessed Soviet spy who publicly revealed the identities of many of her fellow agents] and enable the Government to convict a number of subjects such as Judith Coplon and Silvermaster, whose continued freedom from prosecution is a sin against justice. Public disclosure of these messages would vindicate the Bureau in the matter of the confidence we placed in Elizabeth Bentley’s testimony. At the same time, the disadvantages of using \*\*\*\*\* information publicly or in a prosecution appear overwhelming.

### **Disadvantages [of using the decrypts as evidence to prosecute Soviet agents]**

In the first place, we do not know if the deciphered messages would be admitted into evidence and if they were not, that would abruptly and any hope for prosecution. It is believed that the defense attorney would immediately move that the message be excluded, based on the hearsay evidence rule. He would probably claim that neither the person who sent the message (Soviet official) nor the person who received it (Soviet official) was available to testify and thus the contents of the message were purely hearsay as it related to the defendants. Consequently, in order to overcome such a motion it would be necessary to rely upon their admission through the use of expert testimony of those who intercepted the messages and those cryptographers who deciphered the messages. A question of law is involved herein. It is believed that the messages probably could be introduced in evidence on the basis of exception to the hearsay evidence rule to the effect that the expert testimony was sufficient to establish the authenticity of the documents and they were the best evidence available.

Assuming that the messages could be introduced in evidence, we then have a question of identity. The fragmentary nature of the messages themselves, the assumptions made by the cryptographers in breaking the messages, and the questionable interpretations and translations involved, plus the extensive use of cover names for persons and places, make the problem of positive identification extremely difficult. Here, again, reliance would have to be placed on the expert testimony of the cryptographers and it appears that the case would be entirely circumstantial.

Assuming further that the testimony of the Government cryptographers were accepted as part of the Government’s case, the defense probably would be granted authority by the court to have private to have private cryptographers hired by the defense examine the messages as well as the work sheets of the Government cryptographers. Also, in view of the fragmentary nature of the majority of these messages, the defense would make a request to have its cryptographers examine those messages which \*\*\*\*\* has been unsuccessful in breaking and which are not in evidence on the premise that such messages, if decoded, could exonerate their clients. This would lead to the exposure of Government techniques and practices in the cryptographers field to unauthorized persons and thus compromise the Government’s efforts in the communications intelligence field. Also, this course of action would act to the Bureau’s disadvantage since the additional messages would spotlight individuals on whom the Bureau has pending investigations.

In addition to the question of law involved, there are a number of other factors which weigh against the use of \*\*\*\*\* information in court. These factors are most important from the Bureau's standpoint...

### **Political Implications [of prosecution]**

It is believed that disclosure of existence of \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] information at this time would probably place the Bureau right in the middle of a violent political war. This is an election year and the Republicans would undoubtedly use disclosure of the \*\*\*\*\* [Venona?] information to emphasize the degree of infiltration by Communists and Soviet agents into the U.S. Government during the 1940's when the Democrats were in power. At the same time, the Democrats would probably strike back by claiming that the FBI had withheld this information from the proper officials during the Democratic administration and at the same time would salvage what credit they could by claiming that the messages were intercepted and deciphered during the course of their administration and under their guidance. The Bureau would be right in the middle.

### **International Implications**

The Russians would undoubtedly scream that the U.S. had been expending money and manpower on intercepting and breaking the Russian code during the time the two countries were allied against a common enemy. Its propaganda machine would work overtime proving that this was evidence that the U.S. never acted in good faith during the war. Also, while no written record has been located in Bureau files to verify this, it has been stated by NSA officials that during the war Soviet diplomats in the U.S. were granted permission to use Army \*\*\*\*\* facilities at the Pentagon to send messages to Moscow. It has been stated that President Roosevelt granted this permission and accompanied it with the promise to the Soviets that their messages would not be intercepted or interfered with by U.S. authorities. Here, again, the Soviets would vilify the U.S. as an unfaithful ally and false friend....



# Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Activity #1: The Venona Project

**Directions:** Use the excerpts from the Venona documents to answer the following questions:

Question	Answer
What is the purpose of this document?	
What is Venona?	
What are the main limitations on Venona as a source of information about Soviet espionage?	
What advantage might there be in using the Venona information as evidence to prosecute suspected spies?	
What legal problems might be involved in using Venona information as trial evidence?	
Why, according to the author of the memo, might it be unwise politically to try to use Venona information as trial evidence?	
How does the author think the Soviets would react if the Venona Project became public?	



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #1: The Venona Project

**Directions:** Read the following excerpts from documents related to the Venona Project (<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/venona.htm>) about Judith Coplon, who was suspected of spying for the Soviet Union. As you read, complete the questions on the worksheet.

Judith Coplon worked for the U.S. Department of Justice during World War II. In 1949 she was detained by the FBI, and was found to be carrying classified government documents. She was tried twice, on charges of espionage and conspiracy to commit espionage, but both times her convictions were overturned on technicalities.

Memorandum from Daniel M. Ladd (assistant director of the FBI) to Alan H. Belmont (head of the FBI's Internal Security Section), May 15, 1950

#### **Judith Coplon:**

As you know, the \*\*\*\*\* information enabled our identification of Coplon as a Soviet espionage agent. Two other individuals were involved with Coplon in her espionage activity in 1944, one being Marian Davis, now Marian D. Berdecio, who is married and living in Mexico City. She formerly was employed by ONI [Office of Naval Intelligence] and by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. We have a pending investigation on Berdecio. The second individual who actually recruited Coplon was Flora Don Wovschin, who presently is married and is believed to be in the Soviet Union. She formerly was employed by OWI and by the State Department. Her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Enos Wicher, are presently in the United States and we are investigating them not only to determine whether they have any connections with Soviet espionage, but also in order that we may learn if Wovschin returns to the United States....

...Judith Coplon was not mentioned by name in the messages but the identifying information set forth in the \*\*\*\*\* traffic, dated July 1944 and Jan. 1945, concerning the individual designated by the cover name "Sima" made it certain that "Sima" was Judith Coplon. Our subsequent investigation added additional evidence when it was determined that Coplon was still operating as a Soviet espionage agent in 1949 when she was observed in contact with her Soviet superior, Valentin Gubitchev.....



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #1: The Venona Project

**Directions:** Read the following excerpts from documents related to the Venona Project (<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/venona.htm>) about Emil Julius Klaus Fuchs, who was suspected of spying for the Soviet Union. As you read, complete the questions on the worksheet.

For more information on Fuchs, visit this site:

[http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BFUC.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BFUC.HTM).

Klaus Fuchs (1911-1988) was born in Germany, but emigrated to England in 1933. A talented physicist, he went to work for the British government on the atomic bomb project, which was absorbed into the U.S.-directed Manhattan Project. From 1943 to 1946 he worked in the United States at Los Alamos, the New Mexico scientific complex where the atomic bomb was developed. Soon after returning to Great Britain he was arrested on charges of espionage. He quickly confessed, and served fourteen years in prison.

Memorandum from Daniel M. Ladd (assistant director of the FBI) to Alan H. Belmont (head of the FBI's Internal Security Section), May 15, 1950

#### **Emil Julius Klaus Fuchs:**

Our investigation of Fuchs was initiated on information from \*\*\*\*\*. We are currently attempting to identify Fuchs' American espionage contact, "Goose," who not only apparently operated Fuchs while Fuchs was in the United States, but also apparently was to operate Abraham Brothman, designated by the MGB under the cover name of "Constructor." Brothman presently is operating a consulting engineering firm in New York City, and instructions have been issued to interview him and various of his associates in an effort to identify Goose. You will recall that Brothman was named by Bentley as having furnished information to her in 1940—a fact admitted in interview by Brothman. A brief fully detailing the various aspects of this investigation has been submitted for your information....

....In September, 1949, acting on the basis of information secured from \*\*\*\*\* we furnished to \*\*\*\*\* information indicating that Fuchs had been active in the United States as a Soviet espionage agent. In January, 1950, during an interview with \*\*\*\*\* Fuchs confessed to atomic espionage on behalf of the Soviets. Fuchs was thereafter arrested and convicted for violation of the \*\*\*\*\*. On March 1, 1950, he was given the maximum sentence of fourteen years. Fuchs was exhaustively interviewed by Bureau representatives in London during May, 1950, and furnished information of value concerning his espionage activities in the United States.....



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #1: The Venona Project

**Directions:** Read the following excerpts from documents related to the Venona Project (<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/venona.htm>) about a specific individual suspected of spying for the Soviet Union. As you read, complete the questions on the worksheet.

Alger Hiss (1904-1996) served in the U.S. State Department during World War II, and was involved in the creation of the United Nations. In 1948 a confessed former Soviet spy told investigators that Hiss had been one of his contacts in the 1930s. Hiss denied the charges, but was ultimately convicted of perjury in 1950; he served 44 months in prison. (The Hiss case will be covered in greater detail in the next lesson.)

Memorandum from Daniel M. Ladd (assistant director of the FBI) to Alan H. Belmont (head of the FBI's Internal Security Section), May 15, 1950

#### Alger Hiss:

According to \*\*\*\*\* on March 30, 1945, Anatoli B. Gromov, First Secretary and MGB representative at the Soviet Embassy in Washington D.C., informed his Moscow headquarters that "Ales" has, for some years, been the leader of a little group working for Soviet Military Intelligence. It was stated that this group was composed mainly of Ales' relatives and that the group, which apparently was centered in the State Department, was working mainly on developing military information only and the information from the State Department interested them very little. It was stated that Ales, after the Yalta conference, had been in touch with a high Soviet official whom Ales implied was Comrade Vishinsky who thanked Ales on behalf of Soviet Military Intelligence. It would appear likely that this individual is Alger Hiss in view of the fact that he was in the State Department and the information from [Whittaker] Chambers [a confessed former Soviet spy] indicated that his wife, Priscilla, was active in Soviet espionage and he also had a brother, Donald, in the State Department. It also is to be noted that Hiss did attend the Yalta conference as a special advisor to President Roosevelt, and he would, of course, have conferred with high officials of other nations attending the conference. An attempt is being made by analysis of the available information to verify this identification....

