

# I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 4

JANUARY 26, 1959

101

WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

## The Un-American Inquisitors Create A New Crime

In the Inquisition the most frightful evidence of heresy was to criticize the Holy Office itself. Next to this crime in awfulness, and linked with it, was to question the power of the devil. For if one disparaged the devil's might, one implied less need for the men working with scourge and fagot to expose his secret collaborators. These old manias flourish in full vigor in the speeches which Chairman Walter of the House Un-American Activities Committee and his colleagues have been making in the House.

To read the speeches is to believe that a new heinous crime exists in our country, the crime of advocating the overthrow of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Linked with it are criticism of the FBI, any disparagement of the power of the Communist Party (J. Edgar Hoover\* and William Z. Foster stand shoulder to shoulder on its potency to the last), and any opposition to legislation limiting basic political liberties in the name of security. Where a few years ago the witch hunters were hunting alleged Communists now their targets are those who dare criticize political persecution. Proof of such criticism is made proof of "subversion."

### "Notorious"—For Defending The Bill of Rights

The *Washington Post* which said (Dec. 19) that the House Committee "should be abolished, not reorganized," was in turn attacked by Mr. Walter on the floor of the House as "notorious" i.e., notorious for its defense of civil liberties. Its distinguished editorial writer, Alan Barth, who spoke in California for abolition of the Committee was "identified," as one who had often criticized the FBI. Linking attacks on the Committee with attacks on the FBI chills Congressmen to the bone. The *New York Post* and its editor, James Wechsler, were similarly exposed by Cong. Gordon H. Scherer (R. Ohio) in an extension of remarks on January 15. Mr. Scherer said they had assigned "a staff of reporters in the United States and abroad in a far flung attempt to dig up dirt for a professed objective study of the FBI."

Any talk of studying the FBI objectively at once becomes "professed." Only a heretic would seek to be objective. The *Nation* and its editor, Carey McWilliams, come in for smear, extending even to the "Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic" for having had an advertisement in the same issue of the *Nation* which carried Fred J. Cook's study of the FBI. The corkscrew twist of the Inquisitorial mind may be found in Mr. Walter's attack on Reinhold Niebuhr, one of the signers of an ad for abolition. "He has denounced the Communist Party of the United States in recent years," Mr.

### Testimonial From An Old Friend

"We in the FBI have the highest appreciation for the contributions rendered by the congressional committees dealing with Un-American Activities."

—*Letter from J. Edgar Hoover read to the House by Cong. Clyde Doyle (D. Cal.) Jan. 15 in attacking the Roosevelt "abolition" resolution.*

"I am not passing on the technique of McCarthy's committee, or other Senate committees. That's the Senator's responsibility. But the investigating committees do a valuable job. I never knew Senator McCarthy until he came to the Senate. I've come to know him well officially and personally. I view him as a friend and believe he so views me. Certainly, he is a controversial man. He is earnest and he is honest."

—*J. Edgar Hoover, San Diego, Cal., Eve. Tribune, Aug. 22, 1953, N. Y. Times, Aug. 24, 1953.*

"The closest relationship exists between this Committee and the FBI. . . . It is something, however, that we cannot talk too much about."

—*J. Parnell Thomas, then chairman of the Un-American Committee, at a public hearing July 31, '48.*

Walter said, "while at the same time seeking the release from prison of Communists convicted under the Smith Act." This might be described as the non-sequitur used as proof positive.

All this would be very amusing were it not that in this supposedly liberal Congress not a single member rose to answer, to counter-attack or to lampoon. Though the floor of the House echoes ad nauseam with attacks on totalitarianism (that is, over there), no one dared mention its symptoms over here. When the secret police become sacrosanct, when none dare criticize it without being smeared as subversive, when non-conformists continue to be blacklisted by the House Un-American Activities Committee, when invocation of the Bill of Rights is dismissed as "commie stuff," then we have slipped a long way. Weak as James Roosevelt's speech in defense of his "abolition" resolution was, he deserves credit. No other member dared even to go that far. The spectacle deserves close attention by those who too easily assume that "McCarthyism" is over. Its power is still deep-rooted.

