
leave the country if he wished. Olga Ivinskaya says: "The question whether to go or not never seriously arose," for Pasternak "deeply loved the country." She repeats beautiful Soviet clichés. Ernest Hemingway adds his sickening mite to the pious stereotype: "I know how deeply, with all his heart, he [Pasternak] is attached to Russia. For a genius such as Pasternak, separation from his country would be a tragedy."

Many Americans are as sure that the Russian writers cannot part with their Russia for emotional reasons, as many Russians are sure that American movie actresses have their teeth made out of pearls. Actually, considering the temper of the late '50s, the Soviet rulers would have never allowed Olga Ivinskaya and her children by another marriage to go abroad with Pasternak. What article of the United Nations charter says that the mistresses of great poets should be allowed to join them abroad? Pasternak *had* to give up the Nobel Prize and to write those two "letters of renunciation," one to Khrushchev and the other to *Pravda*, if he didn't want to lose Ivinskaya forever. It should be remembered that until the early '60s it was not clear whether the rulers had become more lenient than Stalin was, or the period of 1954 to 1959 was a five-year respite before a new wave of reprisals.

The rationale for the second arrest of Ivinskaya after Pasternak's death was as clear as it was for her first arrest. After Pasternak's death, he could well be regarded again by Soviet propaganda as "our great Soviet poet." There was only one skeleton in this shining cupboard: the publication of *Doctor Zhivago* abroad. Pasternak's poetry was *not* "anti-Soviet," for there is nothing "Soviet" or "anti-Soviet" about the summers or rains Pasternak loved to set to the Mozartian music of his verse. Summers come in the Temperate Zone of the Earth under all regimes, and rains fall as they did before Russia came into existence. But the novel was at variance with Soviet propaganda's image of Lenin's coup in the autumn of 1917. After Pasternak's death it was convenient to shift the novel

onto the "mistress." Some secret police investigators even declared that *she* had written the novel. Beyond cavil, she was the prototype for Lara, one of the two leading characters of the novel. Surely this was a crime per se, even if not properly codified.

The Russians of my milieu will read Ivinskaya's book like a gold digger works a promising creek. There is little they do not know. But they will fervently sift the text for tiny grains of gold to stow away in their memory.

Yet they will also remember something else. Olga Ivinskaya is a heroine in her own right, the Héloïse of the epoch of totalitarian regimes. Even if her be-

loved had not been the 20th century Mozart of poetry. Even though her book lapses now and then into those platitudes which are taken for revelations in Soviet and Western mass culture. Even though her book is full (at least at the beginning) of that literary-high-society chitchat which is as uninteresting and incomprehensible to anyone outside downtown Moscow as its New York analogue to anyone living beyond Mineola. With all its even-ifs and even-thoughts, the story of Pasternak's Muse, of feminine devotion, saintliness and endurance, will stay, if only in Russian memories, after the mounts of mass culture east or west have reduced to their primary fibrous substance without a trace of human meaning in a single living neuron. □

The Vengeance of Civil Servants and Other Stories

H.R. Haldeman (with Joseph DiMona): *The Ends of Power*; Times Books; New York.

by Paul Gottfried

It is now possible to add yet another volume to those bulky recollections being produced by Richard Nixon's former aides. In view of the unctuous memoirs already published by John Dean and Chuck Colson, I prepared myself for the worst in sitting down to H.R. Haldeman's account of his life in the White House. Unfortunately, Haldeman does paint a self-serving picture of his virtues. When Nixon, for example, is shown feuding with Katherine Graham, shrewish editor of *The Washington Post*, it is our author who supposedly mediated between them. And when Nixon and his more impetuous staff members plot revenge against their enemies, Haldeman again "sounds a cautionary note." Although his relationship to Henry Kissinger was notoriously bitter, Haldeman forgets this bitterness

Dr. Paul Gottfried teaches history at Rockford College.

in retrospect. Instead he depicts himself as the mature mentor, who counselled the hot-blooded Kissinger before that figure came to control American foreign policy.

These observations aside, however, *The Ends of Power* is a book to be recommended to conscientious historians. For in spite of the stylistic and other flaws, the work does try to make sense out of the Watergate affair. And it may also teach us more about Nixon's presidency than does any other book published to date. Haldeman considers the Nixon years a period of growing tension between a desperately insecure, though elected, national leader and a massive enemy force composed of federal officials, intelligence agents, journalists and educators. The tension described would result in having undercover agents being deployed by Nixon against his political enemies. It would also lead to those violent assaults upon Nixon's character and reputation launched by the news media and by assorted critics in government.

