

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

Published by the  
FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS  
1805 H Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.  
Donald J. Hughes, Chairman

No. 56 - 4

----- to provide information  
and to stimulate discussion. Not to  
be attributed as official FAS policy  
unless specifically so indicated.

April 23, 1956

## PROGRESS on "Atoms for Peace"

The most encouraging development to come from the protracted multi-nation negotiations on President Eisenhower's "atoms-for-peace" proposal was announced by the State Department on Apr. 18. Twelve nations, including both the US and USSR, have reached unanimous agreement on the text of a charter for a proposed International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

**EXAMPLE OF ACCOMODATION** Although the text of the charter will not be released until officially reported to participating governments, advance reports indicated that agreement was reached through accomodation on both sides. Russia conceded both her demand for inclusion of Communist China and for a UN Security Council veto on the agency's activities. Negotiation appears to have smoothed a tangle of disagreements among atomic "have" and "have-not" nations over size and representation on the governing board, as well as the ever-present East-West balance-of-power struggles for ultimate control over the agency's activities. Views of the US regarding the size of the governing board, of the USSR on Big Power board representation, and of producer-countries -- such as Belgium -- desirous of protecting their bargaining position in the agency, all appear to have been moderated.

**PROBABLE STRUCTURE** Earliest indications are that the IAEA will consist of: (1) a board of governors expanded to include representatives of 23 nations (the original proposal was for 6 members); (2) a director-general elected by the board; (3) a scientific staff under the director-general, a section of which would be responsible for continuing inspection of atomic operations sites; (4) a weighted voting procedure assuring preferential protection of "major atomic countries" (US, Britain, Russia, Canada and France), with the producing countries having full representation; and (5) a working relationship between the agency and the UN, the details to be decided upon by the board of governors.

Members of the governing board in addition to the "special interest" nations would be elected by a conference of participating nations, with geographic distribution and contribution of skills and facilities serving as primary criteria for membership.

In its present form, which is still subject to possible further revision at a September 84-nation conference at UN headquarters in New York, the IAEA is visualized as a reasonably "strong" organization, with control of its own supply of atomic materials contributed by the Big Powers. Such control, it is presumed, would give the agency board discretionary authority for both development and promotion of rational, "peaceful" atomic energy applications.

### FAS Council Meets in Washington

The FAS Council, national policy-making body of the organization, will hold its annual spring meeting in Washington this week. The two sessions will be on Wed., April 25, at 8:00 PM and Sat., Apr. 28, at 7:30 PM, in the Conference Room of the Amer. Psychological Association Building, 1333 - 16th Street, N.W. Agenda items include: election of Executive Committee, security in unclassified research, disarmament, nuclear weapons tests, academic freedom, science and foreign relations, export control of technical data, scientific manpower.

MEMBER OBSERVERS WELCOME

## DISARMAMENT DEBATE ACTIVE

Russian interest in disarmament again was expressed by Soviet Communist leader Khrushchev in a speech on Apr. 20. Referring to the East and West as "fighting cocks," Khrushchev warned that continuance of current attitudes "would lead to an arms race involving tremendous costs; that an arms race can lead only to disaster for all." President Eisenhower voiced similar sentiments in his foreign policy address on April 20.

Khrushchev's speech was in conformity with altered Soviet policies which have brought new optimism and activity on the long-frozen disarmament front. The 5-nation UN Disarmament Commission subcommittee has already considered more new proposals in its current sessions, which started Mar. 19 in London, than in the 70-odd meetings in the previous 30 months. Whether this represents genuine effort, or political maneuvering which will end in a new impasse, is anybody's guess. That hard thinking is still going on among leaders concerned with US nuclear policy is clear from recent speeches by Sen. Anderson and AEC Commissioner Murray (see below and page 3).

**US PROPOSALS** Official US proposals, presented to the UN Commission by delegate Stassen, do not essentially change our position. Emphasis is on "confidence-building" through small-scale pilot tests of aerial inspection, exchange of disarmament missions, and international monitoring of troop movements outside home countries. New details were offered of stepwise limitation of conventional and (later) nuclear armaments under a proposed Armaments Regulation Organization. Combined in the proposals, according to US spokesmen, are Anglo-French, Russian and American views. Soviet delegate Gromyko questioned Stassen closely on the US position but gave little hint of Soviet reaction.

