

However, Hiss had put himself at a serious disadvantage by this delay of recognition. For it looked to the HUAC like Hiss was stalling while Chambers appeared to be forthright. When the two men met on the seventeenth, Hiss conducted a physical examination of Chambers that took on the aspect of a charade, enlivened as it was by a sarcastic commentary from Robert Stripling, investigator for the HUAC. First, Hiss ran Chambers through an interesting set of vocal exercises to test the timbre of his voice. Then he inspected Chambers' pate, hair color, girth and jowls, wondering aloud if the subject had had his face lifted. Finally, he asked Chambers to open his mouth that he might examine his teeth. Chambers obliged, complaining later that he felt like a farm animal up for auction. Hiss thereupon solemnly announced that he was prepared to identify the man before him as a writer he had known in the 1930's by the name of George Crosley.

Almost everyone greeted Hiss's story with derision, for it seemed as if Hiss were concealing knowledge of Chambers and was now making up some ridiculous story about knowing him under a fictitious name. What was forgotten was the fact that Hiss had never known Chambers' real identity, by the latter's own testimony. And by that same testimony Hiss had known him under an alias. However, even the press proved to be skeptical in word and picture. Peter Arno, the celebrated cartoonist, illustrated a tale told by his pal, Thomas F. Murphy, the federal prosecutor in the two trials of Hiss, in a cartoon that was published in *The New Yorker*. The story was about a giraffe that runs across a hippopotamus in the jungle. Thinking it might be a friend that he hadn't seen in years, he asks the hippo to open his mouth that he might identify him by his teeth. The cartoon depicts the giraffe peering into the gaping, cavernous jaws of the hippo and exclaiming, "My God, it's George Crosley!"

The importance of this confrontation cannot be exaggerated, for the solution to the Hiss Case lies here. It was as if two men were in the room, neither of them Chambers. Carl sat in one corner, George Crosley in the other. Chambers denied that Hiss knew Crosley and said that he knew Carl. Hiss said that the man he knew was Crosley and denied acquaintance with Carl. One identity was that of a criminal spy, the other that of an honorable citizen. If Carl is the man Hiss knew, then Crosley is banished. If he knew Crosley, then Carl must disappear. Hiss, Chambers, the HUAC, everyone accepted this fact. One man was lying, the other telling the truth, and the truthful man proves the other a perjurer. The Grand Jury was dying to indict one or the other for perjury, for one man *had* to be lying, but which one?

The fact that one story has to be disproved for the other to stand up is seen in the argument of Prosecutor Murphy who, through both trials, hammered away at the Crosley story, still heaping scorn upon it in his

Hiss says
you know
would have
been
skeptical
for not
perjury
espionage

summation at the end of the second trial, a year and a half after the beginning of the Hiss Case. Chambers, in his autobiography *Witness*, published in 1952 after Hiss had begun his prison sentence, devotes the longest passage in the book to the confrontation, ridiculing the Crosley story (he never admits he once conceded the truth of it), and reporting with smug satisfaction how the HUAC members derided the story once Hiss had left the room when the confrontation ended.

The solution to the Hiss Case, then, depends on which story is correct, the Carl story or the Crosley one. The Baltimore documents have nothing to do with the determination of Hiss's guilt or innocence. If Hiss can prove that he knew a harmless writer named George Crosley, then his innocence is incontrovertibly established. Then the Baltimore documents become irrelevant, for he couldn't have passed them to an innocuous, non-communist writer.

There are four irrefutable proofs that Hiss knew an innocent writer named George Crosley. For the first we go to the interrogation of Chambers by Hiss's attorneys in November. This grilling was in anticipation of the libel suit, before the revelation of the Baltimore documents. Hiss's attorneys took Chambers over a detailed history of his life. Chambers was quite obliging, giving the attorneys a rather full account of his career in the communist organization. But in doing so Chambers committed a monumental blunder. He, like most writers, was quite vain about his gift for verse. Indeed, he was a rather good poet and had achieved what many poets fail to do, to get published. To prove his point, Chambers announced the name of his publisher in the 1920's, a Samuel Roth. Then a light clicked on in Chambers' mind. He remembered that he had once submitted some poems to Roth under the nom de plume of guess who? *George Crosley*. Chambers immediately recognized the peril he was in. He knew that the attorneys would track down Roth and learn of the Crosley pen name, which in fact is exactly what happened. What to do? Here we must pause to pay tribute to an ingenious ploy of daring and poise. Chambers decided to forestall the attorneys. So he mentioned very casually that it was possible he might once have used the alias George Crosley. And it worked! Not only did Hiss's attorneys fail to realize the significance of such an admission, it diminished the importance of Roth's testimony to the extent that Hiss did not even allow him to take the stand, which he was willing to do, in the trials. Hiss's excuse was that Roth had served several jail sentences for publishing what was then considered pornographic material. Hiss apparently was fearful that having such a witness might prejudice the jurors against him. But he *must* summon Roth and he *must* have Chambers repeat on the witness stand that fatal admission that he had once used the name George Crosley. For such testimony is the very cornerstone of Hiss's defense.

