

Can the new plans be reconciled with the often reaffirmed position of Russia? Yes, if everybody is sincerely interested in obtaining disarmament and if at the same time the principal questions under dispute—Germany, Austria, the war in Indo-China, the status of Mao's China, the European Defense Community—can be settled. Disarmament will never be realized in the abstract. It is directly linked to the settlement of international differences. The general international distrust, rather than the will to aggression of any single government, is the greatest danger to peace today. Controlled disarmament presupposes a minimum of trust.

I cannot insist too strongly that we must achieve disarmament rapidly. All

mankind, even the people of the most powerful states, is endangered by the atomic-arms race. No country today can hope to be protected by a radar network, however complete, or by fighting planes, however numerous. Nor can any country derive comfort from the relative weakness of the enemy as regards heavy bombers. Research on radio-guided missiles which are attracted or, so to speak, swallowed by their objectives is making rapid progress in all the Big Four countries and perhaps elsewhere. These monstrously perfected V-2's already rise to heights of several hundred kilometers. When they reach a height of 900 their trajectory will be 12,500 miles. Thus a mad dictator will be able to launch a rocket-borne H-bomb

against a target anywhere on earth without risking the life of a single aviator. Even if the bomb is diverted from its objective, it will drop somewhere else and kill people for hundreds of miles around.

Yet even the "push-button war" now in course of preparation will be nothing as compared with a bacteriological attack carried out by radio-guided missiles. I am talking of a real army of bacteria, not of the infected flies and poisoned meat imagined by the Chinese and North Koreans.

The dilemma of tomorrow is this: either men, that is, their governments, will finally see reason, or victory will go to the lunatic who first launches his missile.

WILL JOE BOLT THE G.O.P.?

Ike Would Be Delighted . . . by Edgar Kemler

Washington

IN THE first twelve days of the army-McCarthy hearings Joe has had things his way most of the time. But if he ever gets cornered, if his infallibility on Communists-in-government is ever seriously in question, it is believed here that he will take a walk. In other words, he will find some specious pretext for suspending the hearings. Using his powers as chairman of the full Committee on Government Operations, powers that he still holds, he may then find some way to reorganize the subcommittee with himself reinstated as chairman and resume his probes of the army. He hinted as much when the Nixon plan for revoking his right of cross-examination was discussed. When Senator Mundt was asked about it he replied hopelessly, "You can't make a Senator do anything."

A few days ago only a handful of experts here would subscribe to this prediction. But since the McCarthy-Brownell fracas over the disclosure of

McCarthy's purported F. B. I. letter, this prediction is gaining credence, and further details are being added to it. McCarthy's non-recognition of Stevens as Secretary of the Army—the Senator



Senator Mundt

keeps referring to him as a mere "Pentagon politician"—is developing into non-recognition of the Eisenhower Administration as the legitimate government of the United States. This suggests that Joe will walk not only out of the hearing room but out of the G. O. P.

Insiders say that the Administration now regards this as a serious possibility and that Ike, if not his Middle West supporters, would be glad to see him go. Is it altogether coincidence that such speculation should arise just when Colonel McCormick gathered with some old friends in Chicago to launch his For America movement, looking toward a third party? McCarthy, who admitted he knew about the Colonel's plans in advance, is reported to have indorsed them, saying, "I think it would be very healthy sometime to get a realignment of parties so there would be no extreme right or left wing in either the Republican or Democratic Party." At least Joe will have somewhere to go if he bolts the Republicans.

On Friday, Brownell indicated that publication of the "hot" F. B. I. letter would be "unauthorized use of confidential information." McCarthy pointed out rightly that Brownell's publication of the Harry Dexter White reports was also unauthorized, but he wrongly implied that two wrongs make a right.

This transfer of the drama to a larger stage underscores a significant fact—the inability of the subcommittee so

EDGAR KEMLER, author of "An Ethical Guide for New Dealers" and "The Irreverent Mr. Mencken," is a frequent contributor to The Nation.

far to cope with the Senator. Time and again it has looked as if Joe would hang himself on one of his own gimmicks; each time he has ducked out. Take the famous cropped photograph as an example—the group picture of Stevens, Schine, and a Colonel Bradley which was cut down so that it seemed to be a photograph of just Stevens and Schine. After a prolonged check-up on



Francis P. Carr

McCarthy's strange crew of assistants, the blame for the cropping was finally pinned on his man Juliana. But Juliana insisted that his motives were innocent, and his associates could not recall ever having heard anything about the incident. This innocence and loss of memory on the part of the McCarthy staff—and of McCarthy himself later when testifying on another gimmick, the F. B. I. letter—called for further questioning. But suddenly we were off again, investigating why the army allegedly coddled Reds, which in turn brought us to the question why Stevens actually coddled McCarthy.

WHEN McCarthy entered this marathon, he was already visibly slipping. The Gallup Poll of early April showed that his firm followers were only 17 per cent of the voters as compared with 21 per cent last January, and that he was definitely obnoxious to 43 per cent as compared with 26 per cent earlier. In contrast to his telegram campaign against Eisenhower some months ago, he has released no figures on his recent fan mail. It is known, however, that most of his mail and telegrams come

from crackpots who justify the favors for Schine under the Republican regime as a fair exchange for the military preferment of Elliott Roosevelt under F. D. R.'s regime. McCarthy lost his respectability on the day he declared General Zwicker unfit to wear a uniform.

Yet despite his declining box-office McCarthy is as much feared by his fellow-Senators as he was six months ago. Theodore Granik, the TV impresario, has tentatively booked him for the American Forum of the Air on May 16. But after a week's search for a Democratic Senator to debate with McCarthy, Granik has not found one. Even the distinguished Senator Sparkman is known to have passed up the invitation, which could conceivably be an opportunity for giving McCarthy the coup de grâce. Joe, of course, is aware of his offensiveness and uses it as a technique for dominating the hearings. He has accused the three Democrats of making too many speeches, the pro-McCarthy Republicans of being against him, and has hinted that all of them must take the stand before he does, since he claims they are all involved with him in some of the charges or counter-charges.

Why are the Senators afraid? Formerly it was because of McCarthy's demonstrated influence with the voters; now, apparently, it is more because of his having access to the F. B. I. files and, even more important, the Internal Revenue files. (It is noteworthy that he spent the week-end with T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, shortly before he charged Struve Hensel with tax frauds.) His access to these files is of course wholly illegal, being contrary to Executive orders, and its unholy nature was effectively dramatized by army counsel Welch on Tuesday when he refused to read McCarthy's secret F. B. I. letter. This was the letter allegedly sent in 1951 by J. Edgar Hoover to General Bolling, then assistant chief of army intelligence. Welch has persistently questioned McCarthy as to "how in the dickens he got hold of it." McCarthy so far has refused to reveal his source either on the stand or off. He has tacitly admitted violating the law and has defended his action by saying that any law could be violated in the search for concealed Communists. This extraordinary statement, perhaps the most blatant as-

section of legislative tyranny ever uttered, was more or less seconded by Chairman Mundt when he told Welch that "investigative agencies in this town . . . do not have to disclose the source of their information." Under Brownell's ruling, however, Mundt has refused to have the letter inserted into the record.

THE elfish army counsel is by long odds the most appealing figure who has emerged here. Yet one wonders just how effective his rapier thrusts are against Joe's unprincipled demagoguery. At one point McCarthy slyly made it appear that Welch, not himself, was the obstructionist in the marathon. Earlier Welch had said that if McCarthy would take the stand after Secretary Stevens, the army would either waive all other witnesses or at most call two more. Between that night and the following (Tuesday) morning McCarthy's most ardent supporter, Dirksen, removed the qualifying clause from the proposal and got McCarthy to consent to it. Dirksen knew of course, as did McCarthy, that Welch could not tolerate this distortion. Yet when Welch turned it down on Tuesday morning, Dirksen charged him with "changing his mind" and McCarthy charged him with "bad faith." Again the subcommittee as a whole refused to clarify the record. When Welch asked one or all of them to come to his aid, he was completely ignored.

In sum, there has yet to appear on this stage anyone as vigorous and daring in championing the truth as McCarthy is in championing falsehood, and until such a man appears, it has been suggested, the army will continue to fare worse than McCarthy. Certainly Secretary Stevens cannot be described in those terms. As a private citizen he is honest and decent enough, but as a public official, like most of the others on the Eisenhower team, he is simply not equipped to cope with McCarthy or McCarthyism. Even his boss, Defense Secretary Wilson, seems to be disgusted with him. This was indicated by Wilson's recent refusal to comment on the hearings and his denial that he had ever ordered Stevens to cooperate with McCarthy.

