

LOYALTY SYSTEM CALLED CONFUSED

Senate Witnesses Denounce Program as 'Patchwork'—Peress Case Reopened

By C. P. TRUSSELL

Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, March 15—

The Government's loyalty-security program went under intensified fire in Congress today.

It was denounced as being "no program at all"—just "a patchwork of the individual judgments of men who too often seem to have only fragmentary understanding of what they are doing."

Such judgments, it was emphasized, were conflicting. An example cited was the case of Wolf Ladejinsky, Far Eastern agricultural specialist. Mr. Ladejinsky was dismissed as a security risk by the Department of Agriculture but was cleared by the State Department and hired by the Foreign Operations administration.

[Meanwhile, the Senate Permanent Investigations Committee reopened hearings on the case of former Maj. Irving Peress, Army dentist who was promoted and discharged after refusing to say whether he ever had been a Communist. Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat of Arkansas, accused the Army of unwillingness to "disclose all the facts" in the Peress case.]

The program was also called "an invitation to abuse, bigotry and downright stupidity." It was charged that while persons accused had come out with clean records in the end, they and their families had been made to undergo acute stress.

Full Review Proposed

One witness before the Senate Government Operations subcommittee studying a proposal for a thorough review of the program contended that a case now before the Supreme Court well might have been started by a widely used Government informer who was not required to undergo cross-examination.

This case involved Dr. John Punnett Peters, Senior Professor of Medicine at Yale University. It started in 1951 when it was alleged that he had been either an outright Communist or a willing aide to Russia. After a periodic "clearance," Dr. Peters was removed from an advisory

post with the United States Public Health Service. An appeals board found "reasonable doubt" as to his loyalty.

The matter is now in the hands of the highest court. Today, Joseph L. Rauh Jr., national vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, testified that "it is common knowledge in Washington" that the secret informant against Dr. Peters was Louis Budenz.

Mr. Budenz was once a member of the national committee of the Communist party. Having denounced communism years ago, he has appeared as a witness against Red activities in no fewer than sixty proceedings before Congressional committees, courts and loyalty review boards.

The point that Mr. Rauh was seeking to make was not clarified. His emphasis was on the fact that Mr. Budenz, now a teacher at Fordham University, had not been subjected to cross-examination.

The tenor of testimony was to the effect that the loyalty-security program should be revised from bottom to top. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, the chairman, appeared to agree.

Harvard Dean Testifies

One of the severest indictments of the present program was made by McGeorge Bundy, dean of the faculty of arts and sciences of Harvard University.

He said the security program "creates needless confusion and fear, spreads suspicion far beyond the range of reason and tends to discourage that confident and eager sense of partisanship which has so often distinguished the relationship between American scholars and their Government since the days of Benjamin Franklin. * * *

Similar testimony came from spokesmen for many organizations that included Americans for Democratic Action, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee.

David A. Rose, chairman of the committee of the Anti-Defamation League, said:



Fabian Bachrach

ATTACKS PROGRAM: Dean McGeorge Bundy of Harvard University, who indicted the Government loyalty program.

"We interviewed eight Washington law firms which have handled a total of more than 450 security cases under the Truman and Eisenhower (security) directives.

"The most striking finding developed by the survey is that these lawyers won more than 90 per cent of the cases. In other words, in nine cases out of ten the former cases brought by the Government against its employe proved to be groundless."

FOIAb3b

CPYRIGHT