plant built into a mountanside (making it safe from Soviet bombers) will generate enough electricity to produce ingots of raw aluminum at a power cost of 1 cent a pound—the cheapest rate on the North American continent. Excess power will go to pulp mills, the idea being that ships bearing bauxite to Kitimat need something for a return cargo to the Caribbean. The whole story, as Mr. Neuberger tells it, is just as stirring as his previous stories on Bonneville and Grand Coulee. Only this time the hero is not big government but big industry. We congratulate Dick Neuberger on his ability to report the story of Kitimat without political blinders, and we hope that Stuart Chase, that other enthusiast for public power projects, will follow the Neuberger trail into the Canadian Northwest.

A Slight Case of Treason

The British government appears to view treason as lightly as Dr. Alan Nunn May, the first Soviet atomic spy to be convicted and punished. It not only released Dr. May after he had served six years and eight months of a ten-year sentence, but it took extraordinary steps to prevent his being "hounded by the press," as a Home Office spokesman considerately put it. An elaborate mock release was staged to mislead waiting reporters and photographers while Stalin's collaborator was spirited away from jail to a secret haven.

It did not remain secret long. Within hours Dr. May revealed both his whereabouts and his state of mind in a public statement not only denying that his wartime espionage was treason but declaring that he thought he had acted rightly and believed many others thought so too. He even intimated that by helping Soviet Russia to place the free world in mortal danger he had somehow furthered the "development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy" in Great Britain.

Outside the Truman-Acheson Administration we order these things differently in the United States. Alger Hiss, like Dr. May a well behaved prisoner—and like Dr. May an unrepentant spy—was denied parole; and Julius and Ethel Rosenberg have thus far met a firm negative response to every appeal for court action to save them from the death sentence pronounced by Judge Irving R. Kaufman. Indeed, only three days after Dr. May's statement Judge Kaufman, in the face of world-wide Communist and "liberal" pressure, denied them judicial clemency in a decision which dealt unanswerably with the moral aspects of the soft attitude which thousands of well-intentioned sentimentalists take toward treason. He said:

> . . . They turned over information to Russia concerning the most deadly weapon known to man, thereby exposing millions of their countrymen to danger or death. . . .
>
> The fact that the acts of the defendants were not characterized as treason . . . does not reduce the enormity of the offence. . . .
>
> But the Rosenbergs contend that Russia was our ally in 1944 and 1945 and hence this court in imposing sentence was using hindsight. To accept this contention is to approve the theory that this is not a government of responsible civil and military leaders, charged with the duty of determining what military secrets are to be given to a foreign power, but that the decision rests with any individual who might be disgruntled with the determination made by our leaders on matters affecting our security. . . .
>
> This court has no doubt but that if the Rosenbergs were ever to attain their freedom, they would continue in their deep-seated devotion and allegiance to Soviet Russia, a devotion which has caused them to choose martyrdom and to keep their lips sealed.

What assurance, one wonders, did the British authorities have that Dr. May, who believes he was right in pitting his judgment on official secrets against that of his government, would not also continue to serve his Soviet masters after his release? According to the Home Office, he is once more a British citizen in good standing, who can not even be refused a passport if he applies for it. In other words, he is free to come and go as he pleases—on secret Soviet business if he pleases. Which raises the question: Can a crime be said to have been expiated so long as the criminal does not even admit that it *was* a crime? And can an unrepentant criminal be trusted not to repeat his crime if opportunity offers? The clemency shown Dr. May by the British government must inevitably encourage other Soviet spies to believe that in Great Britain at least they may look for indulgent treatment of the crime of treason, no matter how seriously it may endanger the British nation—and with it the whole free world.

Wanted, Some Reporters

Nieman Reports is a magazine published by the Nieman Alumni Council of Harvard University's Nieman Fellows. Inasmuch as *Nieman Reports* is devoted to the problems of journalism and written largely by journalists, many of whom have had a year at Harvard on a Nieman grant, we follow the lucubrations of this organ of opinion with a fascinated eye. It has its undoubted virtues when it is small-l liberal, but its defects are hugely and transcendently McLiberal. This means that it is generous in its concern for a free press but extraordinarily narrow in its notion of what a free press should be free to do.

In the January, 1953 issue of *Nieman Reports*, for example, we have Zechariah Chafee, Jr., noted defender of free speech, taking off on the subject of the report issued five years ago by the Robert M. Hutchins Commission on the Freedom of the Press. Chafee was himself a member of that commission, and he thinks its report still has relevance to the practices of contemporary journalism. With the ideas expressed in the five-year-old report, "A Free and Responsible Press," we are not concerned here. What we are concerned with is Professor Chafee's almost total blindness to the main problem of modern journalism—which is the vast and overwhelming problem of how to get the modern reporter up off his fundament and out into the world to look for the linkages of fact that go to make up the real news in contradistinction to news of the canned or hand-out variety.