The most controversial statements in Haldeman's book concern the role assigned to the C.I.A. in discrediting

Nixon. According to this account, Richard Helms and other leaders of the intelligence service, had actually planned the failure of the Plumbers' operations. Supposedly Howard Hunt, James McCord, and several of their Cuban accomplices were taking orders from the CIA at the very time they were committing the Watergate break-in. Haldeman contrasts the conspicuous record of botched operations left by the Plumbers from their organization in 1971 down through the Watergate fiasco, with the past efficiency of the individual participants as undercover agents. He insists that the CIA had a serious interest in undermining Nixon's prestige. For what its administrators most feared was having their agency degraded to what the F.B.I. had already become after Hoover's death, an instrument of presidential power.

Haldeman focuses on the spoiled relations between Nixon and the CIA, and dwells on the continuing links between the individual Plumbers and the CIA leaders long after the former had supposedly resigned from the intelligence community. Nonetheless, the evidence marshaled does not suffice to prove Haldeman's most far-reaching assertions. For, while it is possible to concede a great deal of animus between the White House and Richard Helms, Haldeman does not convincingly show that the Plumbers failed in their work for obeying the latter, not the former. Nor does he ever prove that CIA administrators did in fact send orders to the Plumbers.

The most perceptive part of his work, however, is to be found in his presentation of Nixon's political encirclement. The impression here conveyed is that Nixon never fully understood the true power of his enemies, and that, once having challenged them on grounds of personal vanity, was then forced to fight without being able to gain for himself the appearance of battling for principle.

During recent years, political analysts, such as Kevin Phillips and Irving Kristol, have proclaimed the accession to power of a new ruling class in America. Encompassing the producers of services rather

than commodities and exercising control over a vast empire of printed and televised words, this new class is now engaged in a struggle against capitalism as the self-styled champions of greater social equality. In my opinion, most studies of this new class have focused far too much on its cultural aspect. For example, Kristol has stressed the snobbish contempt of the academic and literary community, and of its numerous supporters, for the prosaic world of businessmen and industrialists. Phillips has been interested in the difference of values between the media, educators, and publicists on the one side, and the commercial-productive sector of society on the other.

Such pictures of purely cultural confrontation do scant justice to what they attempt to describe. The new class may be aesthetically and morally significant, but what makes it a class, as James Burnham has recently argued, is the shared socio-economic interest of its members. The radical egalitarian stances characteristic of public functionaries and educators are, among other things, the ideological props of an ascending social class dependent upon ever greater exactions of tax money. The struggle of this class against the private sector, and simultaneously against capitalism, should be seen, at least in part, as the attempt of a rising power elite to expand its economic and political base. To be sure, this work is something which must be pursued with the appropriate cultural symbols. So publicly financed reformers denounce philistine homeowners and ridicule Rotarian Babbitts, while being applauded by the self-hating sons of successful immigrant craftsmen and by Harvard-educated journalists. And yet, the demands of Kristol's new class for socialism and social engineering, for enforced ends to sexism and racism, are a call for still greater power to the public sector, the ultimate beneficiaries of the new politics, and perhaps nowhere else are these beneficiaries of radical chic as acclimated to privilege as in the civil service in Washington.

Describing this officialdom, Haldeman makes the observation: "Nixon could

rave and rant. Civil servants, almost all liberal Democrats, would thumb their noses at him." Elsewhere he notes that "Republican cabinet officers, installed at the heads of departments, soon find that they rule nothing. The real decisions are made below by people who cannot be fired under Civil Service rules and who will be there long after the Republican Cabinet officers depart. As far as civil servants are concerned, every Republican administration is a transient phenomenon of no lasting importance." Haldeman was especially struck by Nixon's inability to deal from a position of power with the IRS. He cites the refusal of IRS officials to audit the taxes of Nixon's political opponents, while doing unsolicited audits on the President's backers. He also notes the frequency with which the embarrassing results of these audits were then leaked to anti-administration newspapers.