### What Can Be Done

Speaker Rayburn says he will not let the Roosevelt resolution even come to a vote (perhaps saving it from too ignominious a defeat) but attack is still possible if enough people of standing ask Chairman Omar Burleson of House Administration Committee to hold hearings on this year's appropriation for the Un-American Committee. The time is short; let your Congressman know how you feel.

\*The Communist Party in the U. S. is not out of business; it is not dead; it is not even dormant. . . . Those who try to minimize its danger are either uninformed or they have a deadly ax to grind." —Mr. Hoover quoted by Mr. Scherer, Jan. 15.

## Soviet Scientists Charge Falsification in New U. S. Test Data

# Humphrey Decries Pessimism and Reveals New Detection Methods Found

Senator Humphrey delivered a most informative and thoughtful speech to an empty Senate Jan. 20 on the new developments in nuclear test inspection. It was scantily covered in the newspapers and came too late for adequate coverage in this issue. Serious students should read the text for themselves in the *Congressional Record*.

The Senator announced that his disarmament subcommittee would begin hearings in a few days on the significance of the new data developed in last October's underground tests. He quoted from the January 12 issues of this *Weekly* and of *Time Magazine* as illustrations of exaggerated alarm at opposite poles of political approach. He said this new data was neither something cooked up by Dr. Edward Teller, as our first questions seemed to imply, nor did it mean (as *Time* said) that now "chances of deception are so great as to be a major risk to survival."

### Hopeful Aspects Confirmed

The Senator called for less secrecy. He revealed "already new methods of detection have been found." He confirmed what we reported last week—that the new data also had a hopeful side. He said "Actually the data appeared to indicate that in some respects it may be easier to detect nuclear tests than the Conference of Experts at Geneva had concluded."

We hope the Senator, in his hearings, will also look into the public relations aspect. The Defense Department press release of Jan. 16 (No. 41-59) disclosed, "these new data are still undergoing evaluation by U. S. experts and only

preliminary interpretations" were available. Why, then, the alarmist rush into print?

When this reporter tried earlier at State and Defense Departments to get more information about the new data and the panel of experts who evaluated it, he was told that the information could not be given out here (although given the Russians at Geneva) because we had promised to keep such technical matters a secret while the talks were going on. If there was such an agreement did not the White House release of Jan. 5 violate it?

The answer from Killian committee sources was that it released the statement in fear that persons like Dr. Teller would begin to leak the new data. The *Time* story to which the Senator objected was such a leak; their deadline is Sunday night; they did not know the Killian release was coming out the very next afternoon. Prof. D. T. Griggs of UCLA, Dr. Teller's right hand man, was on the panel which evaluated the new data.

The question of why the data was released now and in this form is given added point by a dispatch in the *Baltimore Sun* (Jan. 21). Its Moscow bureau reports that *Pravda* carried an article by two Soviet scientists accusing American scientists of using "preliminary and insufficiently verified data." The Russians, according to the *Sun*, also "charged that the Americans did not tell the truth when they reported that they used in their recent tests the kind of seismic equipment recommended by the East-West Geneva conference." We hope the hearings will throw light on this, too.

## Scientist Charges Secrecy Exaggerating

Jan. 17

"To the Editor of the New York Times:

"On the basis of the two recent official releases about the new data from the Nevada underground tests, the public is being led to question the feasibility of a bomb test detection system. I feel the public is being deceived. For some reason, the other half of the story is not being told. Pertinent seismological research projects are still being classified. In our free society there is no reason to classify anything that has to do with the science of seismology. The last sentence in today's New York Times article indicates that there is more to be told. The sentence reads, 'There is still some hope among seismologists that the reliability of the inspection system can be restored through improved instrumentation.'