We grew up in a generation of good reporters—and when we say good we imply no judgment on the degree of "liberalism" or "conservatism" involved in their findings. We grew up in a newspaper world that included the *New York Times's* Alva Johnston (a rock-ribbed Tory) and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch's* Paul Anderson (a flaming radical). The point about these men is that they wanted to know not only everything in general, but everything in particular about the things that were mysteries to their competitors. They wanted beats, exclusives and exposures, and went out to get them.

We may romanticize the giants of a bygone day, but we don't think so. For the giants haven't died, they have simply taken their special talents out of an increasingly supine daily journalism into different and more hospitable fields. When you encounter a news beat today you will in all probability find it coming out of the mouth of a radio commentator, or from the typewriter of an off-beat magazine contributor or pamphleteer. A generation ago these men would have been found in newspaper city rooms or in the out-of-town bureaus of the bigger papers. Today they must make a more precarious living. There are, of course, columnists like George Sokolsky, Pegler, Arthur Krock, David Lawrence and the Alsops who mix superior reporting with their commentary, whether right, center or left, but we are speaking here of reporters as such, not those who editorialize as well as dig up facts.

Since we are spending some 60 billions a year to defend ourselves against the ramifications of the Soviet conspiracy, it should be granted readily that the Communist menace is the generator of the biggest American news problem of the day. But who has been the watch-dog on the ruses of the Soviet apparatus? Who first exposed the *Amerasia* case, or the "agrarian reformer" pretentions of Comrade Mao Tse-tung? Who first got hold of the big news that the Christian Democratic, not the Socialist, parties of Europe would be the strongest bars to the spread of communism after the war? Who first broke the news that the Communists had used the Institute of Pacific Relations as a cover-shop for spying and influence purposes? Who informed us about Katyn, about the provisions of Yalta, and about the real impact of the Marshall Mission to China? Who uncovered the Communist manipulation of "peace" societies and of book publishers? And, to go back a bit, who first solved the mystery of Pearl Harbor, that story of a virtually invited attack that got us into a two-front war for the triumph of communism instead of a one-front war for Nazism's defeat by Western liberalism, small-l?

A good inquiry into the problems of "a free and responsible press" might turn up an enlightening series of answers to these questions and others like them. We haven't the resources that went into the making of the Hutchins investigation, but we can make a stab right here at some tentative answers. Purely from memory we should say that the ins and outs of Mao Tse-tung's "agrarian reformer" racket were first exposed by magazine writers like Freda Utley, by publicists like Alfred Kohlberg, and by editors like Isaac Don Levine of *Plain Talk*, not by the men and women of the daily press. The truth about Katyn and Yalta was not, so far as we are aware, first told by daily journalists but in books by Arthur Bliss Lane, Ex-Premier Mikolajczyk and so on (and we can honor the Hearst press here for syndicating Mikolajczyk). The truth about the impotence of European "Third Force" parties and the rising efficacy of the Christian Democratic and Catholic Center parties was first announced, we believe, not in the daily headlines but by our own contributor William S. Schlamm in the pages of *Fortune*. As for the Communist infiltration of such things as the IPR, the UN agencies and the book-publishing industry, the news stories about these were broken by such people as Irene Kuhn in the *American Legion Magazine*, by Victor Lasky in a variety of magazines, by our own Alice Widener, and by numerous contributors to the *New Leader*, *Plain Talk* and *Human Events*. Finally, to come to the Pearl Harbor story, the first facts about that were vouchsafed to us in a pamphlet by John T. Flynn. Has Louis Lyons, the shepherd of the Nieman Fellows, ever asked Mr. Flynn to give a talk to his flock on the art of establishing the evidence for a news beat on a great mystery of State?

No doubt the people who get out *Nieman Reports* will argue that we are treading on very controversial ground when we associate the truth about China with Freda Utley, or the truth about Pearl Harbor with John Flynn. They will probably say that the "charges" of such people have not been "proved." Well, Teapot Dome and other big stories of the twenties weren't "proved" either until Owen Roberts and Attorney General Harlan Stone swung into action for the government. But this didn't stop such papers as the old *New York World* and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* of Paul Anderson's day from turning up facts that led to some mighty uncomfortable questions. The business of the reporter is not necessarily to "prove" something in the absolute legal definition of the term. It is to assemble the facts that make for the most likely hypotheses. If we were invariably to wait on a judge and jury and courtroom operatives for our information we would never understand our world in time to save it.

Our own standard of what constitutes free and responsible journalism will not, we fear, commend itself to the Nieman Fellow hierarchy or to Professor Chafee. The McLiberal, in contrast to the liberal, is more concerned with protecting his pic-