

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

In this Issue:

Book Reviews - - p. 2
God and Evil - - p. 3
Our Resolatory
Unions - p. 4

"That government is best
which governs least."

—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Vol. 15, No. 22

May 29th, 1954

Threepence

THE RAILWAY STRIKE

(From our Correspondent)

EXETER, MAY 22.

FURTHER support for the hope that reformism and socialism have not completely succeeded in destroying working class militancy is given this week by the unofficial strike of railwaymen in protest against the re-introduction of the system of lodging turns.

Under this system, crews of long distance trains work for a whole day on a train going in one direction, spend the night at a hostel, or in lodgings at the terminus, and then return the following day on a train travelling on the return journey. The result is that drivers and firemen working under it have to spend about half their evenings and nights away from home. "Lodging turns" have not been in operation since before the war, and the proposal to re-introduce them has met with fierce opposition by the railwaymen concerned, who maintain that they would be deprived of a normal family life to which they are entitled.

The resentment showed itself in a practical manner on Monday, May 17th, when drivers and firemen at Newton Abbot, one of the principal depots of the Western Region, refused to work the new turns, and declared an unofficial strike. Almost immediately, they were joined by most of the crews based on Bristol, Old Oak Common and Paddington, and during the next few days meetings of railwaymen at Exeter, Cardiff and Plymouth decided not to work on trains normally handled by workers then on strike.

Rôle of Unions

While the railwaymen were thus engaged in a fight over something so fundamental to their conditions of work and living standards, it would be natural to expect vigorous activity also being carried out by the leaders of the appropriate unions, and by the elected representatives of the people, particularly those of the great socialist and Trade Union party. There certainly was vigorous activity, but in the wrong direction! The N.U.R. and A.S.L.E.F. had officially agreed to the introduction of lodging turns, and leaders of both unions appealed to the men to return to work immediately. Mr. Baty, secretary of the A.S.L.E.F. travelled to the South West for this very purpose. In the House of Commons, members from both sides of the floor also urged the workers to end their strike. One of the Labour speakers is reported to have spoken feelingly, drawing on his long-experience on the footplate. It appears that he has also had quite a lot of experience in keeping his job as a Labour M.P.

The appeals of these 'leaders' have so far been disregarded by the railwaymen, but they must have done a great amount of harm in deflecting sympathy and support away from the strike. A small delegation representing the strikers at Newton Abbot and Old Oak Common travelled to London, and were joined by Paddington men, not to negotiate with the British Transport Commission with a view to settling the dispute, but to try to persuade their unions to support them! The sole result of these meetings was a statement from the unions that they were not prepared to consider the

question until work had been resumed, an attitude almost identical with that expressed by Sir Brian Robertson on behalf of the B.T.C.

By the time FREEDOM appears in print the situation may have undergone radical changes, but even now the dispute has many interesting aspects. The justice of the case is obvious. Most of the railwaymen would prefer to spend their off-duty periods with their wives, families and friends, rather than in hostels or lodging houses away from home. Strangely enough, no protests have been heard from the Christian Churches, usually such ardent defenders of the sanctity of family life. If the family clashes with the interests of capitalism or the State, then it has to go by the board.

Justice of Workers' Case

This is further indication, for those who need it, of the rôle of religious organisations and propaganda in the social struggle. The principle involved however, is not basically the preservation of the family, which would in itself find little support among anarchists, but is the right of the workers to organize their lives as they wish, and not to have it done for them.

Much play has been made in the bourgeois press of the fact that many other workers, such as fishermen, often have to spend long periods away from home, so why should not engine drivers as well? The important point is that in the case of fishermen this is almost unavoidable, but for railwaymen there is a simple alternative to the lodging turns system. The crews simply take a train half way to its destination, are relieved by a crew based on that destination, and then in turn take over another train for the latter half of the return journey. This system is conceivably less economical, in financial terms, but is certainly worth the extra cost, to avoid the disruption of men's lives. In any case the saving is minute compared to that which would be effected by ending interest payments,

and abolishing the ticket system. Possibly it would lend force to the men's claim if some unionists with knowledge of administrative work could outline a schedule which they would be prepared to operate.

