

Bureacracy And Freedom

By Marquis Childs

Case Of Lattimore

FROM THE arbitrary power of the bureaucrat to the knock on the door at midnight by the secret police is a shorter distance than we have been led to believe. Furthermore, there are steps along this way which once taken are hard to retrace.

It is a sign of danger when the bureaucrat entrenches himself behind powers which are not subject to appeal. His natural tendency is to try to enlarge what he calls administrative law. Thus he is shielded from the right of appeal and judicial review.

In the newest development in the case of Prof. Owen Lattimore we are seeing how arbitrary this power can be. Lattimore has never been charged with any crime. He has repeatedly under oath before at least two congressional committees denied the accusations, made with the privilege of immunity on the Senate floor, of being a Communist agent or a pro-Communist.

Yet the bureaucracy in the State Department on the basis of a wholly unevaluated report put his name on a passport "watch list" to prevent his leaving the country. This report, gathered by the Central Intelligence Agency, has now been established by the thorough reporting of Alfred Friendly of *The Washington Post* to have been wholly without foundation. The CIA is, incidentally, required by law to leave internal security to the FBI, which has sole responsibility.

Supposedly, the action against Lattimore was a routine one taken on a fairly low level. But since his name has been so much in the news, word of the action was bound to leak. In this fashion, serious harm has been done to a private citizen already subjected to a prolonged trial and Senate inquisition.

AT TIMES Lattimore has seemed to be the victim of a plan calculated to bring about his destruction. Director of the

Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, he is an expert on the Far East, specializing in Mongolia, Sinkiang and other little-known parts of Asia. Everything he has written has been combed over by the McCarran Committee in an effort to show a bias motivated by pro-Communism.

Now, Lattimore's views may have been muddled, woolly, naive. Or they may have been sound. That is a matter of opinion. But nothing has ever been turned up to show that he was motivated by anything other than honest conviction based on fact plus the inevitable concomitant of prejudice in each human mind.

If Lattimore can be destroyed for one set of views, then at another time and in another political climate, those who hold quite different views can be brought down for what they believe. This weakens considerably the core of individual freedom, an ideal despised, scorned, stamped out under Communist totalitarianism, which holds that any means is justified to the end of the theoretically perfect state.

UNFORTUNATELY, among us are some who seem to have accepted the same doctrine. Ex-Communists have carried over into anti-Communism their conspiratorial technique with its disregard for the individual.

It is, above all, the fate of the individual—the soul of the individual and its sanctity—that is directly at stake. Unless we overcome our fears and suspicions and divisions to understand this, we shall destroy the heritage that is central to the Judaic-Greek-Christian tradition.

While this dwarfs every other consideration, there is another aspect to this latest development in the Lattimore case. When the matter of the passport "watch list" came to light, Professor Lattimore, in denying he contemplated any trip, said that

he had considered an offer to go to the University of New Delhi in India, to lecture there for a year. That offer came a year ago, prompted, it is understood, by Prime Minister Nehru, who has a high regard for Lattimore's knowledge.

Recently, tentative overtures were made to Nehru, suggesting that he, along with other Asian neutrals, might be willing to arbitrate the prisoner repatriation on which the Korean truce negotiations have been stuck. There have been hints from New Delhi that the Indian Prime Minister might be willing to undertake such an assignment. This latest demonstration of the United States' panicky fears, its arbitrary action against a scholar, is not likely to induce Nehru to attempt such a difficult arbitration.

One of the good reasons for the President's veto of the McCarran-Walter immigration bill was that it gave more arbitrary power to the bureaucrats by expanding the field of administrative law both in the Justice and State Departments. Down that steep course is the end of individual freedom.