However, Hiss had put himself at a serious disadvantage by this delay of recognition. For it looked to the HUAC like Hiss was stalling while Chambers appeared to be forthright. When the two men met on the seventeenth, Hiss conducted a physical examination of Chambers that took on the aspect of a charade, enlivened as it was by a sarcastic commentary from Robert Stripling, investigator for the HUAC. First, Hiss ran Chambers through an interesting set of vocal exercises to test the timbre of his voice. Then he inspected Chambers' pate, hair color, girth and jowls, wondering aloud if the subject had had his face lifted. Finally, he asked Chambers to open his mouth that he might examine his teeth. Chambers obliged, complaining later that he felt like a farm animal up for auction. Hiss thereupon solemnly announced that he was prepared to identify the man before him as a writer he had known in the 1930's by the name of George Crosley.

Almost everyone greeted Hiss's story with derision, for it seemed as if Hiss were concealing knowledge of Chambers and was now making up some ridiculous story about knowing him under a fictitious name. What was forgotten was the fact that Hiss had never known Chambers' real identity, by the latter's own testimony. And by that same testimony Hiss had known him under an alias. However, even the press proved to be skeptical in word and picture. Peter Arno, the celebrated cartoonist, illustrated a tale told by his pal, Thomas F. Murphy, the federal prosecutor in the two trials of Hiss, in a cartoon that was published in *The New Yorker*. The story was about a giraffe that runs across a hippopotamus in the jungle. Thinking it might be a friend that he hadn't seen in years, he asks the hippo to open his mouth that he might identify him by his teeth. The cartoon depicts the giraffe peering into the gaping, cavernous jaws of the hippo and exclaiming, "My God, it's George Crosley!"

The importance of this confrontation cannot be exaggerated, for the solution to the Hiss Case lies here. It was as if two men were in the room, neither of them Chambers. Carl sat in one corner, George Crosley in the other. Chambers denied that Hiss knew Crosley and said that he knew Carl. Hiss said that the man he knew was Crosley and denied acquaintance with Carl. One identity was that of a criminal spy, the other that of an honorable citizen. If Carl is the man Hiss knew, then Crosley is banished. If he knew Crosley, then Carl must disappear. Hiss, Chambers, the HUAC, everyone accepted this fact. One man was lying, the other telling the truth, and the truthful man proves the other a perjurer. The Grand Jury was dying to indict one or the other for perjury, for one man *had* to be lying, but which one?

The fact that one story has to be disproved for the other to stand up is seen in the argument of Prosecutor Murphy who, through both trials, hammered away at the Crosley story, still heaping scorn upon it in his

HISSTORY
very keep
would be
been
Saskatch
for not
perjury
espionage

summation at the end of the second trial, a year and a half after the beginning of the Hiss Case. Chambers, in his autobiography *Witness*, published in 1952 after Hiss had begun his prison sentence, devotes the longest passage in the book to the confrontation, ridiculing the Crosley story (he never admits he once conceded the truth of it), and reporting with smug satisfaction how the HUAC members derided the story once Hiss had left the room when the confrontation ended.

The solution to the Hiss Case, then, depends on which story is correct, the Carl story or the Crosley one. The Baltimore documents have nothing to do with the determination of Hiss's guilt or innocence. If Hiss can prove that he knew a harmless writer named George Crosley, then his innocence is incontrovertibly established. Then the Baltimore documents become irrelevant, for he couldn't have passed them to an innocuous, non-communist writer.

There are four irrefutable proofs that Hiss knew an innocent writer named George Crosley. For the first we go to the interrogation of Chambers by Hiss's attorneys in November. This grilling was in anticipation of the libel suit, before the revelation of the Baltimore documents. Hiss's attorneys took Chambers over a detailed history of his life. Chambers was quite obliging, giving the attorneys a rather full account of his career in the communist organization. But in doing so Chambers committed a monumental blunder. He, like most writers, was quite vain about his gift for verse. Indeed, he was a rather good poet and had achieved what many poets fail to do, to get published. To prove his point, Chambers announced the name of his publisher in the 1920's, a Samuel Roth. Then a light clicked on in Chambers' mind. He remembered that he had once submitted some poems to Roth under the nom de plume of guess who? *George Crosley*. Chambers immediately recognized the peril he was in. He knew that the attorneys would track down Roth and learn of the Crosley pen name, which in fact is exactly what happened. What to do? Here we must pause to pay tribute to an ingenious ploy of daring and poise. Chambers decided to forestall the attorneys. So he mentioned very casually that it was possible he might once have used the alias George Crosley. And it worked! Not only did Hiss's attorneys fail to realize the significance of such an admission, it diminished the importance of Roth's testimony to the extent that Hiss did not even allow him to take the stand, which he was willing to do, in the trials. Hiss's excuse was that Roth had served several jail sentences for publishing what was then considered pornographic material. Hiss apparently was fearful that having such a witness might prejudice the jurors against him. But he *must* summon Roth and he *must* have Chambers repeat on the witness stand that fatal admission that he had once used the name George Crosley. For such testimony is the very cornerstone of Hiss's defense.