Solidarity Among Strikers

At Newton Abbot, there is almost complete unanimity among the strikers. Only about a dozen drivers are reporting for work. Similar solidarity exists at other depots, and this has come about, not only without any assistance from the central bureaucracy of the unions, but in the face of direct opposition by it.

Although no doubt, most of the workers involved are loyal supporters of the Labour Party and T.U.C. they have shown that when a real problem arises they are prepared to go over the heads of these bodies, and take matters into their own hands, and to do this spontaneously without the aid of paid officials. If this is possible, then why have trade unions of the present type at all? An individual syndicalist should of course join his trade union, but in a situation such as the present one, where the futility of socialism and reformist trade unionism are so completely exposed, the best policy seems to be to urge that the entire branch involved should disaffiliate from the union, and if, as would probably happen, several branches should do this simultaneously they could then federate loosely for mutual solidarity, making it quite clear that they were prepared to back up the official union in any strike action it was involved in, and to support pension and welfare schemes, but NOT to assist in paying high salaries to officials who fought against them on every encounter, and arranged working schedules without consulting them, or to waste money in securing the election of M.P.s who did the same thing.

This would admittedly be a difficult step to take, but is one which will have to be taken if working class organisation is to become effective.

U.S. ANTI-SEGREGATION LAW

A FEW months ago we drew attention to a negro family who were the victims of continuous anti-black demonstrations after having moved into a hitherto 'white' district in Chicago. Since then, other negro families have joined them, but the young couple continued to receive the full brunt of what were particularly virulent attacks on their persons and their home (they have had their doors and windows barricaded since the beginning). Last week saw the end of their struggle; they decided to move out.

While some of the Chicago citizens were selecting their next victims for their campaign of envy and hate, a few hundred miles away nine Justices of the United States Supreme Court were announcing their unanimous decision that racial segregation in the public schools violates the constitution. Methods of effecting the decision have still to be decided by the Supreme Court, but the "separate but equal rights" doctrine which has been in the statute book since 1896 has been irrevocably replaced.

Seventeen Southern States have public school segregation by specific law. Out of these, as far as can be ascertained, only one (Georgia) has openly announced its intention to continue permanent segregation of the races.

It is obvious that legislation cannot alter an irrational state of mind, but it is equally obvious that this decision of the Supreme Court is ahead of a great many ordinary people in its recognition that education "is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms." One writer in the London *Observer*, commenting on the decision, even suggests that a problem has been resolved that "would not have been solved by the natural forces of American Society". The point is, that it is not "natural forces" which gave rise to racial hatred in the Southern States of America but economic ones.

Faced however, with a situation whereby Southern State authorities could get round the law embodied in the Four-

teenth Amendment forbidding any State of the Union to "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law", we have to admit that in moral terms the decision taken by the nine judges is an acknowledgement that segregation is a degrading influence in our society.

Only time will prove whether the law remains on paper or will be adopted as part of the ordinary life of black and white alike. We know ourselves how easily people are swayed by suggestion when it is given authoritative backing. How often are we met with the retort when we are denouncing some particular piece of fallacy—"It must be right, it's the law"?—Can we hope then, that once the *idea* is placed in people's minds that segregation is stupid and without justice it will eventually be taken for granted?

The chances are of course that the new law may have the opposite effect. One State has hinted that rather than see black and white sharing the same schools they will close them down as public schools and run them as private schools. And here, there is another factor governing the South, the historical resentment against the power of the North.

It could be argued that the combination of racial superiority and old resentments may give rise to a complete boycott of the law or means of getting round it. The former seems unlikely. Quite apart from the fact that fanatical acts of race hatred have been dying out over the last few years, (last year it was reported for the first time on record no lynching incidents had taken place in the South) the majority of State Governors have accepted the situation, if regretfully. They have all said of course that it will take years to "work out the details". The un-named masses are another matter, and it is on their decisions that the final successful intermingling of races will depend.