A woman reporter described Secretary Stevens vis-à-vis McCarthy at Fort Monmouth as "Little Lord Fauntleroy trying to reform a Dead End kid." And when

she went to bed that night, she says, she got nightmares thinking about it. In a previous report I wrote that there was rough justice in the way this operation had backfired. In the Middle Ages the English used to say that God sent plagues, comets, lice, and Frenchmen to punish them for their sins. Clearly, Joe

McCarthy is in the same category—a kind of scourge to punish us for going off half-cocked on the Communist issue. No doubt Mr. Stevens now regrets his collaboration with McCarthy the man, but he has still not recanted on the 'ism. According to the April 25 report of the Federation of American Scientists,

McCarthy's Fort Monmouth hearings were followed by a barrage of charges directed by the army security people against army technical personnel at Fort Monmouth. McCarthyism, according to the report, still persists there. If this is true, then Secretary Stevens is building up more trouble for himself.

SCRAMBLE FOR AIR TIME

Who Should Get What? . . . by C. A. Siepmann

FAIR play in controversy is not easily contrived. We shall never get it if we go chasing the wrong hare, which is what, in broadcasting, we seem to be doing. The hare in question was started by Congress when it wrote the Communications Act in 1934. Section 315 provides that "if any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford *equal opportunities* to all other candidates for that office . . . *No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate.*"

When it comes to practice, this well-intentioned ruling has two flaws. It seems, in its last sentence, to say that at election times—and, by extension, at all times when controversy arises—the licensee need not lend his facilities for the airing of controversial questions at all. The Federal Communications Commission, however, put this to rights in the "Blue Book," which insists that every licensee has an affirmative responsibility at all times to provide reasonable time for controversial questions of high moment to the people.

In the second place, this section overlooks the fact that broadcasters are not in business for their health. Time on the air costs money. "Free" time, in any considerable amount, is something that

most stations cannot afford to bestow. It is this fact which in practice has undermined Congress's intention to make sure that all candidates for office get "equal opportunity." For by asking a stiff price for the use of air time, stations have in effect prevented all but the two major political parties from getting themselves heard or seen at all.

But the worst damage done by Section 315 is that it seems to claim "fair play" is assured by the provision of "equal time" for parties to a controversy. At election times, which fortunately come and go, such a provision—barring the "toll" exacted by the broadcasters—may conceivably provide the "rough justice" which is perhaps all that can be looked for. But for the handling of controversy in normal times the precedent is fatal.

WITH the steady deterioration in the good manners of communication since World War II, the "equal time" theory has proved more and more unworkable. To give a man "equal time" to counter arguments against him is inherently absurd. Seven lines of unscrupulous abuse may warrant 700 lines of reply, as 700 ill-considered lines may warrant a one-word reply—"Nuts!" What, then, would be fair? The question is a complicated one, and the time has come for a full airing of the difficulties. I suggest that we shall not get to first base without reconsideration of the rights and the responsibilities involved. Who has what rights and who should have what responsibility?

For a start I suggest that no one has

a "right" to broadcast. You or I may properly request air time, or even offer to buy time, but we cannot claim it. Not even the President of the United States has such a right. The reason is obvious. With anyone and everyone claiming the right, there would be no air time.

You and I are likewise limited in our rights in another matter. An inventor can patent his invention. He has a proprietary interest in it, acknowledged alike by custom and by law. But no patent rights attach to ideas or to opinions. An idea or an opinion, once expressed, becomes public property, and its author at that moment ceases to be in any recognizable sense its proprietor. Anyone can pick it up, use it, exchange it, modify it. What else is meant by the "free market place of thought"? The only way we can maintain proprietary rights in an idea is to keep it to ourselves.

A logical extension of this view makes public property—so far as comment and discussion go—not only of opinions but of public acts. This is particularly true of the acts of public officers—of the people's representatives. Thus the public record of a politician, like his opinions, is open to public scrutiny and comment. His private life and private acts are not—and with rare exceptions should not be.

Now this, in the context of our discussion, has an important consequence. It means that if an idea we have propounded is used in any of the ways just mentioned, we have no "right" to claim air time to answer back. The same

CHARLES A. SIEPMANN, chairman of the Communications Department and professor of education at New York University, is the author of "Radio, Television, and Society."

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.