...Information from \*\*\*\*\* reflects that on March 30, 1945, Anatoli B. Gromov, First Secretary and MGB representative at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C., advised his Moscow headquarters concerning one "Ales." Gromov stated that in a conversation with "Ales" it was learned that he had for some years been the leader of a little group working for Soviet Military Intelligence. It was stated that this group was composed mainly of "Ales" relatives. It was also stated that after the Yalta Conference a certain responsible Soviet channel got in touch with "Ales" and on behalf of the Soviet Military Intelligence had thanked "Ales."



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #1: The Venona Project

**Directions:** Read the following excerpts from documents related to the Venona Project (<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/venona.htm>) about Harry Dexter White, who was suspected of spying for the Soviet Union. As you read, complete the questions on the worksheet.

Harry Dexter White (1892-1948) was a prominent American economist, and during World War II he served as a senior official of the U.S. Department of the Treasury. In that capacity he was involved in the creation of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which were established in an attempt to promote international economic cooperation after the war. In July 1948 a confessed Soviet spy claimed that White had also been involved in espionage for the Soviet Union, but he died of a heart attack the following month.

Memorandum from Daniel M. Ladd (Assistant Director of the FBI) to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, February 28, 1951

#### **Harry Dexter White:**

You have previously been advised of information obtained from \*\*\*\*\* concerning a Soviet espionage agent designated by the cover name of Jurist who was active during 1944. According to the previous information received from \*\*\*\*\* regarding Jurist, during April, 1944, he had reported on conversations between the then Secretary of State Hull and Vice President Wallace. He also reported on Wallace's proposed trip to China. On August 5, 1944, he reported to the Soviets that he was confident of President Roosevelt's victory in the coming elections unless there was a huge military failure. He also reported that Truman's nomination as Vice President was calculated to secure the vote of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party. It was also reported that Jurist was willing for any self-sacrifice in behalf of the MGB but was afraid that his activities, if exposed, might lead to a political scandal and have an effect on the elections. It was also mentioned that he would be returning to Washington D.C., on August 17, 1944.

The new information from \*\*\*\*\* indicates that Jurist and Morgenthau were to make a trip to London and Normandy and were leaving the United States on August 5, 1944.

On the basis of the foregoing, the tentative identification of Harry Dexter White as Jurist appears to be conclusively established inasmuch as Morgenthau and White left the United States on a confidential trip to the Normandy beachhead on August 5, 1944, and they returned to the United States on August 17, 1944.

You may recall that Harry Dexter White was named by Whittaker Chambers in his statements as having been a source of information for Chambers in his work in Soviet espionage until Chambers broke with

the Soviets in 1938. Chambers produced a handwritten memorandum that White had given him and our Laboratory established this memorandum as being in White's handwriting. The Treasury Department advised that parts of this material were highly confidential coming to the Treasury Department from the Department of State.

In addition to the foregoing, Elizabeth T. Bentley in November, 1945, advised that she had learned through Nathan Gregory Silvermaster that White was supplying Silvermaster with information which was obtained by White in the course of his duties as Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury.....

...While Harry Dexter White was mentioned above in connection with the Silvermaster network, the information concerning him from \*\*\*\*\* is of some special interest. He was designated under the cover name of "Jurist" and was in a position to furnish high-level information to the Soviets involving such persons as President Roosevelt, Henry A. Wallace, Cordell Hull, and Henry Morgenthau, Jr. On April 29, 1944, he furnished to the Soviets information that Vice President Wallace was to go to China. The \*\*\*\*\* information also indicates that White was not overly anxious to cooperate fully with the MGB because he was afraid that his exposure might lead to a political scandal involving the Administration. You will recall that Harry Dexter White is deceased at the present time. We did furnish, in a carefully paraphrased form, the identification of Harry Dexter White on the basis of \*\*\*\*\* information to the White House under date of October 17, 1950.



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #1: The Venona Project

**Directions:** Read the following excerpts from documents related to the Venona Project (<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/venona.htm>) about Harry Gold, who was suspected of spying for the Soviet Union. As you read, complete the questions on the worksheet.

For more information on Harry Gold, visit this site:

[http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BGOL.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BGOL.HTM)

Memorandum from Daniel M. Ladd (Assistant Director of the FBI) to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, February 28, 1951

#### **Harry Gold:**

Our investigation to identify Fuchs' American contact began simultaneously with our identification of Fuchs as an espionage agent in September, 1949. We had a little information from \*\*\*\*\* concerning this man which indicated not only that he had been in contact with Fuchs, but was also in contact with Abraham Brothman. We also secured information concerning him from Fuchs and Mrs. and Mr. Robert Hieneman, who are Fuchs' sister and brother-in-law respectively. All of the persons rejected photographs of Harry Gold which were shown to them initially. However, after an involved investigation we centered on Harry Gold as our best suspect, and on May 22, 1950 he admitted extensive espionage activity in the United States. Also on May 22, 1950, Fuchs tentatively identified motion pictures of Gold which were shown to him as his espionage Fuchs, on the following day, definitely identified the photographs of Gold. Gold was arrested on May 23, 1950, and indicted on June 9, 1950, but a Federal Grand Jury in the Eastern District of New York. He pled guilty to this indictment and on December 9, 1950, Judge James P. McGranery in Philadelphia sentenced him to thirty years imprisonment, less the time served since his plea of guilty on July 20, 1950.....



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #1: The Venona Project

**Directions:** Read the following excerpts from documents related to the Venona Project (<http://foia.fbi.gov/foiaindex/venona.htm>) about David Greenglass, who was suspected of spying for the Soviet Union. As you read, complete the questions on the worksheet.

For more information on David Greenglass, visit this site:  
[http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BDGR.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BDGR.HTM)

Memorandum from Daniel M. Ladd (Assistant Director of the FBI) to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, February 28, 1951

#### **David Greenglass:**

Harry Gold, on June 1, 1950, furnished information regarding a contact made in June, 1945, in Albuquerque, New Mexico with a soldier and his wife, later identified through investigation as David and Ruth Greenglass. Gold paid Greenglass \$500 on this occasion and in turn received information relative to classified technical experiments being conducted at the atomic energy program at Los Alamos, New Mexico. Information from \*\*\*\*\* also reflected that Greenglass had been recruited into Soviet espionage activity in the Fall of 1944. On June 15, 1950, David Greenglass was interviewed in New York City and admitted his espionage activity as outlined by Gold. Greenglass was arrested on June 16, 1950, in New York City based on a complaint filed in Albuquerque, New Mexico, charging him with violating the Espionage Conspiracy Statute. Greenglass was indicted in Santa Fe, New Mexico, on July 6, 1950. He has also been indicted in the Southern District of New York, and the last superseding indictment was dated January 31, 1951. He had pled guilty to this indictment and he is to be sentenced following the completion of the Rosenberg-Sobell trial, which is scheduled to begin on March 6, 1951.

Through arrangements made by Mr. O. John Rogge, Greenglass' attorney, both David Greenglass and his wife have given considerable amount of information implicating their brother-in-law Julius Rosenberg, and other individuals in Soviet espionage. Greenglass will be one of the main witnesses in the trial of Rosenberg and Sobell.



# Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Activity #1: The Venona Project

**Directions:** Use the excerpts from the Venona Project documents to answer the following questions:

Question	Answer
What is the real name of your subject?	
By what code names was your subject also known?	
What evidence exists that your subject was engaged in espionage against the United States?	
Over what period of time did this alleged espionage take place?	
Who, if anyone, was also involved in your subject's alleged espionage activities?	
What actions, if any, did the U.S. government take against this alleged espionage activity?	



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: The Rosenberg Trial

**Directions:** You have been selected to portray Max Elitcher, a witness for the prosecution, for an in-class simulation of the 1951 Rosenberg Trial. Use the material in the following to prepare a five-minute presentation summarizing Elitcher’s actual courtroom testimony. To learn more about Max Elitcher, visit this site: [http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BELI.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BELI.HTM).

From “Famous Trials: The Rosenberg Trial”:

<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/transcripts/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM>

[Saypol—the prosecutor—asked Elitcher whether Julius Rosenberg visited him in 1944 in Washington, where Elitcher was working on firing control for anti-aircraft artillery.]

ELITCHER: Yes, he called me and reminded me of our school friendship and came to my home. After a while, he asked if my wife would leave the room, that he wanted to talk to me in private. She did. Then he began talking about the job that the Soviet Union was doing in the war effort and how at present a good deal of military information was being denied them by some interests in the United States, and because of that their effort was being impeded. He said there were many people who were implementing aid to the Soviet Union by providing classified information about military equipment, and so forth, and asked whether in my capacity at the Bureau of Ordnance working on anti-aircraft devices, and computer control of firing missiles, would I turn information over to him? He told me that any information I gave him would be taken to New York, processed photographically and would be returned overnight--so it would not be missed. The process would be safe as far as I am concerned....

SAYPOL: Later, did Rosenberg warn you of a leak in espionage?

ELITCHER: Yes. He said, we must be more careful--not to visit him any more, or see him. Also, he advised that I discontinue my Communist Party activities. I told him I couldn't. That was my life and I could not withdraw....

SAYPOL: Did Rosenberg tell you how he got into espionage?

ELITCHER: He told me that a long time ago he decided that this is what he wanted to do, and he made it a point to get close to people in the Communist Party, until he was able to approach a Russian.

[....]

E. H. BLOCH [defense attorney for the Rosenbergs]: As a matter of fact, from your own story on direct examination, you rejected all overtures on the part of anybody to try to enlist you in stealing information from the Government; isn't that correct?

ELITCHER: Well, I didn't reject them. I went along. I never turned over material, but I was part of it, I mean, it was part of the--I was part of discussions concerning it until 1948.

E. H. BLOCH: Did you at any time tell him that you would turn over material to him?

ELITCHER: Well, I said that I might and I didn't say I would not turn over information, I said that I might....

E. R. BLOCH: Did you ever sign a loyalty oath for the Federal Government?

ELITCHER: I did.

E. H. BLOCH: Do you know the contents of the oath you signed and swore to?

ELITCHER: I signed a statement saying that I was not or had not been a member of an organization that was dedicated to overthrow the Government by force and violence. I don't remember whether the statement specifically mentioned the Communist Party or not.

E.H. BLOCH: At the time you verified that oath, did you believe you were lying when you concealed your membership in the Communist Party?

ELITCHER: Yes. I did.