One should add that the decision taken by the Supreme Court after so many years of acceptance of the principle of segregation should not be taken wholly as a change of morality, without also considering the possible political implications. Europe, it is said, is watching America with a careful eye, and behind the Iron Curtain incidents which underline the reactionary nature of American life are exploited to the full. Considered in this light one could read into the new law the familiar act of political expediency. The question remains for anarchists, should we give our support to a progressive legislation prompted by the wrong motives? R.M.

The McCarthy Hearings

AS THE VIEWER SEES THEM

ON the day that the name Earl Browder came up Senator McCarthy was in an awkward spot. Two and a half weeks had gone by with Mr. Stevens giving evidence and it was obvious that some sort of deal must soon be made to prevent the Senator from going on for another 2½. The committee rules allowed for the examination of each witness to continue round the table in 10 minute periods until no one had any more questions, but since the bubble-bursting appearance of Mr. Adams, Mr. Stevens' office lawyer, the previous Thursday, many questions were embarrassing to bring up. He had kept Friday going with an entertaining display of stagey attitudes, points of order, mock-pious speeches to the "American Nation", protests about this fantastic waste of time, this circus, this television show, at once balanced by very important questions. Mr. Secretary, that this nation has a right to know. This dish, as I say, was served up in 10 minute chunks, the Senator breaking off in the middle of a sentence, impatiently waiting for 2 Counsel, 6 Senators and the Chairman to say "I pass", and continuing, it seemed with the same breath, until 4.30 came along and he was safe for the week-end. People watching on television felt sure that on Monday . . . but Monday came and there he was, as rhetorical and imperturbable as ever. There was no reason why he should ever stop, and yet the patter was wearing thin. There was something comical and tragic about the pretended sincerity of this clumsy inquisition seeking to avoid the appearance of escaping a cross-examination by the Committee of which he was himself ordinarily Chairman, stalling off by every trick the moment when he is himself investigated, so the public will infer, for Un-American activities. So that when he asked Mr. Stevens to listen to a passage he was going to read from Earl Browder (the now deported ex-secretary of the C.P. in the United States), the

sound of astonished mirth could be heard from all over the Senate room, and Mr. Welch, Mr. Stevens' Counsel for the present hearing, leaned back in his chair laughing, and Mr. Jenkins, the Committee's temporary legal adviser, mustered enough court dignity to pronounce solemnly that the testimony of one Earl Browder taken under oath or any other way was not such that this Committee could place credence upon it, and the same he felt sure was true for Senator McCarthy. Senator Mundt, the Chairman, ruled it out of order for said testimony to be quoted. A Senatorial Committee could not possibly believe anything a Communist, such as Mr. Browder, might say to be true, and there was just no point in the Senator from Wisconsin bringing it up, in fact, and the gavel was banged, he ruled that such testimony must not be mentioned.

Senator McCarthy with the glee masked by innocence of a show-off child who knows he's got his Dad beat reads out "In 1945 before a Senate Investigating Committee Earl Browder said . . ."

"Does this mean I am a Communist?"—we are astonished to hear this well-timed levity from Mr. Stevens, usually a meek and unaggressive performer.

"That's very funny, Bob, that's terribly funny, isn't it," and in so many words (but occupying ten minutes) the Secretary of the Army of the U.S.A. is informed that it is doubtful whether the Communists would consider him intelligent enough to make an invitation to join the party worth while.