"An indication of the type of deception that is going on is contained in the January 6 issue of the New York Times which says 'However, the general theory (of direction of first motion) did not hold true in experiments conducted by the super-secret detection agency . . . downward first motions were recorded by three of the best seismographic stations in the United States.' Actually this information was not released until today, January 17, so that it was not possible for responsible scientists to check this and tell the full story. The part of the facts not told by the press on January 6 is that these downward first motions only occurred in what is called the 'skip region.' To withhold this fact completely changes the meaning in the eyes of the scientific community. The Geneva experts designed their system in such a way that data from the skip region would not be used. AS LONG AS SIGNALS IN THE SKIP REGION ARE IGNORED, THE DIRECTION-OF-FIRST-MOTION TECHNIQUE IS STILL JUST AS FOOLPROOF AS THE GENEVA EXPERTS HAD PLANNED. However, the new Nevada data does show that the seismic signals are somewhat weaker than originally estimated by the

## Alarm About Nuclear Test Detection

Geneva experts. It turns out that the Geneva experts underestimated the number of natural earthquakes of energy comparable to nuclear explosions by 38 percent. One does not get this impression from the article in today's New York Times which says: 'From this finding (Nevada data) came the conclusion that there were far more earthquakes of energy comparable to nuclear explosions than had been estimated by the East-West experts.'

"It should be stressed that the capability of the detection system can be restored to the original proposed level by improvements in the sensitivity of the seismic detection system. One straight-forward way to improve sensitivity is to increase the number of instruments in each array. Another obvious way to obtain a vast increase in sensitivity was mentioned in the book *INSPECTION FOR DISARMAMENT* (Columbia Univ. Press 1958). The proposal is to use a large number of auxiliary unmanned seismographs which can telemeter their data to the manned stations. Another proposal from my article in the same book is that a given detection system can be greatly improved in effectiveness with the help of calibration explosions. Most of these refinements would constitute relatively minor concessions on the part of the Russians. If the Russians really want to end testing, things are not nearly as gloomy as implied by the recent releases.

"From the fact that certain seismological projects are still classified, I would guess that there are other fairly simple ways of achieving substantial increases in seismic sensitivity. Certainly that part of science that tells how to make secret weapons should be classified. But in a free society other fields of science such as seismology must be completely free from security regulations. One of the many dangers of such security regulations is that the public may be told only part of the truth. Crucial information can be withheld to serve partisan interests."

Jay Orear  
Associate Professor of Physics, Cornell University

## Southern Oligarchy in Firm Control Rewards Its Pro-Filibuster Friends

### Inside the Senate Clockworks: A Glimpse of the New Committees

The new Committee assignments in the Senate have been hailed as evidence that Lyndon Johnson is a very magnanimous fellow. The *Washington Star* said (Jan. 18), "Some who voted with the liberals" i.e. against Johnson, in the anti-filibuster fight, "even won assignment to two or more major committees. Dodd of Connecticut was the outstanding example."

This misreads what happened. On January 14 the Senate passed a new rule which says that "Each Senator shall serve on two and no more of the following 12 standing committees" — Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Finance, Foreign Relations, Commerce, Judiciary, Labor, Interior, Public Works and Rules. It also provided that no Senator could serve on more than one of four lesser committees: District of Columbia, Government Operations, Post Office and Civil Service, and Space. This added 18 new seats, and gave the leadership more "patronage," but it required two major committee posts for every Senator. So Johnson had to give assignments to those who voted against him.

#### Subtleties of the New Rule

The wisdom of the new rule is debatable. By increasing the size of already large committees, it enhances the power of the chairman and reduces the value of membership. Since questions at hearings are asked in order of seniority, it is often late (and most of the press has left) before junior members get their chance.

Senator Long said there would be enough posts to go around if there were agreement that no Senator could have a second choice committee assignment until every Senator had had his first choice. This would prevent older Senators from monopolizing committees. But Long's was a lone voice. Johnson had persuaded the older Southerners to give up more than two major posts and to enlarge the committees so that he would have extra seats with which to reward with first choice those who voted with him.