E. H. BLOCH: So you have lied under oath?

ELITCHER: Yes.

[....]

E. H. BLOCH: You have come here voluntarily, without any compulsion, isn't that right?

ELITCHER: That is correct.

E. H. BLOCH: Were any promises made to you in return for your testimony before the grand jury or this Court?

ELITCHER: Absolutely none. In fact, I was told that there were no promises to be made, nothing-- the Government would make no statement in regard to what would happen to me.

E. H. BLOCH: Did you at the time you were first interrogated by the FBI entertain any hope that if you told a story in which you said that Julius Rosenberg...tried to recruit you in espionage work, that the Government would go easy on you or would not prosecute you criminally for any crime you may have committed?

ELITCHER: From the first time that I was approached by the FBI, I decided I would tell the whole complete story. I had no idea at the time of what would happen to me. Frankly, I didn't know whether I would be arrested the same day, and to this day, I don't know what is going to happen, and I decided that purely on the basis that I would tell the whole truth and at least in the future I would not be subjected to any perjury, and I would hope in that way I would come out in the best way. I could see no other course but to tell the truth.

E. H. BLOCH: Now, you had merely the most casual relationship with Julius Rosenberg during your student days, isn't that right?

ELITCHER: Yes.

E. R. BLOCH: And you didn't see him for six years after graduation?

ELITCHER: That is right.

E. H. BLOCH: Now, not having seen him for six years, he then comes to your apartment, asks your wife to step into the bedroom, and this man who hardly knows you, launches into an overture for you to be a spy?

ELITCHER: Yes.

E. H. BLOCH: What did you reply?

ELITCHER: Well, I told him I would see about it. I didn't say I would not engage in this activity; I would think about it. I said, "I can't make trips to New York on my own without my wife's knowledge. It is just impractical . . . I will consider it, and if something comes up and I feel I should bring it, I will."

E. H. BLOCH: Was there any question of money raised?

ELITCHER: No.

E. H. BLOCH: Did you pass any information, secret, classified or otherwise of the Government of the United States, to the defendant Julius Rosenberg at any time?

ELITCHER: I did not.

E. H. BLOCH: Well what particular crime did you have in mind you may have committed when you went to a lawyer?

ELITCHER: I know I had discussed a transfer of such material, and I knew that was not legal.



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: The Rosenberg Trial

**Directions:** You have been selected to portray David Greenglass, the main witness for the prosecution, for an in-class simulation of the 1951 Rosenberg Trial. Use the material in the following to prepare a five-minute presentation summarizing Greenglass's actual courtroom testimony. To learn more about David Greenglass, visit this site:

[http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BDGR.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BDGR.HTM).

From "Famous Trials: The Rosenberg Trial":

<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/transcripts/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM>

[Greenglass testified that Rosenberg asked David and Ruth Greenglass to visit him in Knickerbocker Village. When they arrived, a woman by the name of Ann Sidorovich was also there. Greenglass said that Rosenberg told him that Sidorovich would probably meet Greenglass in a movie theater in Denver to pick up information that he is able to get in Los Alamos. Because his contact might turn out to be someone else, Rosenberg cut a Jell-O box with a scissors and gave one half to Ruth Greenglass while keeping the other half. He told Greenglass that whatever person he sent to meet with him would carry the matching half of the Jell-O box as a recognition signal. The meeting point was changed from Denver to Albuquerque. Greenglass then testified as to a meeting (also in New York) arranged by Julius, with a Russian in a car. Greenglass described the lenses to the unknown Russian and answered his questions about activities in Los Alamos.]

[Cohn, Greenglass's lawyer, provided Greenglass with a Jell-O box and asked him to cut it in the way that he said Julius had during their meeting at his apartment.]

[Cohn asked Greenglass about his meeting in Albuquerque with Harry Gold, who turned out to be his contact.]

COHN: Would you tell us exactly what happened from the first minute you saw Gold?

GREENGLASS: There was a knock on the door and I opened it. We had just completed eating breakfast, and there was a man standing in the hallway who asked if I was Mr. Greenglass and I said, yes. He stepped through the door and said, "Julius sent me," and I said, "Oh" and walked to my wife's purse, took out the wallet and took out the matched part of the Jell-O box. He produced his piece and we checked them and they fitted, and the identification was made. I offered him something to eat and he said he had already eaten. He just wanted to know if I had any information, and I said, "I have some but I will have to write it up. If you come back in the afternoon, I will give it to you." I started to tell him about one of the people who would be good material for recruiting into espionage work-- He cut me short and he left and I got to work on the report.

COHN: Where did you work on the report?

GREENGLASS: In my combination living room and bedroom.

COHN: Tell us exactly what you did.

GREENGLASS: I got out some 8 by 10 ruled white paper, and I drew some sketches of a lens mold and how they are set up in the experiment, and I gave a description of the experiment.

COHN: Was this another step in the same experiment on atomic energy concerning which you had given a sketch to Rosenberg?

GREENGLASS: That is right, and I also gave him a list of possible recruits for espionage.

COHN: Did Harry Gold come back in the afternoon?

GREENGLASS: Yes at 2:30-- I gave him my report in an envelope and he gave me an envelope, which I felt and realized there was money in it and I put it in my pocket.

COHN: Did you examine the money at that point?

GREENGLASS: No, I didn't. Gold said, "Will it be enough?" and I said, "Well, it will be plenty for the present." And he said "You need it" and we went into a side discussion about the fact that my wife had a miscarriage earlier in the spring, and he said, "Well, I will see what I can do about getting some more money for you."

COHN: How much was in the envelope?

GREENGLASS: My wife and I counted it later. There was \$500--I gave it to her.

[...]

[Cohn asked Greenglass about a visit he had with Julius Rosenberg while on furlough in September, 1943.]

GREENGLASS: He came up to the apartment and he got me out of bed and we went into another room so my wife could dress.

COHN: What did he say to you?

GREENGLASS: He said to me that he wanted to know what I had for him. I told him "I think I have a pretty good description of the atom bomb."

COHN: The atom bomb itself?

GREENGLASS: That's right.

[Greenglass testified that Rosenberg asked him for a written description of experiments underway at Los Alamos. Greenglass said that he would prepare the descriptions. Rosenberg gave him \$200.]

COHN: Did you draw up a sketch of the atom bomb itself?

GREENGLASS: I did.

COHN: Did you prepare descriptive material to explain the sketch of the atom bomb?

GREENGLASS: I did.

COHN: Was there any other material that you wrote up on that occasion?

GREENGLASS: I gave some scientists' names, and I also gave some possible recruits for espionage.

COHN: Now, about how many pages would you say it took to write down all these matters?

GREENGLASS: I would say about twelve pages or so.

[Greenglass testified that Ethel Rosenberg, in his presence, typed the secret information on a portable typewriter while he and Julius clarified ambiguous and ungrammatical language in Greenglass's draft. Greenglass then testified that Julius bragged as the typing was in progress that he had stolen a proximity fuse when working at Emerson Radio.]

COURT: Did he tell you what he did with that proximity fuse?

GREENGLASS: He told me he took it out in his briefcase. That is the same briefcase he brought his lunch in with and gave it to Russia....

[Greenglass was asked if Rosenberg told him how he passed information to Russian agents.]

GREENGLASS: He told me that if he wanted to get in touch with the Russians, he had a means of communicating with them in a motion picture theater, an alcove where he would put microfilm or messages and the Russians would pick it up. If he wanted to see them in person, he would put a message in there and by prearrangement they would meet in some lonely spot in Long Island.

COHN: Did you in the report you wrote for Rosenberg tell him about atomic explosion which would take place at Alamogordo, New Mexico [the first successful test of the atomic bomb]?

GREENGLASS: Yes, in June 1943--

COURT: How long before the explosion did you tell him?

GREENGLASS: About a month before.

[...]

E. H. BLOCH [the Rosenbergs' lawyer]: You knew at that time, did you not, that you were engaging in the commission of a very serious crime?

GREENGLASS: I did. . . .

E. H. BLOCH: Did it occur to you at the time that you finally said to your wife, "I will do this" and then transmitted to her certain information that there was a possible penalty of death for espionage?

GREENGLASS: Yes.

[...]

E. H. BLOCH: And from the time in the latter part of November 1944, during your entire career in the Army, you continued to spy, did you not?

GREENGLASS: I did.

E. H. BLOCH: And you received money for that, did you not?

GREENGLASS: I did.

E. H. BLOCH: You received \$500 from Harry Gold in Albuquerque, New Mexico for that, did you not?

GREENGLASS: I did.

E. H. BLOCH: Did you ever offer to return that money?

GREENGLASS: I did not.

[...]

E. H. BLOCH: How long ago have you pleaded guilty?

GREENGLASS: A year ago.

E. H. BLOCH: Have you been sentenced?

GREENGLASS: No.

E. H. BLOCH: Do you believe the Court will be easier on you because you are testifying here?

GREENGLASS: I don't believe that in testifying I will help myself to that great extent.

[...]

E. H. BLOCH: Now when you were inducted into the Army, you took an oath, didn't you? You know you have violated that oath?

GREENGLASS: I did.

E. R. BLOCH: Did you consider you were doing an honorable or dishonorable thing?

GREENGLASS: On the basis of the philosophy I believed in, I felt it was the right thing to do at that time.

E. H. BLOCH: Did you continue to think it was the right thing?

GREENGLASS: I was having my doubts.

E. H. BLOCH: When did you begin to have doubts?

GREENGLASS: Almost as soon as I started to do it.

COURT: Did you tell Mr. Rosenberg that you had doubts about the propriety of it?

GREENGLASS: I had a kind of hero worship there and I did not want my hero to fail, and that I was doing the wrong thing by him. That is exactly why I did not stop the thing after I had the doubts.

E. H. BLOCH: You say you had hero worship?

GREENGLASS: That is right.

E. H. BLOCH: Who was your hero?

GREENGLASS: Julius Rosenberg.

E. H. BLOCH: I see. Did you have doubts when you took the money?

GREENGLASS: I had plenty of headaches and I felt the thousand dollars was not coming out of Julius Rosenberg's pocket. It was coming out of the Russians' pocket and it didn't bother me one bit to take it, or the \$4,000 either.

[...]