We go on: Earl Browder said—and as he breaks off you can hear the jesuitical machinery creak. He takes off his glasses and adopts the "honest discussion" posture. "Would you say, Bob, that . . .". The gist of this transparent attack is (1) Communists are cunning (agreed), (2) G2 (Intelligence) is a good place for a Communist spy to hide (agreed), (3) So

we can assume that if let us say a certain number of Communists (Stevens shifts uneasily—is there a trap coming?) are in G2 at a certain time, as testified on oath and we have no proof that they have since been discharged (he blinks, there *must* be a catch coming) we must assume, is that right, Bob, (look out!) that they are still there? No, I don't agree Senator! Any number of things could have happened to them . . . Close shave, he saw that one in time. The Senator says Um-um and leans over to Roy Cohn for more ammunition, as the Counsel for the Committee says that he understands that Senator McCarthy has just read purported testimony of one Earl Browder given in 1945 to the effect that as of that date there were 13,000 Communists in the United States Army, some of them officers. He does not think this testimony (which of course is worthless) has any possible bearing on the issues at stake, but he forgets to mention that the reading of this particular statement was in any case futile as Earl Browder did not mention G2 in his account.

Futile? That depends on what you think is motivating this "enquiry" Certainly if you believe that it is an attempt to uncover the truth of charges and countercharges delivered by Mr. Stevens and Senator McCarthy against each other, you will say that the Senator at this point was wasting time. There are in general three opinions on the hearings. A small group of people (I speak of the institution in which I work) disclaims any interest; to them it is too bad that the hearings had to come up. One man said he was ashamed to be an American. While an anarchist could sympathize with this opinion, in reality those people who disclaim interest are wishing that the hearings were not conducted in front of the so revealing television cameras, but they would seem to be content to let McCarthy remain unexposed to light.

Continued on p. 4

The S. Korean Elections

IN spite of—or perhaps because of—what a *Reuter* report describes as "police intimidation, threats and actual violence" during the S. Korean election campaign, President Syngman Rhee's Liberal party has secured only a small majority over the Independents and other opposition parties, though he had urged voters to give his party two thirds of the seats. Observers say that the results indicate that there will now be an "extensive battle between Liberals and the Democratic Nationalist forces" for the support of the independent candidates who have been elected.

The *New York Times* correspondent in Seoul comments (May 21) that:

One of the most unsatisfactory results of this week's vote, from the point of view of President Rhee and his closest adherents, was the fact that several of the South Korean leader's most outspoken critics were victorious. These included P. H. Shinicky, Chairman [Speaker] of the Nationalist Assembly and head of the Democratic Nationalists, and Chough Pyong Ik, another Democratic Nationalist executive.

Both had charged during the campaign that the police were using pressure to influence the voters against them.

Reports from remote areas as well as first-hand observance of widely scattered polling places, left a clear impression that the vote itself was not marred by open intimidation or violence.

Anglo-Iranian's £16 Million Profits

AS representatives of Anglo-Iranian were leaving Teheran with Persia's counter-proposals for settlement of the nationalisation dispute with Britain, the Company in London was circularising its stockholders with the Statement by the Chairman which he will deliver at the next Annual General Meeting on June 10. Besides a report on the state of the negotiations, there are the all-important accounts, showing that in a financial empire such as Anglo-Iranian, there are always ways and means to make up for setbacks such as overtook them in Teheran. In 1953 the Company made a profit of £63,883,828 as against £61 million in 1952. After provision of £20 million for Depreciation on Fixed Assets and other charges, £19 million for taxation on profits, £24,382,850 was left over to distribute among shareholders or to place to reserve.

SOLIDARITY IN THE WAGE STRUGGLE

IT is one of the most obvious requirements of solidarity that when workers of one industry are on strike for better wages that workers in other industries should support them. In practice however one finds that the issue is not quite as simple as it seems for "wage increases" can be a most imprecise term. Thus if an entire industry is on strike and secures an increase, the increase is not applied equally to all members. An increase of one pound a week may make very little difference to a man earning £40 a week but it doubles the income of the man who earns £1 a week. Such an example is exaggerated, but it does show that the distribution of wage gains becomes a complicated matter where different wage levels occur.

Class divisions also complicate the picture. Very few workers must have been deeply concerned at the "excessive" earnings of dentists in the early days of the National Health Service, or at the pay-cut they soon received. The fact is that wage struggles to attract support seem to need the appeal of justice—using the word to mean relief for the needy. Wage improvements should affect first those whose pay does not lift them out of dire poverty.

It is however unfortunately true that the better paid workers are also usually the better organized. Judges for example usually have little difficulty in getting periodical advances in salary despite the complicated legal and administrative processes involved, whereas the very menial sort of tasks are commonly done by men with little organized apparatus at all.

The idea that justice demands advances for the poorest paid as the most urgent wage relief, is a social one, and springs from the feeling that in a society men are all one with duties towards the less fortunate. Such ideas are very deep seated. They are present in early Christian thought and in the charity of the Mediaeval Church, as well as in the feudal idea that the rich and the great have a duty towards the poor. Capitalism has no such philosophy, but a proportion of rich capitalists have applied the idea, in a rather coldly theoretical way, it is true, by financing "good works"—Lord Nuffield's projects, and the Rockefeller Foundation are examples.

One may apply these musings to the recent decision of Parliament to increase the salaries of its members from £1,000 to £1,500. This is a very large increase—a 50 per cent. rise in fact. But since M.P.s were paid £600 before the war it is not out of tune with the rise in the cost of living. It cannot be a new thing for members to be preoccupied about their official salary, since they have been paid since the reign of Edward III which is a long time ago.

Supporters of the Bill for Increase argued that certain M.P.s—mostly Labour—suffered real hardship. The political correspondent of the *Observer* paints an almost Dickensian picture: "That there is genuine hardship among some Members, particularly Labour Members, could not be denied. There are perhaps as many as 100 M.P.s who eke out their lives in obscure hotels or apartments, and as the cost of living has risen have been increasingly haunted by debts. So desperately are they placed that the Labour Whips have discovered that they have little chance of defeating the Government on any Thursday unless there is an all-night sitting. The impoverished Socialist has had to catch the last train home because he could not afford an extra

night's board and lodging."

Solidarity demands that the richer workers, like the miners or the barrow tradesmen should not be indifferent to the plight of their poorer fellow workers at Westminster.

And yet another point of view was widely supported—that expressed in an amendment put forward by the Conservative Sir Thomas Moore and 18 others. This recommended that no increase in members' salaries should be made "until the needs of other particularly hard-pressed and needy members of the community have been first dealt with." In the debate Sir Thomas urged that no money should be paid until "the hard-pressed and the pensioners" had been dealt with.

Here however we come up against one of those practical difficulties which bedevil the ideas of justice and doing the right thing. There are only 600 odd M.P.s. To give them a rise of £10 a week each costs only £300,000 a year. There are thousands of old age pensioners, and to give them a few shillings increase costs a very large total sum. Unhappily in our society the Chancellor of the Exchequer takes as much account—perhaps, indeed, more—of such practical considerations as he does of natural justice.

If we put aside the unworthy suspicion that certain Conservative M.P.s can well afford to be objective about proposed pay rises, because they do derive income from other sources—if we refused to meddle with any such uncharitable probing into motives, we cannot but sympathize with the amendment of Sir Thomas Moore. After carefully considering questions of mutual solidarity among wage workers, among "workers with hand and brain"; after weighing up the increase in the cost of living, and assessing degrees of hardship, there still remains an uncomfortable picture of legislators who invoke the national interest to block pay increases among certain workers, but by a majority of 280 votes to 166, give themselves £500 a year extra. Somehow it is not a very elevating scene.