The three most important Committees in the Senate are Appropriations, Finance and Judiciary in that order. The six Democratic vacancies created on the first went to Kefauver (Tenn), Monroney (Okla), Bible (Nev), Byrd (W. Va), McGee (Wyo) and Dodd (Conn). Dodd was the only one of these six not to vote with Johnson straight through the filibuster fight but he did desert the civil rights forces on the first crucial vote when he helped Johnson table the Anderson motion. Dodd got two other prize plums — Judiciary and Space.

Three new Democratic seats were created on Finance. These went to Talmadge (Ga), Hartke (Ind) and McCarthy (Minn). Hartke went down the line for Johnson. McCarthy opposed him on (1) motion to table, (2) the Douglas proposal for majority rule and (3) the Morton motion for a three-fifths rule, voting with Johnson only on the final vote for the Texan's own proposal. To Judiciary two new Democratic seats were added, one went to Dodd, the other to Hart (Mich) who voted 100 percent against Johnson. Hart adds a liberal vote; Dodd will be found on the right.

The two new Senators from Alaska fared well in switching 100 percent to Johnson though they had been pledged

#### Unwritten Rule No. 1 in Congress

"Let me tell you a little story [Lyndon Johnson to Senator Hart, D., Mich., one of the freshman rebels on civil rights] when Sam Rayburn first came to Congress, the Speaker told him: 'Young man, you vote against the leadership whenever your conscience or the interests of your state require it. But don't do it very often and don't do it on anything important.'

—Drew Pearson, Jan. 17.

to support the civil rights forces. Gruening was assigned to Interior, Public Works and Government Operations. The first two (Interior has jurisdiction over public lands) are of prime importance to Alaska. Bartlett got Interior, too, (giving Alaska two votes on it) and Armed Services.

The other new Western liberals who lined up with Johnson also did well. Cannon of Nevada got Armed Services, Rules and Space; McGee of Wyoming, Appropriations and Interior. On the other hand, Moss (Utah) who voted against Johnson on the Anderson, Douglas and Morton motions got Interior and Public Works.

#### Clark Pays for His Independence

Three new Democratic seats were created on Foreign Relations. Clark (Penn) has been trying to get on that Committee; it is of major importance to any presidential aspirant. He is one of the best minds in the Senate. But he has been too independent and a leader in the civil rights fight. He was passed over for Lausche (Ohio), the pro-Johnson Church (Idaho) and Gore (Tenn) who has won favor with the forces opposing a nuclear test agreement.

Church was one of the five Western Democrats who deserted the civil rights forces this year. The other four were Mansfield (Mont), Murray (Mont), O'Mahoney (Wyo) and Chavez (N. M.). Chavez, just reelected, is the only Senator of Spanish-Mexican ancestry; his people are much discriminated against in the Southwest; yet he voted with the South.

The Senate committees emerge in the new Congress with the Southerners and their small State Western allies as usual firmly in the saddle, thanks to seniority and shrewd footwork. Of the 15 standing committees, eight are headed by Southerners. *Except for the tiny State of Rhode Island, not a single State north of the Potomac and east of the Mississippi, the most populous area of the country, has a Senate chairmanship.* The one exception is Green, who got the Foreign Relations post in an earlier civil rights deal.

Five small States outside the South—New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Montana and Rhode Island—have five of the 15 chairmanships, all of them held by men who are allies of the Southern oligarchy. The other two are Hennings (Mo), chairman of Rules, a minor committee in the Senate (unlike its counterpart in the House) and Magnuson (Wash), who heads Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Magnuson, elected as a liberal, may now best be described as an extinct volcano.

#### Next Week: The New Committees in The House

#### Where the Body Lies Buried in the

"The other coalition [against civil rights] was a revival of cooperation between the Southern and Western Democrats together with the remaining hard core of the Republican right wing . . . this coalition was not new . . . it has operated for years on such economic issues common to both areas as legislation on sugar cane and sugar beets, rivers and harbors and reclamation projects, the wool tariff, the

#### Senate Battle Over Civil Rights

silver subsidy, aid to the Western mining industry, and similar matters . . . civil rights, apparently, was added as a part of the bargain."