Bureaucratic insubordination also abounded in the Justice Department throughout Nixon's tenure of office. One medium-level Department employee, Richard McLaren, filed an anti-trust suit to have ITT divested of some recently acquired holdings. Although the suit was subsequently dismissed in court, McLaren proceeded anyhow to appeal the verdict. Neither the Attorney General nor the Deputy Attorney General could get him to drop the case, even though the President, who was then hoping to win financial support from ITT for the '72 election, emphatically opposed continuing the suit. Perhaps it is all too easy, at first blush, to side with McLaren, the apparent underdog in the situation. And yet, as Haldeman carefully notes, the suit against ITT was in fact once turned down in a court of law, and so the attempt to appeal the case could be seen as "an act of government harassment against business." In addition, the failure of the Attorney General to make his will prevail following the dismissal of the suit, pointed up the difficulty of Nixon's cabinet appointees in dealing with their bureaucracies.

Haldeman sets the Watergate disaster into the context of Nixon's unsus-

cessful war against the federal civil service. Surrounded by surly and mischievous government workers who resented his intrusion into their affairs, this Republican president looked for ways to run his administration without them. He assigned responsibilities to such confidential advisors as Kissinger and Haldeman; at other times, as in slowing down school desegregation plans, Nixon appealed directly to the people to gain leverage against the HEW. His resort to the Plumbers' unit was at least initially designed to uncover the source of information leaks in the government which were damaging to him and, to what he then felt, was national security. Although these undercover operations would eventually be directed against his personal enemies, their origin, according to Haldeman, lay in his justified perception of a civil service run riot.

Supposedly the "get Nixon" forces prepared for their most savage assault within two months of Nixon's landslide victory in November 1972. The occasion was a decision on the part of the triumphant chief executive to overhaul his own administration. In Summer 1972, the President authorized Roy Ash, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to construct a plan for streamlining the entire executive branch of government. Ash was to reduce the secretarial posts to what seemed a manageable number and to contrive means for ridding the administration of hostile civil servants. Within twenty-four hours of his re-election, Nixon demanded the resignations of a number of his key appointees and by January 1973, had approved a comprehensive plan "for restoring executive power to the President."

Haldeman points to a rapid increase starting in January 1973 in the space devoted to the Watergate break-in in *The Washington Post*, *New York Times*, *Newsweek* and on television news programs. Published reports and editorial comments cited irate politicians and civil servants who linked the Plumbers' operations to Nixon's ultimate goal of becoming a presidential dictator. I believe

that Haldeman is right in examining the furor over Watergate in light of Nixon's attempted shake-up of the Washington bureaucracy. The accusation of creating an imperial presidency belonged to that litany of outrage which emanated from the press and professoriate throughout the period of Nixon's downfall. In fact, the news media had depicted Nixon as tyrannizing over courageous liberal civil servants ever since his publicized dispute with Robert Finch, his first and supposedly most progressive Secretary of HEW. And the adversary press received considerable assistance from its bureaucratic allies when the IRS released information about Nixon's alleged tax evasion in Spring, 1973.

Haldeman repeatedly underscores the ties between the Washington Civil Service and the predominantly liberal news media and Congress. Because of their intimate involvement in carrying out what in recent years have been liberal social policies, the Civil Service can generally count upon the support of

progressive journalists and news announcers. An equally cordial alliance can be shown to exist between federal bureaucrats and the Congress. Haldeman makes the reasonable observation that "The greatest power centers in Washington are the liaisons between Congressional Committee staffs and the Federal bureaucratic departments they deal with."

The Congressional struggle against Nixon involved more than the outraged pride and constitutional concerns of the participants. What also probably upset many anti-Nixon Congressmen was the threat of having their access to an entrenched civil service suddenly cut off by a willful chief executive. Haldeman portrays Nixon and his White House aides as having walked into a den of enemies without the sword of legality to protect them. Although the Nixon administration has now been discredited and removed, the den composed of new class bureaucrats and their numerous myrmidons remains very much intact. □

In the forthcoming issue of *Chronicles of Culture*:

The Midyear Harvest

"We are repeatedly asked to explain what we mean by the term 'Liberal Culture'—the one combination of words perhaps used most often in these pages. The general impression is that whatever it means, we do not like it. This is correct. So before we venture into subtle reasoning on what we mean by what, something should be forcefully and unequivocally stated: liberalism and the Liberal Culture are not synonymous, not the same, and often, though not very often, at odds—"

from *Comment*

Also:

Opinions & Views — Commendables — In Focus
Waste of Money — Liberal Culture — Screen
Journalism — The American Scene
Polemics & Exchanges

The Facts of Guilt and Myths of Innocence

Allen Weinstein: *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case*; Alfred A. Knopf; New York.

by Harold C. Gordon

The Hiss-Chambers case has nagged the American conscience for thirty years. Who lied? Was it Whittaker Chambers, when he accused Alger Hiss of transmitting secret documents through him to the Soviets? Or was it Hiss, when he denied Chambers' accusations? A federal jury believed Chambers, and Hiss was sent to prison for 44 months. But neither he nor his partisans have ever ceased to protest his innocence.