E. H. BLOCH: Do you feel any remorse now for what you did down at Los Alamos?

GREENGLASS: I do....

E. H. BLOCH: Do you bear any affection for your sister, Ethel?

GREENGLASS: I do.

E. H. BLOCH: You realize the possible death penalty in the event Ethel is convicted by this jury?

GREENGLASS: I do....

E. H. BLOCH: Do you bear affection for your brother-in-law, Julius?

GREENGLASS: I do.



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: The Rosenberg Trial

**Directions:** You have been selected to portray Ruth Greenglass, a witness for the prosecution, for an in-class simulation of the 1951 Rosenberg Trial. Use the material in the following to prepare a five-minute presentation summarizing Greenglass's actual courtroom testimony. To learn more about Ruth Greenglass, visit this site: [http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BRUT.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BRUT.HTM).

From "Famous Trials: The Rosenberg Trial":

<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/transcripts/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM>

RUTH GREENGLASS: I told my husband that I knew that he was working on the atomic bomb. He asked me how I knew and who had told me. I said that I had been to Julius Rosenberg's house and that he had told me that David's work was on the atomic bomb, and he asked me how Julius knew it and I told him of the conversation we had had, that Julius had said they spent two years getting in touch with people who would enable him to do work directly for the Russian people, that his friends, the Russians, had told him that the work was on the atomic bomb, that the bomb had dangerous radiation effects, that it was a very destructive weapon and that the scientific basis, the information on the bomb should be made available to Soviet Russia....

KILSHEIMER [Greenglass's lawyer]: Now will you state as best you can recollect, the substance of that conversation which you had with the Rosenbergs on that occasion?

RUTH GREENGLASS: Yes. Julius said that I might have noticed that for some time he and Ethel had not been actively pursuing any Communist Party activities, that they didn't buy the Daily Worker at the usual newsstand; that for two years he had been trying to get in touch with people who would assist him to be able to help the Russian people more directly other than just his membership in the Communist Party, and he went on to tell me that he knew that David was working on the atomic bomb and I asked him how he knew, because I had received an affidavit from the War Department telling me--I said that I had received an affidavit from the War Department telling me that my mail to David would be censored and his to me, because he was working on a top secret project. And he said--I wanted to know how he knew what David was doing. He said that his friends had told him that David was working on the atomic bomb, and he went on to tell me that the atomic bomb was the most destructive weapon used so far, that it had dangerous radiation effects that the United States and Britain were working on this project jointly and that he felt that the information should be shared with Russia, who was our ally at the time, because if all nations had the information then one nation couldn't use the bomb as a threat against another. He said that he wanted me to tell my husband, David, that he should give information to Julius to be passed on to the Russians.

KILSHEIMER: And what information did he ask you to obtain from your husband if he should be willing to do it?

RUTH GREENGLASS: He wanted a physical description of the project at Los Alamos, the approximate number of people employed, the names of some of the scientists who were working there--something about whether the place was camouflaged, what the security measures were and the relative distance of the project to Albuquerque and Santa Fe.

[Greenglass said she didn't want David to engage in espionage at Los Alamos, but told him of Julius's request that he do so.]

GREENGLASS: My husband did not give me an immediate answer; at first he, too, refused, and the following day he told me that he would consent to do this.

KILSHEIMER: Now, did you inform your husband as to the type of information that Julius Rosenberg had asked you to obtain?

RUTH GREENGLASS: Yes, I did.

[Greenglass testified about her husband's description of Los Alamos.]

GREENGLASS: He said that Los Alamos had formerly been a riding academy, that it was forty miles from Santa Fe and about 110 miles from Albuquerque, that the project itself was on the top of a hill and it was secluded; you could hardly see it until you were almost on top of it; that there was a guard at the entrance at all times, and everyone was checked going in and out. He told me the names of the scientists, Dr. Urey, Dr. Oppenheimer, Kistiakowsky, Niels Bohr. David told me that he worked in an experimental shop, that he made models from blueprints that scientists brought in to him.

[Greenglass admitted her role in advising her husband as to his espionage activities.]

GREENGLASS: I told him to be very careful in getting the information, not to take any papers, not to take any blueprints, not to be obvious in seeking information from other people, and be careful not to get involved in political discussions.

[Greenglass testified about a meeting with the Rosenbergs when David was in New York on furlough. While David and Julius talked about the bomb, she had a conversation with Ethel.]

KILSHEIMER: What did you say to Ethel Rosenberg at that time?

RUTH GREENGLASS: Well, Ethel said that she was tired, and I asked her what she had been doing. She said she had been typing; and I asked her if she had found David's notes hard to distinguish. She said no, she was used to his handwriting. Then she said that Julie, too, was tired; that he was very busy; he ran around a good deal; that all his time and his energies were used in this thing; that was the most important thing to him; that he was away a good deal and spent time with his friends, that he had to make a good impression; that it sometimes cost him as much as \$50 to \$75 an evening to entertain his friends; and then we spoke further. I said that I expected to be very lonely in Albuquerque; and Ethel said that I would make friends; that after a while I would probably meet other people there from New York.

[Greenglass testified about the day Harry Gold showed up at their apartment in Albuquerque.]

KILSHEIMER: Where was the last time you had seen the portion of the Jell-O box side which Harry Gold produced?

RUTH GREENGLASS: In Julius Rosenberg's hand.

[....]

[Greenglass was asked a series of questions about a visit by Julius following the arrest of Harry Gold. She testified that Julius showed them a newspaper picture of Gold and told them it was the spy who had met them in Albuquerque. She testified that Julius told the Greenglasses that they should flee the country. Greenglass testified about another visit from Julius on June 4, 1950.]

KILSHEIMER: Now, what took place at that time?

RUTH GREENGLASS: He gave my husband a package wrapped in brown paper and he said it was \$4,000, that there would be more money available in Mexico when we got there.

KILSHEIMER: What did you do with the \$4,000?

RUTH GREENGLASS: We put it in the chimney in our fireplace and afterwards my husband gave it to my brother-in-law.

KILSHEIMER: Did Rosenberg on that occasion tell you when you would have to leave the country?

RUTH GREENGLASS: He told us that we would have to leave sooner than expected, that they were closing in and getting ready to make an arrest....I asked him what he was doing. He said he was going too, that he would not leave at the same time, and he would meet us in Mexico. We would see him there, and I asked him what Ethel thought about it and he said Ethel didn't like the idea of it herself but she realized it was necessary and they were going to go.

[....]

A. BLOCH [defense attorney for the Rosenbergs]: Do you think that acting as a spy against the interests of the United States is a crime?

RUTH GREENGLASS: I think it is wrong.

A. BLOCH: When did you first realize that it was wrong?

RUTH GREENGLASS: I have always known it was wrong....

A. BLOCH: And you kept on doing what you said you did?

RUTH GREENGLASS: I have told the truth about what I did....

A. BLOCH: And you knew that that \$500 was paid to your husband by Gold?

RUTH GREENGLASS: From Julius.

A. BLOCH: And you knew that that was compensation for spy work?

RUTH GREENGLASS: No, I was under the impression at first that Julius said it was for scientific purposes we were sharing the information, but when my husband got the \$500, I realized...he gave the information and he got paid.

[....]

BLOCH: . . . [T]oday you entertain a hope that your husband is going to be treated by the Court with lenience?

**RUTH GREENGLASS:** I am telling the story because it's true and I hope and pray that my husband will come home. That is what I want, but I am not telling the story for that, no.



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: The Rosenberg Trial

**Directions:** You have been selected to portray Harry Gold, a witness for the prosecution, for an in-class simulation of the 1951 Rosenberg Trial. Use the material in the following to prepare a five-minute presentation summarizing Gold's actual courtroom testimony. To learn more about Harry Gold, visit this site: [http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BGOL.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BGOL.HTM).

From "Famous Trials: The Rosenberg Trial":

<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/transcripts/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM>

[Harry Gold had worked for the Soviets for fifteen years and was one of their most trusted spies. He may have been the only American spy to meet Yakovlev, chief of the American spy network. He was the witness best positioned to tell the inside story of Soviet espionage activities.]

GOLD: Yakovlev was about twenty-eight or thirty years of age at the time I knew him. He was about 5 feet 9 inches in height; had a medium build, which tended toward the slender. He had dark or dark brown hair and there was a lock of it that kept falling over his forehead, which he would brush back continually. He had a rather long nose and a fair complexion, dark eyes. He walked with somewhat of a stoop....

[Gold described his espionage activities. He described his meetings with the British physicist and spy, Klaus Fuchs. He described his meetings with Yakovlev, or "John." He described the use of recognition signals and said that he never gave his true name or residence.]

GOLD: In other words, if we were just going to discuss the possibility of obtaining certain types of information, the hazards involved, just how much information should be obtained and just what source was needed, then a rather long meeting was scheduled. If I was going to actually get information, very usually a brief meeting was scheduled, the idea being to minimize the time of detection when information would be passed from the American to me. In addition to this I made payments of sums of money to some of the people whom I regularly contacted and always I wrote reports detailing everything that happened at every meeting with these people; and these reports I turned over to Yakovlev.

COURT: And where would you get the money from, that you paid to some of these people for the information?

GOLD The money was given to me by Yakovlev.... This is how it worked: We had an arrangement not only for regular meetings but we had an arrangement for alternate meetings, should one of the regular ones not take place, and then in addition to that we had an arrangement for an emergency meeting. This emergency meeting was a one-way affair. A system was set up whereby Yakovlev could get in touch

with me if he wanted me quickly. but I couldn't get in touch with him because I didn't know where. Yakovlev told me that in this way the chain was cut in two places. The person from whom I got the information in America did not know me by my true name, nor did he know where I lived, nor could he get in touch with me and I couldn't get in touch with Yakovlev. Yakovlev said this was a good thing.

[Gold testified about one favorite technique for passing information.]

GOLD: I would take the information and put it between the folds of a newspaper and Yakovlev and I would exchange the newspapers. The one that I got was just a newspaper. The one that he got had the information between the folds, the information usually being in some sort of an enclosure.

Gold testified that Yakovlev asked him to go to Albuquerque to meet an American spy. He said that Yakovlev told him that the woman who was supposed to make the trip couldn't.