GOD & EVIL

IF human life is sacred there is no reason why any other life should not be sacred as well. Albert Schweitzer's "reverence for life" extends even to bacilli and disease-carrying insects. He tells in his autobiography how once he was given a young eagle which fed on fish, and he was faced with the moral dilemma of either letting the young eagle die of starvation or be responsible for the death of thousands of little fishes with which to keep him alive. The dilemma, however, saddening as it was, did not lead him to despair, and he accepted moral responsibility for the choice he made. Men are capable of a sense of solidarity and kinship with all living beings, but the argument against human life having any special value is not usually brought forward to vindicate such feeling of solidarity and kinship but to draw the conclusion that since human beings cannot help and do not worry about destroying other living creatures in order to live themselves, human beings could also be destroyed without qualms for similar reasons. Ridding a house of flies with Flit and ridding a country of Jews with gas chambers are deeds that have been put in our time exactly on the same level.

If the killing of a chicken or a pig is not deemed a crime, and indeed is considered highly meritorious, why should so much fuss be made about the killing of a man? Is there any definition of crime other than its being a punishable action? If a monopoly in the administration of punishment has been secured one can kill with impunity and amidst the general applause. Only the weak can be criminal; the strong have only to make sure that they remain strong, and God will be on their side.

It is part of Socialist propaganda, at least on the continent, to say that God and the teachings of the Church were a clever device on the part of the strong to keep the weak in subjection, and with the myth of heaven and hell, to refrain the latter from seeking justice in this world. According to Nietzsche, instead, Christian religion was a device of the weak to keep the strong in check and so enervate them as to bring the whole human race to the same level of cowardly and hypocritical renunciation of strength. As a matter of fact, religion can be an instrument both to afford protection to the weak and to consolidate the dominance of the strong. Apart from the use that can be made of the idea of God; however, is there a relation between God and evil which the human mind could, be it never so faintly, comprehend?

Human beings, and all other species of animals, cannot live without killing, without destruction of vegetable life. This is the strongest argument, if not against the existence of God, at least against that of a God on whom we could found our ideas of good and evil. It rather supports such views as that of Schopenhauer's unintelligent and amoral 'Will' or of the Marquis de Sade's creator delighting in murder, torture and destruction. Against such pessimistic conclusions there stands, however, a thought-challenging, will-shaking fact. There is no doubting the great spiritual and pragmatical advantage of a belief in God, yet man's sense of good and evil and his condemnation of killing as evil are such that he is ready for their sake to forgo even this great advantage.

To speak of man's quest for the absolute will appear to many students to-day as meaningless and idle. Yet is not the school of thought they are following also striving for the absolute in the precision of the statements they make and in the demarcation of the facts to which their statements refer? The rejection of God as absolute goodness because of the evil found in creation can and does proceed from a quest of the absolute even if this quest should turn out to be no more than a mental habit, and even if it should yield no other result than concluding on the hopeless badness of man in order to obliterate all moral efforts and distinctions. The same quest, pushed a step further and still in the same direction can lead to the choice of absolute evil, as recently testified by Sartre's "Saint Genet, Comedien et Martyr".

Evil is a problem that cannot rationally and satisfactorily be solved. It is unaccountable, the same as existence. It is, in particular, impossible to account for it logically when the existence of God as absolute goodness has been postulated. For if God is absolute then there should not be a single speck of evil untouched by and therefore setting limits to God's goodness. Also, if God is absolute goodness, no work in His creation should bear the stamp of evil. If all that is has been created by God, even non-being, to which evil is sometimes approximated or identified with, must have proceeded from God. The biblical myths of Lucifer and the Fall are no answers to the problem for when it is said that Lucifer and Adam were created free their freedom meant potential evil and this potentiality could only be given them by God who had it in Himself contrary to His attribute of infinite goodness.

Soloviev's idea of God as non-being as well as being, the Manichean belief in a co-eternal struggle between good and evil, and romantic conceptions of a God prisoner of His own creation suffering and labouring with man towards a cosmic redemption can be emotionally and even logically more satisfactory, but they demand a reliance on revelation and a theological concern which only a few individuals, especially in our time, are capable of.

Excursions into theology, however, are not necessary. Evil and good can be accepted as data of human existence, as data of mystery, and can be considered as a purely human affair. It is only by considering them as a purely human affair that something can be done about them on the basis of human responsibility. Any moral endeavour, otherwise, is soon engulfed into the abyss of determinism, fatalism or predestination. The problem of good and evil, in other words, as a human and not a cosmic problem has to be tackled as if God were not.