However, Hiss had put himself at a serious disadvantage by this delay of recognition. For it looked to the HUAC like Hiss was stalling while Chambers appeared to be forthright. When the two men met on the seventeenth, Hiss conducted a physical examination of Chambers that took on the aspect of a charade, enlivened as it was by a sarcastic commentary from Robert Stripling, investigator for the HUAC. First, Hiss ran Chambers through an interesting set of vocal exercises to test the timbre of his voice. Then he inspected Chambers' pate, hair color, girth and jowls, wondering aloud if the subject had had his face lifted. Finally, he asked Chambers to open his mouth that he might examine his teeth. Chambers obliged, complaining later that he felt like a farm animal up for auction. Hiss thereupon solemnly announced that he was prepared to identify the man before him as a writer he had known in the 1930's by the name of George Crosley.

Almost everyone greeted Hiss's story with derision, for it seemed as if Hiss were concealing knowledge of Chambers and was now making up some ridiculous story about knowing him under a fictitious name. What was forgotten was the fact that Hiss had never known Chambers' real identity, by the latter's own testimony. And by that same testimony Hiss had known him under an alias. However, even the press proved to be skeptical in word and picture. Peter Arno, the celebrated cartoonist, illustrated a tale told by his pal, Thomas F. Murphy, the federal prosecutor in the two trials of Hiss, in a cartoon that was published in *The New Yorker*. The story was about a giraffe that runs across a hippopotamus in the jungle. Thinking it might be a friend that he hadn't seen in years, he asks the hippo to open his mouth that he might identify him by his teeth. The cartoon depicts the giraffe peering into the gaping, cavernous jaws of the hippo and exclaiming, "My God, it's George Crosley!"

The importance of this confrontation cannot be exaggerated, for the solution to the Hiss Case lies here. It was as if two men were in the room, neither of them Chambers. Carl sat in one corner, George Crosley in the other. Chambers denied that Hiss knew Crosley and said that he knew Carl. Hiss said that the man he knew was Crosley and denied acquaintance with Carl. One identity was that of a criminal spy, the other that of an honorable citizen. If Carl is the man Hiss knew, then Crosley is banished. If he knew Crosley, then Carl must disappear. Hiss, Chambers, the HUAC, everyone accepted this fact. One man was lying, the other telling the truth, and the truthful man proves the other a perjurer. The Grand Jury was dying to indict one or the other for perjury, for one man *had* to be lying, but which one?

The fact that one story has to be disproved for the other to stand up is seen in the argument of Prosecutor Murphy who, through both trials, hammered away at the Crosley story, still heaping scorn upon it in his

HISSELF
you know
would have
been
Sister
for not
perjury of
espionage of

summation at the end of the second trial, a year and a half after the beginning of the Hiss Case. Chambers, in his autobiography *Witness*, published in 1952 after Hiss had begun his prison sentence, devotes the longest passage in the book to the confrontation, ridiculing the Crosley story (he never admits he once conceded the truth of it), and reporting with smug satisfaction how the HUAC members derided the story once Hiss had left the room when the confrontation ended.

The solution to the Hiss Case, then, depends on which story is correct, the Carl story or the Crosley one. The Baltimore documents have nothing to do with the determination of Hiss's guilt or innocence. If Hiss can prove that he knew a harmless writer named George Crosley, then his innocence is incontrovertibly established. Then the Baltimore documents become irrelevant, for he couldn't have passed them to an innocuous, non-communist writer.

There are four irrefutable proofs that Hiss knew an innocent writer named George Crosley. For the first we go to the interrogation of Chambers by Hiss's attorneys in November. This grilling was in anticipation of the libel suit, before the revelation of the Baltimore documents. Hiss's attorneys took Chambers over a detailed history of his life. Chambers was quite obliging, giving the attorneys a rather full account of his career in the communist organization. But in doing so Chambers committed a monumental blunder. He, like most writers, was quite vain about his gift for verse. Indeed, he was a rather good poet and had achieved what many poets fail to do, to get published. To prove his point, Chambers announced the name of his publisher in the 1920's, a Samuel Roth. Then a light clicked on in Chambers' mind. He remembered that he had once submitted some poems to Roth under the nom de plume of guess who? *George Crosley*. Chambers immediately recognized the peril he was in. He knew that the attorneys would track down Roth and learn of the Crosley pen name, which in fact is exactly what happened. What to do? Here we must pause to pay tribute to an ingenious ploy of daring and poise. Chambers decided to forestall the attorneys. So he mentioned very casually that it was possible he might once have used the alias George Crosley. And it worked! Not only did Hiss's attorneys fail to realize the significance of such an admission, it diminished the importance of Roth's testimony to the extent that Hiss did not even allow him to take the stand, which he was willing to do, in the trials. Hiss's excuse was that Roth had served several jail sentences for publishing what was then considered pornographic material. Hiss apparently was fearful that having such a witness might prejudice the jurors against him. But he *must* summon Roth and he *must* have Chambers repeat on the witness stand that fatal admission that he had once used the name George Crosley. For such testimony is the very cornerstone of Hiss's defense.