GOLD: Yakovlev then gave me a piece of paper; it was onionskin paper, and on it was typed the following: First, the name "Greenglass," just "Greenglass." Then a number [on] "High Street"; all that I can recall about the number is...it was a low number and...the second figure was "0" and the last figure was either 5, 7 or 9; then underneath was "Albuquerque, New Mexico." The last thing that was on the paper was "Recognition signal. I come from Julius."

[Gold also testified that he was given part of a Jell-O box and told that Greenglass or his wife should produce the matching piece. According to Gold, Yakovlev gave him \$500 to give to Greenglass once he had received the information.]

[Through a detailed examination, Gold told the story of how the secrets of Los Alamos were discovered, how Greenglass passed information in Albuquerque, how (Klaus) Fuchs passed information in London, and how Yakovlev first became concerned about security lapses.]

GOLD: Yakovlev almost went through the roof of the saloon. He said, "You fool." He said, "You spoiled eleven years of work." He told me that I didn't realize what I had done, and he told me that I should have remembered that sometime in the summer of '45 he had told me that [Abraham] Brothman was under suspicion of having been engaged in espionage and that I should have remembered it.

[Gold testified that Yakovlev told him shortly before Fuchs' arrest, "I'll never see you again." Direct examination ended.]

LANE: The Government, your Honor has no further questions.

COURT: Any cross?

E. H. BLOCH: The defendants Rosenberg have no cross-examination of this witness.

PHILLIPS: No cross.

COURT: The witness is excused.



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: The Rosenberg Trial

**Directions:** You have been selected to portray Elizabeth Bentley, a witness for the prosecution, for an in-class simulation of the 1951 Rosenberg Trial. Use the material in the following to prepare a five-minute presentation summarizing Bentley's actual courtroom testimony. To learn more about Elizabeth Bentley, visit this site: [http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BBEN.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BBEN.HTM).

From "Famous Trials: The Rosenberg Trial":

<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/transcripts/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM>

SAYPOL [the prosecutor]: Miss Bentley, had you learned what was the relation of the Communist Party of the United States to the Communist International?

BENTLEY: It was part of the Communist International and subject to its jurisdiction as such.

SAYPOL: Well, what connection did the Communist Party membership of you and Golos have with the destination of this material to Russia?

BENTLEY: The Communist Party, being part of the Communist International only served the interests of Moscow, whether it be propaganda or espionage or sabotage....

[Bentley testified about her relationship with her Soviet control, Mr. Jacob Golos.]

SAYPOL: Miss Bentley, referring to this occasion when you accompanied Mr. Golos to the vicinity of Knickerbocker Village and you saw him in conversation with a man. Do you recall that?

BENTLEY: Yes....

SAYPOL: Subsequent to the occasion when you went to the vicinity of Knickerbocker Village with Mr. Golos and saw him in conversation with a person, and continuing until November 1943, did you have telephone calls from a person who described himself as Julius?

BENTLEY: Yes, I did.

SAYPOL: Did you then have conversations with Golos regarding the telephone calls from the person describing himself as Julius?

BENTLEY: That is correct.

SAYPOL: And thereafter, having conversed with Golos about the telephone call from Julius, in the first instance, would you immediately hereafter receive further telephone calls from the person describing himself as Julius?

BENTLEY: Yes....

SAYPOL: From your conversations with Julius and with Golos, did you come to learn in what vicinity Julius resided? [....]

BENTLEY: Yes, he lived in Knickerbocker Village.

[Bentley was asked what function she served in relation to Golos and "Julius."]

BENTLEY: My part was that I took messages from Julius to Golos and told Golos that he wanted to meet him, and so on. I was the go-between.

Cross-examination:

E. H. BLOCH [lawyer for the defense]: Now, you have referred to a man by the name of Jacob Golos? He was known to you also as John?

BENTLEY: John was the name he used with his undercover contacts. His real name was Jacob Nathan Golos.

E. H. BLOCH: And what name did he use to you?

BENTLEY: Well, when I first met him for the first year, I knew him as Timmy. After that, I knew him by his real name.

E. H. BLOCH: What name did you call him?

BENTLEY: You mean personally?

E. H. BLOCH: Yes.

BENTLEY: I called him Yasha.

E. H. BLOCH: You were pretty friendly with him, weren't you?

BENTLEY: I think I have said this in other trials; I was in love with Mr. Golos....

E. H. BLOCH: And you lived with him, did you not?

BENTLEY: I certainly did....

E. H. BLOCH: Did you know that Golos was married at the time you started to have relations with him?

BENTLEY: Mr. Golos was never legally married to any woman in his life. Any other women had the same relationship I had. He did not believe in bourgeois marriage. He was a Communist.

E. H. BLOCH: Would you characterize your relationship with Mr. Golos as your being the mistress of Mr. Golos?

BENTLEY: I don't feel I am called upon to characterize it. That is up to you....

E.H. BLOCH: Did you know that Mr. Golos had a child when you started to have relations with him?

BENTLEY: I knew that Mr. Golos had lived with a woman previously, who had gone back to the U.S.S.R. two years before, and that he had had a child by her, yes....

E. H. BLOCH: Did you recognize the voice of the man who you say called you up and said, "This is Julius"? [...]

BENTLEY: No. I have never met anyone whose voice I heard, whom I could identify as Julius.

E. H. BLOCH: How many times in all do you say this person who called you up and said, "This is Julius"--

BENTLEY: It might have been five or six; it may have been more.

E. H. BLOCH: And during what period of time was this?

BENTLEY: I think I have stated that. It was from the fall of '42 to about November Of '43--

E. H. BLOCH: Can you tell us more specifically when these calls came in?

BENTLEY: Yes, they always came after midnight, in the wee small hours. I remember it because I got waked out of bed....

E. H. BLOCH: Did you always ask the people who called you their names?

BENTLEY: If I didn't get the voice right off, but this particular party always started his conversation by saying, "This is Julius."

E. H. BLOCH: "This is Julius"?

BENTLEY: Yes.

E. H. BLOCH: That was on six or seven occasions?

BENTLEY: I put it at five or six. It might be seven or eight. I don't know exactly the number of them....



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: The Rosenberg Trial

**Directions:** You have been selected to portray Julius Rosenberg for an in-class simulation of the 1951 Rosenberg Trial. Use the material in the following to prepare a five-minute presentation summarizing Julius Rosenberg’s actual courtroom testimony. To learn more about Julius Rosenberg, visit this site: [http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BJRO.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BJRO.HTM)

From “Famous Trials: The Rosenberg Trial”:

<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM>

E. H. BLOCH [Rosenberg’s lawyer]: Now, Mr. Rosenberg, are you aware of the charge that the Government has leveled against you?

ROSENBERG: I am.

E. H. BLOCH: Do you know what you are being charged with?

ROSENBERG: Yes.

E. H. BLOCH: What are you being charged with?

ROSENBERG: Conspiracy to commit espionage to aid a foreign government.

[....]

E. R. BLOCH: Now I want to direct the following questions and try to have you focus your attention upon your recollection of their testimony. Mrs. Ruth Greenglass testified here, in substance, that in the middle of November 1944, you came over to her house or you invited her to your house and you asked her to enlist her husband, Dave Greenglass, in getting information out of where he was working and deliver or convey that information to you. Did you ever have any conversation with Mrs. Ruth Greenalass at or about that time with respect to getting information from Dave Greenglass out of the place that he was working?

ROSENBERG: I did not.

E. H. BLOCH: Did you know in the middle of November 1944 where Dave Greenglass was stationed?

ROSENBERG: I did not.

E. H. BLOCH: Did you know in the middle of November 1944 that there was such a project known as the Los Alamos Project?

ROSENBERG: I did not....

E. H. BLOCH: Do you owe allegiance to any other country?

ROSENBERG: No, I do not.

E. H. BLOCH: Have you any divided allegiance?

ROSENBERG: I do not.

F. H. BLOCH: Would you fight for this country? [...]

ROSENBERG: Yes, I will, and in discussing the merits of other forms of governments, I discussed that with my friends on the basis of the performance of what they accomplished, and I felt that the Soviet Government has improved the lot of the underdog there, has made a lot of progress in eliminating illiteracy, has done a lot of reconstruction work and built up a lot of resources, and at the same time I felt that they contributed a major share in destroying the Hitler beast who killed six million of my co-religionists and I feel emotional about that thing.

[...]

[Rosenberg testified as to his version of the conversation he had with Greenglass during the walk they took shortly before Greenglass was arrested. Rosenberg said that during their walk Greenglass demanded \$2,000. According to Rosenberg, Greenglass claimed Julius owed him for their failed business venture.]

COURT: And you can't think of any reason whatsoever, can you, why David Greenglass would, of all the people he knew, his brother, all the other members of his family, single you out, as he did apparently and as you say he did, and say that you would be sorry unless you gave him the money?

ROSENBERG: Well, he knew that I owed--he had an idea that I owed him money from the business, and I guess that is why he figured he wanted to get money from me.

[...]

E. H. BLOCH: Just one last question. Did you ever have any arrangement with Dave Greenglass or Ruth Greenglass or any Russian or with your wife or with anybody in this world to transmit information to the Soviet Union or any foreign power?

ROSENBERG: I did not have any such arrangement.

[...]

SAYPOL [the prosecutor]: You told us about Greenglass taking you for a walk and demanding \$2,000 from you. Did you tell your wife about this?

ROSENBERG: Yes, she wanted to help him even though I thought we should not after he tried to blackmail me.

[Rosenberg was asked about his previous association with Elitcher, and Rosenberg responded that they had known one another slightly during their college days.]

SAYPOL: And then four years later, when you were in Washington, you decided that you wanted to call him and pay him a visit?

ROSENBERG: That's right.

SAYPOL: Well, what was it that you wanted to see him about?

ROSENBERG: I was lonesome and I just wanted to see somebody to talk to.

SAYPOL: And out of the clear sky you looked in the telephone book under "E" for the name Elitcher and you called him up?

ROSENBERG: Mr. Saypol, I was looking in the phone book for any names that I could recognize as former classmates or people I knew at one time.

COURT: What names were you looking for?

ROSENBERG: For some names I might recognize.

COURT: You mean, you started with "A" and started going--

ROSENBERG: No, I didn't just start with "A"; I thought of a couple of people's names who might be in Washington; I remembered the incident at the swimming pool at that time, that Elitcher was in Washington, and perhaps he had a telephone.