Human society is a particular case in the order (or disorder) of nature. It would be a mistake to apply to it the crude biological normality by which each species prospers on the destruction of others. It is equally a mistake to apply the concept of good and evil to the biological world. For good and evil are rational and ethical concepts, and although the individual mind is the seat and source of all morality and reason, it is through the social fact, through the intercommunication of individual minds that ethics and rational thought have developed. Without society there would be no language, which is the life-blood of reason, nor would there be faith in reason of sufficient strength to resist the lure of impulse and imagination. There would be no morality, either, good and evil being merely categories of passively experienced pleasure and harm, and never actively and responsibly chosen modes of behaviour. Good and evil are social concepts and meanings made possible by the social fact. It is only by extrapolation that they assume cosmic proportions. To apply them to God is to conceive God in the image of man, and to forget that God, whatever idea we may have of Him, even as a trinity, is not a social being in the same sense as man is, in the sense, that is, by which good and evil have sense. Both the scientific and the religious outlooks, insofar as they attempt to reach for an objective, impersonal, impartial and unconditioned viewpoint, are destructive of human values, both end by setting human life at naught, and erase all distinctions between good and evil.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

THE McCARTHY HEARINGS AS THE VIEWERS SEES THEM

Continued from p. 4

ing his behaviour on television. The most obvious is his violent resentment of any remark or action that could possibly be construed as adverse criticism of himself, which he shows by an immediate "counter-attack", justifying his whole self with words of indignant emotion. He jumps at any opening to justify himself. The second is the rôle of Saviour that he adopts of the American People, which is a way of justifying his life and actions: without Me you would be utterly lost. The disintegration of logical thought, the fear of attack from a hostile world and the delusions of grandeur are symptoms of a severe character disorder, one that is known to be found, though usually less marked, in active political figures, not of course confined to politicians in the U.S.A.

MR. ROBERT STEVENS is an equally plainly demarcated character. He is said by newspaper writers to be a successful business "executive" and to have raised the fortunes of his family business which has to do with cotton manufacture. He was made Secretary of the Army in 1953 when the Eisenhower cabinet was formed. [Members of the Cabinet are appointed by the President and are not elected by vote to any legislative organization. Some newspapers have attempted to show the hearings as a dispute between the legislative and executive branches of government, a theory that does not hold water]. He is held in common consent here as a "finishing-school boy" who doesn't know a scamp when he sees one, a man who has led a sheltered life and has views on life that are straightforward and based on the Ten Commandments and the ideals of democracy. McCarthy said, "Yes, Bob, I do think you are anti-Communist, but very unintelligently anti-Communist," and one is inclined to agree. As he sits in the witness chair he looks like a frightened child who has suddenly been confronted with a policeman. He has never had to face this sort of ordeal before and does not know how to handle it. The stand he makes against McCarthy (and, as I said, it is McCarthy and Cohn who have kept him in the seat

for thirteen days) is of the feeblest possible. He evades a question by answering another, yet pleading with the Chairman that he honestly wants to answer to everything—so that the American People may know the facts; he allows insults to pass unnoticed; he either "recalls some talk along those lines" or "positively does not recall any such thing". By his appearance of timidity he disheartens the anti-McCarthy and gladdens the press. His evidence reveals that he has acted all along as a man frightened of McCarthy and eager to placate him, and possibly from this fact has answered McCarthy's suspicion (as stated in the countercharges) that "the Army" tried to "buy off the Committee's investigation" by offering preferential treatment for Private Schine. Observation of his behaviour does not indicate that Stevens could himself have brought matters to a head by issuing the charges accusing McCarthy of improper conduct.

MR. ROY COHN is less easily discussed. He was known as a "brilliant" young man and was described by McCarthy, for whom he works as Chief Counsel as "one of the most brilliant young fellows I ever met." His school record was a succession of tops. He did the four year Law course at Harvard University in three years and graduated too young to sit for his Bar examinations. His legal activity seems to have consisted of prosecuting people charged with espionage or conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Govt. by force (the charge, legal under the Smith Act, that can be raised against members of the Communist Party). He took a leading part in prosecuting the Rosenbergs three years ago in the New York District Court over which his father, Judge Cohn, presided, and the prosecution seems to have brought him to the notice of the Senator. I regret the need to warn readers at this point against their emotions in the Rosenberg "case", yet it is necessary in the interests of clear thinking to insist that this man and woman were legally electrocuted after legal conviction of a crime, even though the crime was defined as illegal after its commission, a common legislative device, and that to

expect a legal reprieve under such conditions is plain superstition. Cohn's connection with the case is significant only as an indication that he too might then have considered himself as an anti-Communist expert, and have become a natural for McCarthy. For similar reasons it is necessary to point out that it is significant that the Cohn family is Jewish because of the fact that the Rosenberg-Glasshouse trial tended also to produce a defensive anti-Communist bias on the part of other Jewish people.

To this extent then Cohn is a helpless creature of environment. A further possible fact makes it necessary to think very clearly about Cohn. This is the precise nature of his relationship with Mr. Schine. Schine, the ghost behind everyone's words, has figured little so far in the investigation, but from the beginning it was clear that almost the whole of the "pressure" considered by "the Army" to be "improper" had its origin in Cohn. It was Cohn who telephoned, wrote, consulted and produced the reasons which made it appear necessary for the "good of the nation" that Schine first not be drafted into the Army, then be appointed instead to some elusive position in other government investigating agencies; then when it became obvious that he would have to join the Army that he be appointed as an adviser to Stevens; failing that that he should be given special time off to go to New York; that he should not be sent to Korea, and so on. It was also said by Mr. Stevens that he had heard that McCarthy himself had no particular use for Schine and in fact wanted him drafted to avoid compromising his own position. So far it has not been brought out to what degree Cohn was able for personal reasons to manipulate McCarthy. What has evolved is the ridiculous position in which McCarthy has found himself maintaining that Cohn's supplications, to which he was himself opposed, were in fact perfectly justified.

Evidence has been given of Cohn's reactions of hurt rage to situations where he thought himself slighted and this

taken with his observed behaviour as a cross-examiner—furtive glances to the Chair for approval while asking hostile questions with a humble mien—does not produce the impression of a normal or stable personality. The nature of his motives must be evaluated by the reader.

MR. ADAMS, a civil servant at present the legal adviser to the Dept. of the Army, is the fourth member of the contending quartet, and has so far been the only one to come out with clear and uncomplicated statements. He is charged by the McCarthy side in association with Stevens of concealing Communists from the Senate Investigating Committee. His testimony remains to be heard, but I think it probable that he has foreseen the brewing storm from the first shift of wind and has been careful to keep an exact account of everything he was connected with.

The present situation in the hearings is that McCarthy has failed in his marathon attempt to so exhaust the committee members that they might (1) agree to continue the hearings in "executive" (i.e. secret) sessions or (2) agree to hear McCarthy in the witness seat and then call the whole thing off. What happened was that his obvious threat of exercising his right to continue to question Stevens indefinitely was scotched by Stevens' counsel's (Mr. Welch) announcement that his client had succumbed to a virus infection and was getting penicillin. He was therefore excused from attending temporarily, and the Committee decided to call Mr. Adams.

The reason for this lengthy description of the scene lies in its value as a re-valuation of the characterological basis of the behaviour of political figures, or, if that is too long-winded, of the private reasons for public actions. To what, if any, extent Cohn was using McCarthy, or Adams Stevens, as well as the trickery of both sides will probably now come out. To the observer on television the hearings are of extraordinary interest. They have put politics under the microscope.

New York. JOHN SWINTON.