Now a new book has appeared that should satisfy any unprejudiced reader that Hiss was indeed guilty as charged. With *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case*, historian Allen Weinstein has produced the most complete and dispassionate account of the subject ever to appear in print.

His verdict is all the more impressive because he began work in the belief that Hiss was innocent. Five years of exhaustive research persuaded otherwise. In that time, he interviewed scores of surviving actors in the drama, obtained a court order that released more than 40,000 pages of classified FBI files, and was allowed access to the files of the Hiss defense attorneys by order of Hiss himself. In the end, after sifting through the mountain of accumulated evidence, he concluded that Chambers had told the truth and that Hiss had not. "Alger Hiss," he said in a recent interview, "is a victim of the facts."

The Hissophiles have always insisted that he was a victim of a frame. How could a man like Alger Hiss have betrayed his country? A graduate of Harvard Law School, law clerk to Chief Justice Oliver

Mr. Gordon is Director of Special Studies of the United States Industrial Council in Nashville, Tennessee.

Wendell Holmes, and State Department *Wunderkind* who had accompanied FDR to Yalta, he was head of the prestigious Carnegie Endowment for International Peace when Chambers, an ex-Communist who was then a senior editor at *Time* magazine, denounced him to the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1948.

At trial, the prosecution's case rested on two crucial supports: Chamber's testimony that Hiss had been engaged in espionage, and copies of State Department

friendship with Hiss. Chambers testified that Alger and Priscilla Hiss were members of a secret Party cell in Washington when he first encountered them in 1934. From that time, until he broke with Communism in 1938, he and his wife enjoyed a close personal association with the Hisses. Hiss at first disclaimed any acquaintance with Chambers, but later—pressed to explain how a total stranger had acquired a wealth of intimate detail about himself and his family—he "reclected" having briefly known him

"Alger Hiss is one of the greatest assets the Communist Party could possess. What is vindication for him? It is the moment when one of the most respectable old ladies (gentlemen) in Hartford (Conn.) says to another of the most respectable old ladies (gentlemen): 'Really, I don't see how Alger Hiss could brazen it out that way unless he were innocent. Multiply Hartford by every other American community. For the CP, that is victory. That is all it needs. At that moment, confusion is rooted, morale split or sapped, truth poisoned. . . . And all that Alger has to do for this victory is to persist in his denials.'"

—Whittaker Chambers to William F. Buckley, Jr., 1954

documents that had been typed on the Hiss Woodstock typewriter. Elaborate hypotheses have been formulated to explain both. Chambers, who died in 1961, has been written off as a liar or a psychopath, driven by twisted motives to destroy an innocent man.

The documents have been ascribed to the work of "sinister forces." Admittedly, they were typed on the Hiss machine, but by whom? Hiss had discarded the Woodstock a decade before he was fingered by Chambers. Anyone could have retrieved it and manufactured the requisite proofs.

Thanks to Dr. Weinstein, we may finally lay these speculations to rest. His findings have served only to underscore the credibility of Chambers, and the incredibility of the various "forgery by typewriter" theories.

Interviews with retired Soviet operatives in Budapest and Jerusalem confirmed Chambers' larger story about life in the Communist "underground" during the 1930's. Depositions filed with the FBI likewise confirmed the story of his

between 1935 and 1936 as a free-lance writer named "George Crosley."

This was a cover-up. What is more, the Hiss files show that his attorneys were aware of it. Not only did their own investigations corroborate details of Chambers' narrative, but defense counsel Charles Cross told Weinstein of a particularly damning revelation that never came out on the witness stand. In January of 1937—months after Hiss claimed he had last seen "Crosley"—the Hiss family's pediatrician made a house call at their residence. She was met at the door by a "very gruff" man who told her, "You may not come in!" In 1949, she recognized the man as Chambers from a newspaper photograph.

Other sources verified the Party affiliation of Alger Hiss and the more serious charge of espionage. Among these were the 1945 disclosures of Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk who defected from the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa. The information he brought with him about spy rings in Canada and the United States caused the FBI to put Hiss under surveillance, which