[Saypol asked Rosenberg why had he not called other people with whom he had worked in Washington.]

ROSENBERG: I didn't know them socially.

SAYPOL: Did you know Elitcher socially?

ROSENBERG: No, but he had been a former classmate.

[Rosenberg was asked about his dismissal from his job with the U. S. Signal Corps in 1945]

SAYPOL: What really happened to you, you were dismissed were you not?

ROSENBERG: I was suspended.

SAYPOL: Were you then dismissed?

ROSENBERG: That is correct.

SAYPOL: And what was the reason?

ROSENBERG: It was alleged that I was a member of the Communist Party....

SAYPOL: It is not a fact that on that occasion you were told you were being removed from Government service because of the fact that information had been received that you were a member of the Communist Party?

ROSENBERG: I can't recall the date exactly.

SAYPOL: Can you recall the fact of being advised that that information that you were a member of the Communist Party was imparted to you?

ROSENBERG: I was down at Captain Henderson's office on one occasion.

SAYPOL: Is it not a fact that on that occasion you were told you were being removed from Government service because of the fact that information had been received that you were a member of the Communist Party?

E. H. BLOCH: If Mr. Saypol wants a concession I will concede right now that this witness was removed from Government service upon charges that he was a member of the Communist Party.

COURT: All right.

SAYPOL: Were you a member of the Communist Party?

ROSENBERG: I refuse to answer on the ground that it might incriminate me.

SAYPOL: Is it not a fact that in February 1944 you transferred from Branch 16-B of the Industrial Division of the Communist Party to the Eastern Club of the First Assembly under Transfer No. 12179?

ROSENBERG: I refuse to answer.

[...]

[Rosenberg was asked why he didn't tell the FBI about Greenglass's desire to steal parts from the military.]

SAYPOL: Did you think you should have volunteered it to them?

ROSENBERG: Well, when a member of the family is in trouble, Mr. Saypol, you are not interested in sinking him.

COURT: Were you trying to protect him at that time?

ROSENBERG: Well, I didn't know what he was accused of, your Honor. I had a suspicion he was accused of stealing some uranium at that time.

COURT: Well, in connection with that, were you interested in protecting him?

ROSENBERG: I wasn't interested in doing him any harm at that particular point.

COURT: You are not answering the question. You were interested in protecting him?

ROSENBERG: Not in protecting that act itself, but protecting the individual.

COURT: To the point where you would not reveal something which you felt--

ROSENBERG: Well, I wasn't asked a particular thing like that and there was nothing for me to reveal. I wasn't aware of the trouble he was in.

Rosenberg was asked if and when he became aware of the theft of secrets from Los Alamos.

ROSENBERG: Well, I read about the Harry Gold case.

SAYPOL: You read about the Klaus Fuchs case, too?

ROSENBERG: That is correct.

SAYPOL: You knew that David Greenglass had been questioned in February by an agent of the FBI regarding the theft of uranium, didn't you?

ROSENBERG: That is correct.

SAYPOL: Where did you find that out?

ROSENBERG: David told me.

SAYPOL: And you still say that you had no suspicion, when the agents questioned you, regarding the nature of the arrest of David Greenglass?

ROSENBERG: That's right, because David Greenglass himself told me that he didn't steal the uranium after that interview, and I believed him.

SAYPOL: Did you, in the month of June, 1950, or in the month of May 1950, have any passport photographs taken of yourself? [...]

ROSENBERG: I don't recall. I might have had some photos taken.

SAYPOL: For what purpose might you have had those photographs taken?

ROSENBERG: Well, when I walk with the children, many times with my wife, we would step in; we would have--we would pass a man on the street with one of those box cameras and we would take some pictures. We would step into a place and take some pictures and the pictures we like, we keep.

COURT: He is not asking you that. He is asking you about these particular pictures in June 1950. What was the purpose of those pictures?

ROSENBERG: Just--if you take pictures, you just go in, take some pictures, snapshots....

SAYPOL: Do you remember telling the man at 99 Park Row that you had to go to France to settle an estate?

ROSENBERG: I didn't tell him anything of the sort....

SAYPOL: At the time David was talking about going to Mexico, what kind of pictures did you take and how many?

ROSENBERG: I don't recall....



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: The Rosenberg Trial

**Directions:** You have been selected to portray Ethel Rosenberg for an in-class simulation of the 1951 Rosenberg Trial. Use the material in the following to prepare a five-minute presentation summarizing Ethel Rosenberg’s actual courtroom testimony. For more information on Ethel Rosenberg, visit this site: [http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BERO.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BERO.HTM).

From “Famous Trials: The Rosenberg Trial”:

<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM>

A. BLOCH [Rosenberg’s lawyer]: Did you do all the chores of a housewife?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Yes, I did.

A. BLOCH: Cooking, washing, cleaning, darning, scrubbing?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Yes, I did.

A. BLOCH: Did you hire any help throughout that period?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: On occasion for brief periods. I know that when I came from the hospital after the birth of the first child I had some help for the first month, and then upon the time that the second child arrived, I had help for about two months, and there was a period when I was ill and that started about November 1944, I had to have help, right up to about the spring of 1945.

A. BLOCH: Now, outside of these three periods you last mentioned, you did all the housework yourself?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: That is right.

A. BLOCH: Your laundry and everything?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: That is correct.

[...]

A. BLOCH: Did you at any time type any matters that may be called information concerning anything relating to our national defense?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: No, I did not.

COURT: Did you know anything about the charges that had been leveled against your husband by the Government in '45?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Oh, you mean the time that the Government dismissed him?

COURT: Yes.

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, it was alleged that he was a member of the Communist Party.

COURT: And he was dismissed for that reason? [...]

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, they gave that as a reason, that is right.

COURT: Now, you typed the reply for him; is that right?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Yes.

COURT: And the reply which you typed denied that he was a Communist?

COURT: Now, you typed the reply for him; is that right?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Yes.

COURT: And the reply which you typed denied that he was a Communist; is that correct? [...]

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Yes.

[...]

COURT: Did you know that your brother [David Greenglass] was working on the atomic bomb project?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: No.

COURT: When did you find out about that for the first time?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Oh, when he came out of the Army.

COURT: You mean in 1946?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Yes.

[...]

[Bloch then repeated the Greenglasses' testimony about the Jell-O box. He quoted Greenglass's testimony as to how Julius had said:]

A. BLOCH: "This half will be brought to you by another party and he will bear the greetings from me and you will know that I have sent him"; was there any such thing? Did you ever hear of any such thing as a Jell-O box being cut in two in order to be a means of identification of any emissary or agent to be sent by your husband out West in order to get information from the Los Alamos Project?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Outside of this courtroom, I never heard of any such thing.

COURT: Incidentally, did you have any Jell-O boxes in your apartment?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Oh, yes....

A. BLOCH: Now, your sister-in-law testified, in substance, that she had a miscarriage some time after she had been living with her husband in Albuquerque, and that she had written you a letter in which she informed you of the fact that she had had a miscarriage, and that thereupon she received a response from you in the shape of a letter, in writing, in which you said, in substance, that soon a relative will come to visit her, and insinuated that that was a sort of a signal, or that the word "relative" had some meaning, transmitting to her the idea that somebody was going to come to see her and receive information; did you ever write a letter containing a phrase that a relative would come to see her?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: No, I did not.

A. BLOCH: Did you ever make an arrangement with her, or did your husband in your presence, that if the phrase "relative" would be used in any letter, it would mean as an identifying mark, and that it would refer to somebody, an emissary of yours or your husband's coming over to get information?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: There was never any such talk.

[...]

[Ethel was asked whether Julius ever discussed with her the demand for money made by Greenglass, which was alleged in Julius's testimony.]

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, the first time he said that Davey had demanded \$2,000 from him and had seemed pretty upset....

A. BLOCH: Were you worried about it?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Yes, I was.

COURT: Well, forget whether you were worried about it; what did you do about it?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, I said to my husband, "Well, doesn't he know the kind of financial situation we are in? Didn't you tell him you can't give him money like that?" And then I remember saying something to the effect that "If Ruthie [Greenglass] doesn't stop nagging him for money, she is liable to give him another psychological heart attack like he had in the winter."

[Ethel testified that Julius told her about another conversation with David Greenglass.]

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, this time my husband told me that Davey really must be in some very serious trouble, that he was extremely nervous and agitated and that he began to talk wildly, threatened that he would be sorry if he didn't--my husband said that David threatened him, that he, my husband, would be sorry if that money wasn't forthcoming.

A. BLOCH: What did you say or do about it?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, I told my husband that I thought I should call the house and find out if everything is all right, and my husband said, "Well, the only thing is, Dave may be working, he may not even be home and I have no way of knowing just how much of this Ruthie knows about," and she has really had her hands full between her burns and having given birth to a child, and perhaps it would be wiser if he took it upon himself to see him at the earliest opportunity he could....

A. BLOCH: Did you at any time either on that occasion or any other occasion, either in words or in substance ask her to get an assurance from Dave that he was not going to talk, that he was going to claim

he was going to be innocent, or that he was innocent and that if he does that, everybody will be okay and satisfied?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: No, I never said any such thing....

[...]

COURT: Did you have any pictures taken for any purpose whatsoever in May or June 1950?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: We may have; we may have.

COURT: Do you remember where?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: No, all I remember was some commercial photographer....

COURT: How did you happen to get before that camera?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well...my older child was interested in machines, among other things. We, it was our wont to go for walks with them and to stop and look at anything of interest, anything that might be of interest to the children, and very often, as we took these walks, the older child particularly would ask, "Oh, come, let's go in here and get our pictures taken." That is--I think kids generally do that kind of thing.

COURT: How many times would you say he had done that?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Oh, several times. We happen to be what you would call "snapshot hounds" and that bunch of pictures that you saw there doesn't nearly represent all the snapshots and all the photos that we have had made of ourselves and the children all through our lives.

COURT: Then you remember, you say, having had some photographs taken in May or in June?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: It may have been that time. I am really not sure. There were so many frequent occasions when we dropped into these places.

COURT: I am talking about the very last ones that you had taken.

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, I can't say what I don't recall and I really don't recall specifically.