—Senate Rules and the Civil Rights Bill, by Howard E. Shuman, *American Political Science Review*, Dec. 1957. This survey, by a legislative assistant to Senator Douglas, is the best we have come across.

## Let's Hope There'll Be More Trips Back and Forth in the Wake of Mikoyan's

### How the Old Bolshevik Could Have Handled Those 'Hot' Questions

Mikoyan had two alternatives on his trip to our country. He could have made himself a hero, by answering all those hot questions exactly as we newspapermen would have liked him to—and then applied for asylum in the U. S., settling down as a successful capitalist. But he wouldn't have done anything for the cause of peace.

Assuming that Mikoyan is a thoughtful human being like the rest of us and noting (from past experience)\* that he is one of the less rigid Russian Communist leaders and supposing for a moment that he wanted to do something to avert a war that may end civilization, what could he do?

#### Travel Can Be Dangerous

He could do just about what he did. That is, he could try to create a more friendly image of his government and lay the basis for further visits and talks. At the same time, being a politician, he also had to watch his step. He could no more afford to let the die-hards in Moscow accuse him of straying off party line than Humphrey could afford to come back from seeing Krushchev without that little pad (reproduced in *Life*) by which he could prove that he remained so loyal amid the lures of the Kremlin that he even defended John Foster Dulles.

As it is, Mikoyan was pretty daring. When he defended Moscow's intervention in Hungary by comparing it with ours in the Lebanon, many Americans were insulted. But so were a lot of Communists—not all of them in Russia. To hear the party faithful, the Lebanese affair was dirty imperialism while the Red Army in Hungary waged a crusade to save its people from feudal landlords and Fascist aristocrats who had been laying low for years, disguised as Communist writers and Csespel working stiffs.

Such people would have no difficulty in believing it if Mikoyan were suddenly exposed as a "revisionist," seduced by that notorious FBI agent Cyrus Eaton. Neither side has

\*It was Mikoyan who made the first public attack on Stalin at the Twentieth Congress before Krushchev got on the bandwagon with that secret speech; some Hungarians think Mikoyan really tried for peace in Budapest but lost out to panicky diehards in Moscow.

#### To Give A Gift Sub Is To Widen The Audience for Peace and Civil Liberties

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.  
Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:\*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

1/26/59

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes  No

#### In What Cold War Constitution Does HST Find His Presidential Personality Cult?

"Under our Constitution, there is only one place where foreign policy is made, and that is in the White House, and by no one other than the President himself . . . who has access to sources and types of information available to no one else."

—Harry S. Truman, on the Mikoyan visit, Jan. 19.

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy . . . He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties . . . The Congress shall have Power . . . to declare war."

—All the Constitution says on the subject.

"Mr. Gerry never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war . . . Mr. Mason was against giving the power of war to the Executive, because not safely to be trusted with it . . . He was for clogging rather than facilitating war, but for facilitating peace."

—Madison's Notes on the Convention which framed the Constitution in 1787.

a monopoly on screwballs, with a genius for getting their facts mixed.

There are hotheads in Moscow as in Washington, and we hope they won't be foolish enough to be disappointed because Mikoyan didn't come back with an Export-Import Bank loan. The trip will be valuable if it makes the ruling group realize (1) that friendly gestures will always evoke friendly responses from the American people, (2) that brinksmanship and threats (as about Berlin) are as foolhardy when they come from Moscow as when they come from Washington, (3) that it is hard to get people to take pledges seriously about West Berlin when pledges were broken as terribly as were those given Nagy and Malter, (4) that it is better to deal with Ike than wait for the Democrats (even Dulles flexed a little), and (5) that only the Germans our countries have had to fight twice in one generation benefit by Soviet-American disagreement.

#### Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly  
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.  
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER