

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS  
David L. Hill, Chairman

1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.  
April 20, 1953 -- No. 53 - 4

## WIDESPREAD PROTESTS FORCE DELAY OF ASTIN OUSTER

### WEEKS IN TACTICAL RETREAT

Under steady and mounting pressure from an aroused scientific community and an alert press Secretary of Commerce Weeks, on April 17, announced a tactical retreat on the forced resignation of Dr. A. V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. Scheduled to take effect on April 18 the resignation has now been postponed until late summer or early fall when the Kelly committee, earlier established by Secretary Weeks, is expected to complete its study and evaluation of Bureau functions and operations "in relation to the present national needs."

**NEW ACADEMY COMMITTEE** The Commerce Secretary also announced, in accord with widespread demand, that he has requested a new National Academy of Sciences committee to investigate the technical aspects of battery additives testing. The tone of the Secretary's statement was conciliatory, paying tribute to Astin as "a scientist of distinction who has served his country well," and disclaiming any intent "to cast reflection on the integrity of the Bureau." But the statement gave no ground on Astin's final fate ("No question is involved of Dr. Astin's permanent retention"), and offered little assurance on the central issue of non-scientific pressures on scientific investigation. "Such differences as I have had with Dr. Astin result from a conflict with respect to administrative viewpoint and procedure and have literally nothing to do with scientific evaluations or con- (Continued on Page 4, Column 1)

### FAS CALLS ACTION INCOMPLETE

In a press release on April 18, recently elected FAS chairman David L. Hill called the steps on the Astin affair announced by Secretary of Commerce Weeks on April 17 "welcome but incomplete." Hill said that "Secretary Weeks has wisely yielded to general indignation over the dismissal of Dr. A. V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. By postponing the effective date of Dr. Astin's forced resignation, he has allowed time for calm and considered investigation before the final verdict is reached. Secretary Weeks has been wise, too, in calling on the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an impartial examination of the technical aspects of Bureau testing of AD-X2."

Hill noted, however, that "nothing in Secretary Week's statement justifies or gives confidence in the wisdom of his unrecalled decision to insist on Dr. Astin's resignation." He pointed out that scientific protests center on the Secretary's original suggestion that the Bureau "has not been sufficiently objective, because they discount entirely the play of the market place," and on the implications of his intention to have Bureau functions and objectives re-evaluated "in relation to the American Business Community (sic) and other agencies of government."

"Until it is made clear -- forcefully and simply by the highest sources -- that this conception [of subordination of scientific activities to non-scientific pressures] is not operative in the Commerce Department or anywhere else in the administration, the damage resulting from the Astin affair will continue to spread," Hill warned. "We still believe that a full independent investigation of the motives and circumstances surrounding the Astin dismissal itself must be made."

### SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AROUSED

The social effectiveness of an aroused scientific community has once again been demonstrated in the Astin affair. Whatever may have been in Secretary of Commerce Weeks' mind when he summarily requested the resignation of National Bureau of Standards Director A. V. Astin, to scientists his action smacked strongly of political meddling in free scientific investigation. The result has been the greatest flood of protest from scientists and their organizations to hit Washington since early FAS days. The flood, combined with the editorial support of powerful newspapers and the interest elicited on Capitol Hill, has rocked the foundations of Commerce -- and created a new awareness of science and scientists as a factor which must be taken into account in determination of public policy.

(Continued on Page 3, Column 2)

### OPEN MEMBERSHIP MEETING -- WASHINGTON

#### "SCIENCE IN GOVERNMENT"

Cosmos Club Auditorium April 30, 1953  
-- unless otherwise posted Thursday  
(corner Mass. and Fla. Avenues) 8:00 P.M.

Hans Bethe and other prominent speakers will discuss ramifications of the Astin affair. Members and friends (e.g., physicists at APS meeting) are invited. Refreshments.



Courtesy of the Washington Post

## DISARMAMENT DEBATE REVIVED

The disarmament question, if not apparently as hopeless as before the recent Russian peace offensive, is no less muddy. The UN Political Committee voted 52-5 in favor of a 14-power resolution directing the Disarmament Commission to resume work, and report back not later than Sept. 1. Great significance was attributed to the fact that Vishinsky did not attack the substance of the resolution nor reintroduce the Russian counter-plan, but contented himself with proposing minor amendments. One of these, withdrawing commendation for the past work of the Disarmament Commission, was accepted by the US-British bloc, but the proposal to withdraw endorsement of the 1952 Paris resolutions -- which the US insisted would be tantamount to abandoning the principles of international inspection and safeguards -- was defeated, albeit less decisively (33 to 10).

### RUSSIAN "CONCESSIONS"

The optimism attached to the softened Soviet attitude was based on the hope that Russia had abandoned its insistence on (1) an immediate universal one-third armament reduction, and (2) prohibition of atomic weapons as the first step in atomic control -- the two points which have stymied all previous disarmament negotiations. However, these two points were reaffirmed in the April 9 "old hat" speech of Vishinsky, so that little optimism seems justified over the substance of the Russian "concessions." Furthermore, no indication exists that the Russians would be willing to consider an effective international inspection mechanism, a *sine qua non* of atomic control, as reaffirmed by President Eisenhower in his April 16 foreign policy address.

Speaking to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Eisenhower stated that "a nation's hope of lasting peace cannot be firmly based upon any race in armaments," but that, "as long as there persists a threat to freedom, [free nations] must, at any cost, remain armed, strong and ready for any risk of war."

### SUPER POINT IV

The President proposed there be an alternative to "a life of perpetual fear and tension; a burden of arms draining the wealth and labor of all peoples; a wasting of strength that defies the American system or the Soviet system or any system to achieve true abundance and happiness for the peoples of this earth." In a statement reminiscent of the late Sen. McMahon, he said that "this government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. [One purpose would be] to assist all people to know the blessings of productive freedom."

### BRICKER RESOLUTION

The prospects of disarmament seem further clouded by the progress of the Bricker Senate Resolution and its American Bar Association counterpart -- both of which could, in the view of many opponents, hamstring international atomic control, participation in FAO, WHO, etc., and even force our withdrawal from the UN entirely. Many witnesses have been heard by the Senate Judiciary Committee, including Sec. Dulles and Att'y. Gen. Brownell, who were "sympathetic" to the Bricker point of view, but found the present wording unacceptable. Taft is still for the proposal but says "there will have to be changes." The Bricker resolution, sponsored by 64 Senators, calls for a constitutional amendment which would (1) make ineffective any treaty provision abridging a constitutional right; (2) require congressional action before any treaty becomes effective as internal law; (3) apply similar limitations to executive agreements; and (4) require their advance approval by Congress.

Two FAS Committees are active in the UN sphere -- a committee on atomic control and disarmament at Chicago and one on the scientific and technical activities of the UN. The latter is now being organized with membership in various parts of the country. Suggested areas for study and action include an examination of the responsibilities and procedures of the UN, UNESCO and Point Four technical assistance programs, an investigation of possible conflicts and degrees of overlapping of functions among these agencies. US participation in such programs might be analyzed, with some attention to possible savings by eliminating duplication.

## ATOMIC POWER AND FREE ENTERPRISE

With the enthusiastic support of President Eisenhower and the approval of the National Security Council, AEC is drawing up proposals for modifying its absolute monopoly of atomic energy to permit private industry to enter the atomic power field.

The new program, actually started in the final months of the Truman administration, is to be presented to Congress within the next few weeks. It is expected that months of public hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will be required for the discussion of many complex problems before the necessary legislative changes in the Atomic Energy Act can properly be prepared. The principal modifications of the Act would be (1) to authorize the AEC to sell, lease, or loan fissionable materials to private companies under certain security and safety restrictions, and (2) to authorize the companies to develop and operate nuclear reactors for the production of power.

### PROTECTION FROM RISK

Power companies, chemical and engineering firms, and some large users of electric power hailed the AEC announcement with enthusiasm. In addition to seeming eager to reap the potential benefits of atomic power development, these groups seem to desire a large measure of protection from any economic risks involved in such development. The most talked-of suggestion as to the nature of this protection is that the government should purchase plutonium produced as a by-product of power-producing reactors in case the power aspect itself is not economically profitable.

This suggestion has been presented in a rather casual manner, and somewhat hidden behind glowing claims that the actual production of power from atomic fission is a relatively simple matter, and requires little more effort than relaxation of the AEC's present monopoly on atomic energy. Some responsible groups, however, debate these claims as being excessively optimistic, and estimates as high as 50 years have been made as to the time before fissile power can be economically competitive. The prospect of much government money being poured into private power development therefore looms very real.

### "NUCLEAR N. A. M."

The tenor of some of the industrial influences pressing for relaxation of the AEC monopoly may be indicated by the expressed ambition of one newly organized group to become a "nuclear National Assoc. of Manufacturers." This group, the Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc. (which has on its board former AEC Commissioner T. Keith Glennan), says it could build an atomic power plant in two years without disclosing any atomic secrets if the government would permit it to do so. Other moves pressing for the release of atomic energy to industry are: private studies already underway under AEC auspices which indicate that engineering problems can be solved, claims that there are no serious safety obstacles, and indications of willingness to allow liberal licensing of patents.

### FOREIGN AFFAIRS CONNECTIONS

In the field of foreign affairs, the new AEC program is finding welcome by many experts. The emphasis of the proposed plan on peaceful applications of atomic energy and the possibility of reactors becoming available for power-starved nations in the under-developed areas of the earth can give the State Department a great talking point in the Cold War. Perhaps, as the *Christian Science Monitor* suggests, "instead of an atomic arms race...there would be an atomic power race, in which both sides were rushing to bring the fruits of atomic power to all mankind." But this does not necessarily take precedence over the domestic considerations and the *Washington Post's* warning that there is as yet "no hurry" to formulate "ground rules for private participation in atomic development."

### REP. COLE HEADS JOINT ATOMIC COMMITTEE

The protracted deadlock between House and Senate members over the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy chairmanship (NL 53-3) has finally been resolved in favor of Rep. W. Sterling Cole (R, N.Y.). Cole is to be chairman for two years, when a Senator is again to take over. If the Republicans still hold the Senate the job will go to Hickenlooper, present vice-chairman, who may need the prestige of the office for his next election campaign.

# SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY VIGOROUSLY ACTIVE IN ASTIN AFFAIR

Selected quotes from some of the numerous public statements by scientific organizations provide the following composite of scientists' reaction to the Astin ouster:

Scientists both in and out of government have been shocked by the abrupt and ill-considered dismissal of Dr. A. V. Astin.<sup>1</sup> By forcing Astin's resignation in the way he has done, the Secretary seems to be bringing political influence into an institution which has been free of politics throughout its 50-year history.<sup>2</sup> [The impression of political pressure] unless corrected, will greatly impair the morale of scientists now working for the Government, and will make it increasingly difficult to draw other scientists into careers in Government service.<sup>3</sup>

The inflammatory remarks by the Secretary concerning technical findings of the Bureau, the curtain of censorship on all reports and comments, and the pressure now being exerted on other departments of the Government to endorse battery additives are alarming actions...<sup>4</sup> Materials of science obey natural laws, laws which are not amenable to amendment or revisions.<sup>5</sup>

[Few scientists] will accept dominance and control by Government officials over objective investigation and its results. It is hard to see how confidence and good working relations can be restored unless the Astin dismissal promptly has the fullest and most impartial public investigation.<sup>6</sup>

The [Kelly] committee...is competent, but its scope has been limited to evaluation of 'present functions and operations... in relation to present national needs.' More is needed.<sup>7</sup> In order to allay the growing concern about the future of science in Government, it is urged that the director...be retained in his present position until these two committees have reported, at which time it should be possible to assess the merits of the case properly.<sup>8</sup>

Finally, it is believed that nothing short of restoring Dr. Astin to his former position can begin to repair the damage done....<sup>9</sup>

- |                                    |                                 |                           |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. FAS                             | 2. Atom. Sci. of Chicago        | 3. Amer. Inst. of Physics |
| 4. Philos. Soc. of Washington      | 5. Elisha Mitchell Sci. Society |                           |
| 6. Science, official organ of AAAS | 7. Amer. Chem. Society          |                           |
| 8. Washington Academy of Science   | 9. Electrochemical Soc.         |                           |



Scientific Community Aroused (Cont. from Page 1).

## FAS OFFICE ALERT

FAS has been active on the issue from the outset. Alerted early -- even before Drew Pearson disclosed the dismissal on March 31 -- the last NL warned of the coming storm. To those in Washington it was possibly clearer than elsewhere that major problems of public policy were involved. Government science increasingly has provided the objective basis of fact on which other government agencies rely for policy decisions and regulatory operations. In striking at the Bureau of Standards for lack of "objectivity" and insufficient regard for "the play of the market place," Secretary Weeks said he was trying "to help business in every possible manner." What the Secretary did not know, or possibly fully understand, was that government decisions may be based upon the work of scientific laboratories, but they are not made by them. In seeming to subordinate scientific objectivity to market place objectivity, Secretary Weeks was monkeying with the pump when he probably intended to work with the valves.

On April 1 the FAS Washington Office, and its quickly assembled volunteers, went into high gear. Emphasis was completely on the facts and their widest possible distribution. By April 12 an estimated 20,000 mimeographed pages on the Astin affair had been dispatched to FAS membership, press, Congress, prominent non-member scientists, and potentially interested organizations. Included were Secretary Weeks' testimony before the Small Business Committee, Astin's statement, summaries of editorial and Congressional reactions, background stories and up-to-the minute bulletins on fast-breaking events.

## POLICY DRAFTED

On April 4 a preliminary policy statement, drafted and approved by Executive Committee consultation via wire and phone, was released to the press. Page one news in Washington, Baltimore, St. Louis -- and prominently featured in most major centers -- it first indicated the full measure of scientific concern and high-lighted the need for complete public investigation. Meanwhile, membership reaction was beginning to roll into the office -- unanimously endorsing FAS activities and giving much valuable advice and perspective. Contributions, too, came in with heartening generosity -- enough to ensure that finances would not limit the effort.

By April 6 the Office, through direct conversations with interested Senators and their representatives, was reasonably well-informed on the tactical situation on the Hill -- where a hearing was shaping up in the Senate Small Business Committee. The expected timing and scope did not suggest that the issue would get the full, prompt airing scientists believed necessary, and the Council, Executive Committee and advisors again were queried on policy and strategy. On April 10 a second press release was prepared pointing to the urgency of the situation and the importance of concentrating on the Astin dismissal itself rather than on the precipitating AD-X2 controversy. Distributed to FAS officers 24 hours in advance for comment, it was released on April 11 and widely reported on the ensuing two days. Twenty-four hours later, under the impact of mounting pressure from several sources, the Senate Small Business Committee advanced the hearing date from an indefinite time in May to the third week in April -- though still not satisfactorily defining its scope.

## MORAL AND MORALE

This brief story of a hectic two weeks has its moral -- as well as its value for morale. Win, lose or draw -- and there is ground for optimism -- the existence, philosophy and mode of operation of FAS have once again been justified in the Astin affair. Several things stand out: 1) Science -- its role and its implications -- needs steady explanation and sometimes defense; 2) The facts, always science's tool, are also its best weapon in the social arena; 3) Action must be prompt, timely and sound if it is to be effective on fast-moving issues; 4) Organization must be in existence in advance -- close to its membership, fortified by accumulated contacts and experience -- if scientists' opinions are to register in the public mind and in public decisions.

# NON-SCIENTIFIC ISSUES SEEN IN WEEKS' ACTION

## Weeks in Tactical Retreat (Cont. from Page 1).

clusions," the Secretary said. There was no mention of Secretary Weeks' earlier-expressed view -- which so alarmed scientists -- that the Bureau "has not been sufficiently objective, because they discount entirely the play of the market place."

**REACTIONS** Early reactions to the Weeks' statement varied widely, although with a common denominator of relief that precipitate action had been forestalled. Senator Thye (R, Minn.) cancelled scheduled hearings before the Small Business Committee saying that "important aspects of the matter relating to the Bureau of Standards have been resolved by the announcement of the Secretary of Commerce and the decision of Dr. Astin to remain as director while an investigation is being made by an independent committee of competent scientists. ...Any Committee hearings might well becloud the issue at this time rather than clarify it." Senator Tobey (R, N.H.), Chairman of the Commerce Committee which has before it the Morse resolution directing the Committee to investigate the entire affair, said he thought Weeks' action was "the ending of the whole thing...a very happy ending." Tobey said his Committee plans no further steps in the matter.

Senator Morse (Ind, Ore.) took a somewhat different view. He expressed satisfaction that Secretary Weeks had seen "the handwriting on the wall" but warned that to keep scientific research free of political control the fight must be continued. He called for a "complete reversal of Weeks' earlier order if the investigation shows that Astin has conducted his office in an impartial manner, true to the scientific facts as the Bureau has found them."

**EDITORIAL COMMENT** Commenting editorially, the Washington Post April 18 found creditable Secretary Weeks' recognition that his previous action had been "overhasty and ill-advised." But it viewed his revised stand as incomplete, saying, "We do not think there can be any reasonable compromise on the principle that the independent scientific findings by the Bureau be upheld by other agencies of the Government until and unless they have proved to be wrong. Apparently further adjustments in the Secretary's thinking are necessary to bring a satisfactory settlement of this unfortunate controversy." The Washington Star, editorializing on the same day, said that "The fact remains, however, that the firing of Dr. Astin, under the circumstances, was a major blunder, and it is to be hoped that the lesson to be learned from it will not be wasted on the other members of the administration."

**SCIENTISTS WARY** Early reactions of scientists to Weeks' new position were restrained. Though there was relief that some action -- even though not fully satisfactory -- had been taken, there was little disposition to regard the matter as settled. It was pointed out that, as matters stood at the moment, Astin was still fired -- for no good scientific reason yet demonstrated publicly. If his actions and those of the Bureau were professionally above reproach -- which Secretary Weeks now seemed to concede -- the only basis for his non-reinstatement appeared to be either to "save face" or because the administration insisted on the right to put its "own man" at the head of the Bureau. Neither appeared to be a sound or justifiable reason for replacing the director of a major scientific institution.

Actually, Weeks did not save much face. And, despite the technical right, there was every reason to dispute the wisdom of the conception of a political party's "own man" in a high scientific post. Weeks and the White House had been advised in the previous two weeks by the highest level of the scientific community that political or commercial pressures prevent successful operation of government scientific laboratories. They had been advised that the remedies for the present difficulties include firm policy pronouncements that research, development and testing will be kept free of non-scientific pressures, and that administrators of scientific activities will continue to be chosen by their scientific qualifications alone. Scientists looked in vain for mention of these topics in Weeks' statement.

A thoughtful appraisal of the non-scientific aspects of the Astin affair by J. R. Wiggins, managing editor, which appeared in the Washington Post on April 6, is digested below. Editorially, the Post has strongly supported the inviolability of scientific objectivity from political decisions. Mr. Wiggins sees two other important questions involved in the Astin case:

First -- "Should government through regulatory bodies, the courts and scientific agencies, judge the merit of new products, and the soundness of claims made for them, or should this function be left to the test of the market place?"

**CAVEAT EMPTOR** Wiggins points out that Mr. Weeks, although acknowledging the rightful role of government in the regulation of food and drugs for human consumption, questions the wisdom of attempts to protect the purchaser against non-injurious products. In this case -- the battery additive being an apt example -- let the customer decide, says the Secretary.

"Congress decided otherwise in 1914," says Mr. Wiggins. "It decided that it was unfair competition to permit a manufacturer to make unwarranted claims for a product and it set up the Federal Trade Commission to protect more scrupulous rivals and to defend the public against the danger of monopoly by the most unreliable. In 1938, the Commission was given broad power to operate against deception alone, whether or not the deception furthered monopoly.

"Those who agree with Secretary Weeks feel these powers have been so used as to check the small entrepreneur bringing out a new and untested product. They do not think laboratory tests are always a safe guide. They argue that 40 years ago, no scientist would have discovered or identified the vitamins in Scott's emulsion....

"So, they say, let buyers judge for themselves. Subject the new product to the 'test of the market place.' Let the government stay out of the matter."

Risks of this policy, Wiggins notes, include the possibility that millions of consumers will be bilked, honest rival companies will be destroyed and that a finally cynical public will not give any new product a ready market....

On the other hand, in maintaining the present FTC controls, "it is possible that individuals have been prevented from marketing products the claims for which they could not substantiate to the satisfaction of government laboratories and the FTC. Are the gains of regulation worth this risk? That is essentially what Congress and the country must decide."

**IF NOT FTC, THEN WHO?** Second -- "Secretary Weeks and his colleagues are not only asking 'what regulations?' but they wish to know who should do whatever regulating is necessary. That they have doubts about the FTC is plainly shown in the Secretary's testimony before the Senate Small Business Committee. Commerce, through the old Bureau of Corporation, exercised many of the investigative functions of the FTC before 1914. But Congress decided to set up FTC independently because ... [it] wanted an independent and quasi-judicial agency" not subject to "political" pressures.

Now, says Wiggins, Secretary Weeks has put the FTC on the spot by direct action. The Commission has been getting from the Bureau of Standards the "advisory opinions on which most of its actions against deception have been based. Without the Bureau's ready cooperation, its operations in this field will be crippled. By this strange route, the FTC thus finds itself, to a degree, back in the Commerce Department which it left in 1914.

"Who is to regulate and how much? These are the questions that now are to be debated again. The Secretary is an able and sincere advocate of minimal regulation by a benevolent regulator, confident of the justice and fairness of the test of the market place. Those who believe otherwise are going to have to struggle to maintain a trend in the opposite direction, in progress in American Government since 1914."

**Senate Small Business Committee membership:** Republicans -- Edward J. Thye (Minn.), chairman; Tobey (N.H.), Ferguson (Mich.), Saltonstall (Mass.), Hendrickson (N.J.), Schoeppel (Kan.), Duff (Pa.); and Democrats -- Sparkman (Ala.), Long (La.), Gillette (Ia.), Humphrey (Minn.), Hunt (Wyo.), Smathers (Fla.)

## SECURITY SET-UP STILL UNCERTAIN

The new federal security program (NL 53-3) has yet to be announced by the Administration, although hints of its imminence appear frequently in the press. While Attorney General Brownell has implied vaguely that some impartial agency might be given a supervisory function, apprehension persists that the chief official of each Government department and agency will have full responsibility to hire and dismiss. It does not now appear that there will be provision for appeal from an official's decision, nor a single review board to give, by example, uniform evaluation to evidence.

### I. E. R. B. DISCONTINUED

Another victim of the current administrative reorganization is said to be the Industrial Employment Review Board -- the only appeal mechanism for security cases of civilian employees under contract to the military. In its place, there may be set up new regional agencies, with new procedures, criteria, and personnel. While regional boards may have some advantages, the FAS Committee on Loyalty and Security has called attention to the dangers inherent in decentralized organization. It suggests the overall program at the minimum should have definite standards and carefully considered procedures so that a particularly harsh board will not in effect set the pace for all. In addition, there should be continual recognition of the different degrees of sensitivity of scientific work.

### THE PROBES OF ACADEME

No let-up of the current probes of educators is in sight. Reports alleging violations of academic freedom and of the rights of college instructors are said to be swamping the office of the American Assoc. of University Professors, according to Dr. R. E. Himstead, the association's general secretary. The AAUP, in a 10-page statement issued after 6 months' study of the "Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and their Faculties," voiced a plea for academic freedom -- asserting that the "discipline or dismissal of a faculty member should not be assumed by political authority" and that "universities deprecate special loyalty tests to which others are not subjected." At the same time, the AAUP stated that "invocation of the Fifth Amendment places upon the professor a heavy burden of proof of his fitness to hold a teaching position. It is his duty as a citizen to speak out if he is called upon to answer for his convictions." However, 30 AAUP members at Columbia said (Apr. 16) refusal to testify "is not in itself a proper cause for dismissal." Since NL 53-3 appeared, the list of adverse critics of Congressional investigative methods has swelled to include 56 Mass. educators and many others.

### B W DEBATE CONTINUES IN UNITED NATIONS

A UN probe into Communist charges that the United States had used germ weapons in Korea was voted 52-5 in the UN Political and Security Committee April 8. (See also NL 53-3) Cooperation by the Soviet bloc is not expected, in spite of the mild tone of recent Soviet repetition of the charges. Said US delegate Gross: "We feel that a lie is just as false whether it is whispered or shouted." Philippine delegate Romulo pointed out that the accusations were directed not only at the US but against all countries of the UN side in Korea. He invited the accusers "to put up or shut up."

### US RE-AFFIRMS POSITION

In response to the Communist attempt to discredit the US by calling attention to US failure to ratify the Geneva protocol of 1925 outlawing bacteriological weapons, Gross stated that the protocol was an ineffective deterrent. Even though every member of the UN were to ratify it, the "Soviet Government, having already hurled the lie about the UN use of germ warfare in Korea, would be free under its own reservations to the Geneva protocol to use germ warfare against any UN member. There is no security in such an arrangement." Gross called for a workable plan for "honest international control of bacteriological weapons." Poland attacked the resolution on the ground that Chinese and North Korean Communists had not been invited to participate in the discussion of the inquiry proposal. The resolution now goes to the UN General Assembly.

### FAS WASHINGTON MEETINGS, April 29 - May 2

Press Conference (tentative), April 29, 5 PM

Council, Session I, April 29, 8 PM, Science Service Building, 1719 N Street, NW (Observers welcome)

OPEN MEMBERSHIP MEETING, April 30, 8 PM, Cosmos Club (unless otherwise posted)  
"Science in Government." Arrangements by WAS

Executive Committee, May 1

Council, Session II, May 2, 4 PM, Science Service

### DR. HILL ELECTED FAS CHAIRMAN

In the balloting completed on April 1 the membership chose David L. Hill, Professor of Physics at Vanderbilt University, as FAS Chairman for 1953-54. E. U. Condon, Director of Research at Corning Glass, was elected Vice-chairman. Hill was formerly active in the Princeton Chapter and as a volunteer in Washington. He has been a member of the Council since 1950. At the same time, members-at-large elected the following as their representatives on the FAS Council: J. Bregman, C. D. Coryell, E. C. Kemble, M. S. Livingston, V. F. Weisskopf (Cambridge); L. H. Donnell (Chicago); P. Morrison (Cornell); J. B. Phelps (Yale); R. L. Platzman (Purdue); A. S. Wightman (Princeton); H. C. Wolfe (New York). Representatives from the seven chapters complete the Council roster.

### AMAZING M.A.S.E.

A sprightly 1-page mimeographed bulletin, issued weekly by the Mohawk Assoc. of Scientists and Engineers, is at once an example and a testimonial to the methods of one of FAS' most effective chapters. This year's issues, announcing and reporting the group's weekly luncheon meetings, have been concerned with: congressional investigation into communism in educational institutions, proposed changes in the Atomic Energy Act, US visa policy for visiting scientists, educational TV, World Federation or Atlantic Union, loyalty and security problems in government agencies, UN, and H-bombs. A well written issue appeared soon after the Astin affair developed.

\*\*\*\*\*  
The FAS is a national organization of scientists concerned with the impact of science on national and world affairs. This Newsletter is designed primarily to inform the membership and stimulate discussion of relevant issues. The facts and opinions contained do not reflect official FAS policies unless specifically so indicated. The Newsletter is edited by member-volunteers in the Washington area. Comments and contributions are invited.  
\*\*\*\*\*

NOTICE -- The scientific community should have insurance that FAS-type activity will be forthcoming promptly when unpredictable crises like the Astin affair occur. Membership growth, participation and other support can be this insurance. Use the coupon or send for a copy of the new FAS brochure just published.

- MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION -- Dues: Regular - \$5 (with income below \$2500 - \$3); Supporting - \$10; Patron - \$25. New membership and an introductory subscription to Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists - \$7.50 (with income below \$2500 - \$5.50).
- NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIPTION -- \$2 to non-members (all members receive the Newsletter)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address \_\_\_\_\_

Check enclosed  Send bill   
MAIL TO: FAS, 1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

## HOUSE AGAIN CUTS NSF FUNDS

The National Science Foundation was allowed only \$5.7 million by the House Appropriations Committee in its report on April 17. The Budget Bureau had called for about \$ 12 1/4 million, already less than the \$15 million statutory limit. The House committee's figure is an increase over the \$3.5 million approved by them a year ago, and is even somewhat more than the actual 1952-53 appropriation of \$4.75 million. At best, it now appears that the final figure for next year will be no more than a modest increase over the present financing. If the present trend continues, it will be many years before the NSF has sufficient funds to carry out a scientific program fully adequate to existing needs. There has been no further action on the Smith-Aiken bill (S. 977) to remove the ceiling on NSF appropriations (see NL 53-3).

**LIMITED ACTIVITY** The House committee apparently took little heed of NSF director Alan T. Waterman's warning that this nation's present output of scientists and engineers has sunk to only approximately one third of the 1950 output, while at the same time our research output has trebled. He also stated that in 1955 it is estimated that Russia will be graduating 50,000 engineers compared to 17,000 in the United States. A similar situation will exist with respect to the production of all types of scientists. Though severely limited by available funds, the NSF is active in attempting to alleviate this situation, as exemplified by the April 2 announcement of 556 graduate fellowship awards in the natural sciences for 1953-54.

**RESEARCH SUPPORT** On April 9, the NSF announced 60 grants in support of scientific studies and conferences, the third group of awards to have been made in the past 10 months. Fifteen scientific fields are represented, including several grants for research on the learning process under the category of psychobiology. The duration of the grants is from 6 months to 3 years.

### LIE DETECTOR USE DISCONTINUED

The AEC has established a new and restricted policy on the use of the polygraph (lie-detector) as a tool in its security program. Its present periodic use at Oak Ridge in widespread check-ups will be stopped, but the procedure will be retained in specific cases. The AEC has concluded that the machine affords the basis for only an "indeterminate marginal increase in security" beyond that afforded by other established procedures. It was also concluded that the substantial cost in money, morale, personnel recruitment and labor relations far outweighed the limited advantages of lie detector use. Its principal value, the AEC found, was in "detection of pilferage."

### F A S NEWSLETTER

Federation of American Scientists  
1749 L Street, N.W.  
Washington 6, D.C.

## SLOWDOWN ON PASSPORTS

The procedures of the State Department Passport Division are still far from satisfactory, in spite of the appeal mechanism set up last September, according to reports reaching the passport committee. To date no use has been made of the appeal machinery, apparently because the Passport Division has simply failed to reach a decision in questionable cases.

An excellent example is afforded by the unsuccessful efforts of one outstanding US chemist to obtain a passport. Although he applied seven months ago, the Passport Division has yet to take action on his application. The case of Anne Bauer, whose court suit last May helped force the Department to set up appeal procedures, has also received no action. Since indefinite delay may be equivalent to passport refusal for individuals planning trips on specific dates, the FAS passport committee intends to concentrate at present on an attempt to persuade the State Department to speed up action on passport applications. The adequacy of the appeal procedure itself is of no immediate concern so long as no adverse decisions are announced.

**McCARRAN ACT ATTACKED** The Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, in a letter to the N. Y. Times March 24, called for a complete rewriting of the Act. They feel that if Congress attempts to amend the law instead of rewriting it "from beginning to end," this will constitute a "half cure," since the "real vice...lies in innumerable little details in the law, which are hidden by the gobbledygook language in which it is written." The lawyers conclude that the Act "in its spirit and in its technique of codification is a throwback to statute writing in some of the worst periods of English history of the Middle Ages."

**BRITISH VERSION** Last November the British Foreign Office asked Prof. C. F. Powell, Nobel Prize physicist, to undertake a series of lectures on his scientific specialty at leading West German universities. Powell accepted; then the Foreign Office abruptly cancelled the trip on the eve of his departure for fear the lectures might have a "political complexion" in view of Powell's association with the British Peace Committee.

The British Association of Scientific Workers Executive Committee vigorously protested, and said that such action, which "serves to restrict free scientific communication, will in the long run seriously impair the development of science and technical progress." Powell, its President, stated: "This incident affords a good illustration of the way in which the present international tensions are frustrating the cooperation and ordinary scientific intercourse between the scientists of even friendly countries. If these tendencies continue they will lead to a rapid and serious weakening of our whole scientific heritage."

Sec. 34.66, P. L. & R.  
U. S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
WASHINGTON, D. C.  
PERMIT NO. 9124

Postmaster: If addressee has moved and new address is known, please forward and advise of new address on Form 3547. If new address unknown, return to sender. Postage for these services guaranteed.