

The Hamlyn lectures are aimed at a wider public than those of legal training. Dr Willams has therefore cast his work in a style and with a degree of explanation which render it capable of appreciation by the intelligent layman. If the law student can be so classed, and I believe he can, this short book can be most cordially commended to his attention. It is readable; it is full of critical wisdom; and it will give the student a better general perspective on criminal procedure and evidence than he will find in any similar book of which I know.

NORVAL MORRIS

*Report of the Special Committee on the Federal Loyalty-Security Program of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.*  
(Dodd, Read, & Co., New York 1956.)

It is a matter of common knowledge that in the post-war years there has been great concern with the problem of internal subversion in the United States. It has been given dramatic illustration by the trials and conviction of Alger Hiss, and by the activities of Senator Joseph McCarthy and his Senate investigatory committee. Loyalty and security programmes have been very much in the forefront, and these programmes have given rise to a great deal of soul-searching within the United States. The special committee on the Federal Loyalty-Security Program of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York was appointed to study this programme and report its findings and recommendations for the improvement of the programme. This volume is its report.

The committee was composed of distinguished lawyers drawn from widely scattered areas of the United States, and was provided with a staff which included two distinguished law school professors, Elliott Cheatham of Columbia and Jerre S. Williams of the University of Texas. In examining the problem, it canvassed opinions from many persons in diverse fields including government officers, representatives of business and labour, practising lawyers with special experience in this field, and University teachers. Professor Wolfgang Friedmann, formerly Professor in this Law School, is named among those who have given evidence before the committee.

The problem with which the committee was concerned is one of great practical importance. Twenty years ago, there was no personnel security system in the United States, but at the present time there are federal programmes covering nearly six million government and industrial employees. The report sketches the Communist threat, the problems of national security and the steps taken to guard it. It considers the range and development of security programmes and makes a judgment of their costs and achievements. Finally the committee addresses itself to proposals; and the principal recommendations are that the scope of the programme should be reduced to cover employment in 'sensitive' positions; that the standards which employees should be required to meet should be clarified; that the procedure should be improved in the interests of efficiency and fairness; and that a Director should be appointed to co-ordinate and review the operation of the programmes.

The central problem which has concerned many thinking Americans, and obviously concerns the committee, is that of striking a balance between the demands of national security and the importance of preserving important individual liberties in the United States. There have been

bitter controversies in the post-war years; some have laid too much stress on the element of security; others in pressing demands for individual freedom have been forgetful of the very real problems of a cold war in which the agents of Communism—themselves utterly contemptuous of democratic values—seek to use the freedom of a democratic society to destroy it. The balance is hard to strike; and with people like McCarthy, recently dead, and for some years before in eclipse, there has at times been a serious threat to important liberties. This very good committee has presented a balanced and intelligent report which, while it is of immediate importance to Americans, is important reading for all of us. Its sober and balanced analysis and conclusions are valuable, not least to those outside America who have been disposed to believe that a careful independent investigation of this sort is impossible in the country which threw up McCarthy. It threw him up to be sure, but in terms of effectiveness, it also threw him out.

ZELMAN COWEN

---

*Communications, other than those in respect to advertising, including the submission of books for review, should be addressed to—*

The Editors  
Melbourne University Law Review  
The Law School  
University of Melbourne  
Carlton, N.3  
Victoria, Australia

*The Editors cannot undertake the return or safe custody of MSS sent to them without previous communication.*