SAYPOL: Well, we have it now at least that the photographer, the commercial photographer, was within walking distance of your home at 10 Monroe Street; is that right?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, there were times we took walks and took photographs elsewhere.

SAYPOL: We are now talking about the time that you last remember, within the two years, when you went with your family to a commercial photographer to have a picture taken or pictures?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: But I didn't say that we took a walk this particular time to this particular place.

SAYPOL: Where was it?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: I wouldn't know.

[...]

[Saypol asked Ethel whether she helped her brother David Greenglass join the Communist Party.]

SAYPOL: Did you help him join the Communist Party?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: I refuse to answer.

[...]

[At the grand jury hearing Ethel had been asked whether she had "discussed this case with your brother David Greenglass." She refused to answer at that time, pleading her Fifth Amendment right not to incriminate herself. Saypol asked her about this.]

ETHEL ROSENBERG: It was true, because my brother David was under arrest.

SAYPOL: How would that incriminate you, if you are innocent?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: As long as I had any idea that there might be me chance for me to be incriminated I had the right to use that privilege....

COURT: Now let me ask a question. If you had answered at that time that you had spoken to David, for reasons best known to you, you felt that that would incriminate you?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, if I used the privilege of self-incrimination at that time, I must have felt that perhaps there might be something that might incriminate me in answering.

SAYPOL: As a matter of fact, at that time you didn't know how much the FBI knew about you and so you weren't taking any chances; isn't that it?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: I was using--I didn't know what the FBI knew or didn't know.

SAYPOL: Of course you didn't, so you weren't taking any chance in implicating yourself or your husband? [...]

ETHEL ROSENBERG: Well, if I answered that I didn't want to answer the question on the grounds that it might incriminate me, I must have had a reason to think that it might incriminate me.

SAYPOL: Well, that reason was based on the advice that your lawyer had given you, was it not?

ETHEL ROSENBERG: My lawyer had advised me of my rights.

SAYPOL: He advised you only on the basis of what you told him? [...]

ETHEL ROSENBERG: I can't recall right now what my reasons were at that time for using that right. I said before and I say again, if I used that right, then I must have had some reason or other. I cannot recall right now what that reason might or might not have been, depending on the different questions I was asked....



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: The Rosenberg Trial

**Directions:** You have been selected to portray Emmanuel Bloch, lawyer for the defense, for an in-class simulation of the 1951 Rosenberg Trial. Use the material in the following to prepare a five-minute presentation summarizing Bloch's concluding statement to the Court. For more information on Emmanuel Bloch, visit this site:

[http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BBLO.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BBLO.HTM).

From "Famous Trials: The Rosenberg Trial":

<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM>

The fear that an impartial jury could not be secured was particularly important in this type of case. Now, all of you are New Yorkers or you come from the environs of New York. We are a pretty sophisticated people. People can't put thing over on us very easily. We are fairly wise in the ways of the world and the way s of people and we all know that there is not a person in this world who hasn't some prejudice, and you would be inhuman if you didn't have some prejudice. But we ask you now as we asked you before, please don't decide this case because you may have some bias or some prejudice against some political philosophy.

If you want to convict these defendants because you think that they are Communists and you don't like communism and you don't like any member of the Communist Party, then, ladies and gentlemen, I can sit down now and there is absolutely no use in my talking. There was no use in going through this whole rigmarole of a three weeks' trial. That is not the crime.

But believe me, ladies and gentlemen, I am not here, other defense counsel are not here as attorneys for the Communist Party and we are not here as attorneys for the Soviet Union. I can only speak for myself and my father. We are representing Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, two American citizens, who come to you as American citizens, charged with a specific crime, and ask you to judge them the way you would want to be judged if you were sitting over there before twelve other jurors....

Now, let us take Dave Greenglass. This didn't come out of my mouth. This came out of his mouth. Is he a self-confessed spy? Is there any doubt in any of your minds that Dave Greenglass is a self-confessed espionage agent? He characterized himself that way. What did this man do? He took an oath when he entered the Army of the United States. He didn't even remember what the oath was. That is how seriously he took it. But, in substance, he swore to support our country. Is there any doubt in your mind that he violated that oath? Is there any doubt in your mind that he disgraced the uniform of every soldier in the United States by his actions? Do you know what that man did? He was assigned to one of the most important secret projects in this country, and by his own statements, by his own admissions, he told you that he stole information out of there and gave it to strangers, and that it was going to the Soviet

Government. Now, that is undisputed. I would like Mr. Saypol [the prosecutor] or anybody who is going to sum upon the part of the Government to refute that. Is there any doubt in your mind about that?

You know, before I summed up, I wanted to go to a dictionary and I wanted to find a word that could describe a Dave Greenglass. I couldn't find it, because I don't think that there is a word in the English vocabulary or in the dictionary of any civilization which can describe a character like Dave Greenglass.

But one thing I think you do know, that any man who will testify against his own blood and flesh, his own sister, is repulsive, is revolting, who violates every code that any civilization has ever lived by. He is the lowest of the lowest animals that I have ever seen, and if you are honest with yourself, you will admit that he is lowest than the lowest animal that you have ever seen.

This is not a man; this is an animal. And how he got up there, and how he got up there. Did you look at him? I know you did; you watched him; all your eyes were fastened on him, just as people are fascinated by horror; and he smirked and he smiled and I asked him a question, so that it would be in the cold printed record, "Are you aware of your smile?" And do you know the answer I got? Do you remember it? "Not very." Listen to that answer, "Not very."

Well, maybe some people enjoy funerals; maybe some people enjoy lynchings, but I wonder whether in anything that you have read or in anything that you have experienced you have ever come across a man, who comes round to bury his own sister and smiles.

Tell me, is this the kind of a man you are going to believe? God Almighty, if ever a witness discredited himself on a stand, he did. What kind of a man can be disbelieve if we are going to believe Dave Greenglass? What is the sense of having witness chairs? What is the sense of having juries subject witnesses' testimony to scrutiny and analysis? Is that the kind of a man that you would believe in your own life, or would you punch him in the nose and throw him out and have nothing to do with him because he is a low rebel? Come on, be honest with yourselves, ladies and gentlemen, is that the kind of testimony that you are going to accept?

And he was arrogant; he was arrogant. He felt he had the Government of the United States behind him. He had a right to be arrogant; he had a right to be arrogant, because I want to say right now that the Greenglasses put it all over the FBI and put it all over Mr. Saypol's staff, and I submit that they are smarter than the whole bunch. They sold them a bill of goods. Every man sitting over here is an honest man. The FBI representatives, Mr. Saypol and his staff, every man of them, they are doing their duty, but you know, even the smartest of us can be tricked, and do you want me to show you how they were tricked? [...]

Ruth Greenglass admitted here that she was in this conspiracy. Is there any doubt about that? Is there any doubt that in the middle of November she came out to Albuquerque and tried to induce her husband to sell secrets? Is there any doubt that she grabbed Gold's money and deposited it in the bank? Is there any doubt that she gained by the illegal fruits of her husband's venture? Is there any doubt that she knew all about it?

Ruth Greenglass has never been arrested. She has never been indicted. She has never been sent to jail. Doesn't that strike you as strange? If this is such a terrible crime, and I tell you, gentlemen, it is a serious crime, a most serious crime, don't you think that the Greenglasses put it over the Government when Ruth Greenglass wasn't even indicted? Something peculiar, and I am not attributing anything wrong to the

FBI or the prosecutor's staff, and let us get that straight right now. With all due respect I think the Greenglasses sold you a bill of goods....

Ruth Greenglass got out. She walked out and put her sister-in-law in. It was a deal that the Greenglasses planned and made for themselves, and they made it--they may not have made it by express agreement with the Government, and I don't think the Government would countenance anything like that, but tell me do actions speak louder than words? Is the proof of the pudding in the eating? Is Ruth Greenglass a defendant here?

And, ladies and gentlemen, this explains why Dave Greenglass was willing to bury his sister and his brother-in-law to save his wife. Yes, there were other factors of course. He had a grudge against Rosenberg because he felt that Rosenberg had gypped him out of a thousand dollars, but that would not have been enough to explain Greenglass' act.

Not only are the Greenglasses self-confessed spies but they were mercenary spies. They spied for money.... They would do anything for money. They would murder people for money. They are trying to murder people for money.

Now I will tell you what the plot of the Greenglasses was here. Two-fold. Greenglass figured that if he couldn't put the finger on somebody, he would lessen his own punishment; and he had to put the finger on somebody who was here in the United States, and he had to put the finger on somebody who was a clay pigeon; and that man sitting there (indicating defendant Julius Rosenberg) is a clay pigeon, because he was fired from the Government service, because it was alleged that he was a member of the Community party; and he was the guy who was very open and expressed his views about the United States and the Soviet Union, which may have been all right when the Soviet Union and the United States were Allies, but today it is anathema; and you heard him testify, and he said it openly here, he didn't try to conceal it, "Yes, I thought that the Soviets did a lot for the underdog and they did a lot of reconstruction work and he went on to recount one or two other things that he felt should be to their credit. Well, that is the kind of philosophy that was expounded in the New Deal days by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and by these gentlemen of the press, sitting here. But, boy, when you do that today, it is different; and in 1950 we had the same kind of climate that we have now. This man was a clay pigeon....

What kind of man was [Julius Rosenberg]? Is this your concept of a racketeer? Is this your concept of a pay-off man, a man who lived in a Knickerbocker Village apartment at \$45 a month, and finally his rent was raised after many, many years, was raised to \$51 a month, whose wife did scrubbing and cleaning and who had two kids, and they had a terrible struggle and they had to go and borrow money, and he scraped together \$1,000 in May 1950 to buy stock in the Pitt Machine Company, and he had to give notes for \$4,500 for the balance of the purchase price; tell me, does that square with your idea of a pay-off man?

Now, look at that terrible spy (pointing to the defendant Ethel Rosenberg). Look at that terrible spy and compare her to Ruthie Greenglass, who came here all dolled up, arrogant, smart, cute, eager-beaver, like a phonograph record.

[Y]ou will find that [Ruth Greenglass] repeated, almost word for word, if not word for word, the whole business; and she wants you to believe that she didn't rehearse this story with Dave and Dave Greenglass didn't rehearse this story with her. Cute, cute. Maybe some of you are more acute in sizing up women than others, but if Ruth Greenglass is not the embodiment of evil, I would like to know what person is? Is Ruth Greenglass the kind of person that can be trusted? Let me tell you something, she is so acute that

she wriggled out of this. That is how smart she is. She wriggled out of it. She squirmed through that needle's eye. Well, if she can fool the FBI, I do hope that she won't be able to fool you....

[Ethel] wanted to help [David Greenglass]. That is human. Can we condemn every member of a family who wants to stick to another member of the family? What is so terrible? Wouldn't you do it, and wouldn't I do it? And here is a man who had had a fight with Davey to get his stock. And when Davey came around and said he was in trouble, like a schnook--that is a Jewish word; it means this--I am trying to get the exact translation--well, a very easygoing fool. He goes to his doctor to try to get a false certification for Davey....

[Gold] got his 30-year bit and he told the truth. That is why I didn't cross-examine him....

Bentley is a professional anti-Communist. She makes money on it. I am sure the Government doesn't pay her any money. She writes books, she lectures. This is her business; her business is testifying. Now, what did she say? Let us hear what this great authority said, this intellectual moll, this Puritan little girl from New England. Did she ever meet Rosenberg? She was a top gal. She gave orders, she says to Earl Browder [head of the Communist Party of the United States]....

Now, for God's sake, you are intelligent people. Do you believe, or have you ever heard that a Government cites somebody without making public the citation: And do you believe that this little guy (indicating), with a little business, this terribly wealthy man who hasn't got a dime to his name, that he was cited by the Russian Government? If you believe that, for God's sake, convict the Rosenbergs and let's get an end to this case; but if you don't believe it, then take a lot of the other things with salt that these Greenglasses said in their anxiety to bury the Rosenbergs....

Now I want to conclude very simply. I told you at the beginning and I tell you now that we don't come to you in this kind of charge looking for sympathy. Believe me, ladies and gentlemen, there is plenty of room here for a lawyer to try to harp on your emotions, especially so far as Ethel Rosenberg is concerned; a mother, she has two children, her husband is under arrest. No, because if these people are guilty of that crime they deserve no sympathy. No, we want you to decide this case with your minds, not with your hearts, with your minds.... I say that if you do that, you can come to no other conclusion than that these defendants are innocent and you are going to show to the world that in America a man can get a fair trial.



## Soviet Espionage in America

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: The Rosenberg Trial

**Directions:** You have been selected to portray Irving Saypol, prosecuting attorney, for an in-class simulation of the 1951 Rosenberg Trial. Use the material in the following to prepare a five-minute presentation summarizing Saypol's concluding statement to the Court. For more information on Emmanuel Bloch, visit this site:

[http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS\\_BSAY.HTM](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROS_BSAY.HTM).

From "Famous Trials: The Rosenberg Trial":

<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM>

All of the partners and employees of the firm do not do the same thing at the same time. While one partner talks to a customer, another may be negotiating with another prospect.... Each act by each party, by each employer in the court of business is an act performed for the benefit of the firm and for the benefit of his fellows. Imagine a wheel. In the center of the wheel, Rosenberg, reaching out like the tentacles of an octopus. Rosenberg to David Greenglass. Ethel Rosenberg, Ruth Greenglass; Rosenberg to Harry Gold; Rosenberg, Yakovlev. Information obtained, supplied. Rosenberg, Sobell, Elitcher-- always the objective in the center coming from all the legs, all the tentacles going to the one center, solely for the one object: The benefit of Soviet Russia. The sources, Government sources, Los Alamos, atomic information. Sobell, Elitcher, information from the Navy, relating particularly to gunfire control; always secret, always classified, always of advantage to a foreign government. The association of Rosenberg and Sobell began at City College, and it continues until today. They have been held together by one common bond: Their mutual devotion to communism and the Soviet Union, and their membership in this conspiracy to commit espionage for that Soviet Union. That is why their classmate, Max Elitcher, was asked to join the Young Communist League when they were at college. That is why Sobell and Rosenberg joined in the concerted action to recruit Elitcher into their Soviet espionage ring. While Sobell was chairman of his Communist Party unit in Washington, delivering to its members weekly directives concerning worship of the Soviet Union, Rosenberg was working his way up in the Communist Party underground.

Rosenberg told Elitcher at Manny Wolf's that night in 1948, just as Rosenberg and Ethel Rosenberg had told Ruth Greenglass that night in November 1944, how he had realized the ambition of his life. He told them how he had gone from one Communist Party contact to another until he had achieved the coveted status of a Communist Party espionage agent.

There is no condonation for the activities of the Greenglasses in 1944 and 1945. David Greenglass is a confessed member of the Rosenberg espionage ring.... By his own plea of guilty, by his own voluntary act, without weaving a web of lies in an attempt to deceive you, he has made himself liable to the death penalty, too. The spurious defense that Greenglass, or the Greenglasses, in order to satisfy a business

grudge, a business dispute against the Rosenbergs, has concocted a story about espionage, making himself liable to the capital penalty by his plea of guilty because of the business disagreement, is as much of a concoction as the story of the defendants that Greenglass went to his worst enemy, Julius Rosenberg, for help when he wanted to flee the country.

Greenglass' relations toward his older sister, Ethel, and her husband, Julius, were such that he was willing prey to their Communistic propaganda. He committed this crime because they persuaded him to do it.

As far as Gold is concerned, the die has already been cast. The charges against him have already been disposed of. He has been sentenced to thirty years, the maximum term of imprisonment. He can gain nothing from testifying as he did in this courtroom except the initial relief, the moral satisfaction in his soul of having told the truth and tried to make amends. Harry Gold, who furnished the absolute corroboration of the testimony of the Greenglasses, forged the necessary link in the chain that points indisputably to the guilt of the Rosenbergs. Not one question was asked of him by any defendant on cross-examination.

The atom bomb secrets stolen by Greenglass at the instigation of the Rosenbergs were delivered by Harry Gold right into the hands of an official representative of the Soviet Union. The veracity of David and Ruth Greenglass and of Harry Gold is established by documentary evidence and cannot be contradicted. You have in evidence before you the registration card from the Hotel Hilton in Albuquerque, which shows that he was registered there on June 3, 1945. You have before you the transcript of the record of the Albuquerque bank, showing that on the morning of June 4, 1945, Ruth Greenglass opened a bank account in Albuquerque and made an initial deposit of \$400 in cash--just as she and David testified they did here on the witness stand right before you.

This description of the atom bomb, destined for delivery to the Soviet Union, was typed up by the defendant Ethel Rosenberg that afternoon at her apartment at 10 Monroe Street. Just so had she on countless other occasions sat at that typewriter and struck the keys, blow by blow, against her own country in the interests of the Soviets.

The truth was beginning to catch up with the Rosenbergs and their crowd. The passport photos of the Greenglass family were taken at Rosenberg's insistence. Rosenberg asked for five sets, but Greenglass had six sets taken. The five sets are now undoubtedly in the hands of Rosenberg's Soviet partners, but the sixth set is here, in this courtroom, before you as Government's Exhibits 9-A and 9-B.

We know what Julius Rosenberg told Ruth Greenglass on that occasion and what he and his wife told Ruth and David on every occasion when they were together. The Rosenbergs told them to go and commit espionage in the interests of communism in the Soviet Union, just as Rosenberg and Sobell told that to Elitcher and countless others, and that is what happened....

Yesterday you heard Mr. Schneider identify both of them as those who had come to him at his place of business on a Saturday in the middle of June 1950, with their children. He told us nothing of snapshots, taken for amusement of precocious children. He told us of an order for three dozen passport photos for Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and their family, who told him that they were going to France.

But it is these very witnesses whom they now attack that they themselves chose as their partners in crime. While Rosenberg attacks the Greenglasses today, seven years ago it was the Rosenbergs who took this same David Greenglass and set him to betraying his country. It was Sobell at Rosenberg's

instigation who recruited Elitcher. The only ones with knowledge about the activities of these defendants are those who participated in the same activities. These witnesses were not y our choice, nor were they mine, these witnesses, Elitcher and the Greenglasses. They were selected by thee defendants as their associates and partners in crime.

We have not only the testimony of Ruth and David Greenglass about Rosenberg's espionage activities. We have Elitcher's, a man who never saw Ruth and David Greenglass or Harry Gold. Elitcher has placed the brand of Soviet spy on Rosenberg. You have the documentary evidence of Gold's registration card, the bank account, the wrapping paper, the testimony of Dr. Bernhardt, Dorothy Abel, Evelyn Cox, of Schneider, who took the passport pictures. That is why the evidence as to the Rosenbergs' guilt is incontrovertible. Their guilt is established by the proof not beyond a reasonable doubt, but beyond any conceivable doubt.

These defendants seek to escape the consequences of their own acts by hiding behind straw men.... Greenglass is a confessed spy and Elitcher has admitted that some years ago he did not disclose his Communist Party membership in an application; but these men under the greatest stress have stood up here and disclosed the truth about their past activities. They have not compounded their sins by trying to lie to you here in this courtroom. The question here is not the fate, or present or future, of other people. The question here is the guilt of these three defendants named by the grand jury here on trial before you in this courtroom. That is the single issue and the evidence on that issue is overwhelming.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard statements of defense counsel here concerning the injection of communism in this case. I repeat again, these defendants are not on trial for being Communists. I don't want you to convict them merely because of their Communist activity. Communism, as the testimony has demonstrated, has a very definite place in this case because it is the Communist ideology which teaches worship and devotion to the Soviet Union over our own government. It has provided the motive and inspiration for these people to do the terrible things which have been proven against them. It is this adherence and devotion which makes clear their intent and motivation in carrying out this conspiracy to commit espionage. We ask you to sustain the charge of the grand jury in a verdict of guilty against each of these three defendants, on one basis and one basis alone; the evidence produced in this courtroom as to their guilt of the crime of conspiracy to commit espionage; that proof as to each defendant has been overwhelming. The guilt of each one has been established beyond any peradventure of doubt.

I am a firm believer in the American jury system. I have confidence in the perception of the jury of twelve intelligent American citizens. I am confident that you will render the only verdict possible on the evidence presented before you in this courtroom--that of guilty as charged by the grand jury as to each of these defendants.