**SOVIET PROPOSALS** Former Soviet insistence that a ban on nuclear weapons must come first was abandoned in their proposal of Mar. 27. Emphasis is shifted to conventional disarmament, with nuclear control hardly mentioned except for prohibition of tests. The latter point was re-emphasized on Apr. 18 by a Soviet note protesting US tests scheduled for Eniwetok on May 8 -- as a violation of US commitments under the UN Charter for protection of trust territories.

The Russian and US proposals, though seemingly close in basic emphasis, conflict in almost all details, the N. Y. Times observed (Apr. 1). The USSR proposes cutting armed forces to 1,500,000, whereas the US regards 2,500,000 as the minimum needed for domestic, NATO and far eastern commitments. Russia proposes a 3-year step-wise disarmament, with only lip service to aerial inspection; America, on the other hand, insists upon an "open sky" as the initial and essential requisite for agreement (Times, Apr. 11). The Soviets propose Germany as a test area for disarmament, whereas German rearmament and unification have been adjuncts to all Western control plans.

### MURRAY FOR RATIONAL A-ARMAMENT

A policy of "rational nuclear armament" was called for by Thomas E. Murray in testimony Apr. 12 before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Disarmament. The policy was seen as required both by ethical considerations and by realistic (Continued on Page 3, Column 1)

# ACADEMY SECURITY REPORT

# BEGINS TO TAKE EFFECT

## AAUP DRAWS ACADEMIC FREEDOM LINE

The Amer. Association of University Professors, at its 42nd meeting in St. Louis on Apr. 6-7, placed on its censure list 8 universities and colleges -- the largest group ever cited at one time -- for violations of academic freedom and tenure dating back as far as 1949. The resolutions of censure were all passed overwhelmingly or unanimously, though not without bitter minority opposition in some cases.

**ON THE LISTS** Cited for censure were: U. California, Ohio State U., Rutgers, Temple, Jefferson Medical College, U. of Oklahoma, St. Louis U. and N. Dakota Agricultural College. The first six actions leading to censure involved dismissals resulting from loyalty-security controversies. Committed by an AAUP special committee, for supporting faculty members involved in such controversies, were: U. of Chicago, Cornell, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, MIT and Sarah Lawrence.

**PRINCIPLES** Prior to voting on censure, the Association adopted basic principles for justifying dismissals. Rejecting the notion that invocation of the Fifth Amendment, or past or present membership in the Communist Party, are adequate grounds for dismissal, the Association found the only legitimate grounds to be: "unfitness to teach because of incompetence, lack of scholarly objectivity or integrity, serious misuse of the classroom or of academic prestige, gross personal misconduct, or conscious participation in conspiracy against the government."

In invoking censure, the AAUP noted that California, Ohio State, Oklahoma and Temple have recently made "substantial progress" toward acceptable policies on academic freedom and tenure, and authorized its Academic Freedom committee to confer with the administrations of these schools "in regard to further improvements and the removal of the censure."

## PASSPORT CASES PENDING

Two significant passport suits, brought by singer Paul Robeson and attorney Leonard Boudin, moved toward a decision this month in the US Court of Appeals, with the entire 8-judge bench hearing oral arguments. Robeson's case centers around his refusal to sign a non-Communist affidavit. Boudin has sworn he is not now a Communist but refuses to sign a statement with regard to past party membership.

**PARTY MEMBERSHIP STATUS DEMANDED** The decisions in these suits presumably will decide the legality of a new passport application questionnaire,

scheduled to go into effect about July 1, which will ask about present and past Communist party membership. Such information has in the past been required by the Passport Division in a great many special cases, but the present standard application form does not cover the Communist question.

Also at issue in the Boudin case is the current Passport Division practice of using secret information. In the event that the Appeals Court fails to make a definite ruling on this point for Boudin, it is sure to come up again in the case of physicist Bruce Dayton. Dayton, who is scheduled to be heard by the Appeals Court in May, will argue that current procedures of the State Department Board of Passport Appeals do not satisfy the requirement of due process.

## SECURITY LAW CHANGE

Attorney General Brownell asked Congress on Apr. 17 for a relatively minor amendment to the statute (Public Law 733, 81st Congress) on which the current loyalty-security program is based. The amendment would make unnecessary "mandatory suspension" prior to invoking hearing procedures.

In a masterpiece of understatement, the Attorney General said the mandatory suspension "sometimes works an undue hardship on an officer or employee." The *N. Y. Times* of April 18 called the recommended change "the first proposal made by the Eisenhower Administration for a basic statutory change affecting the loyalty-security programs," and reported that Reps. Celler (D, N.Y.) and Keating (R, N.Y.) had promptly announced support.

On April 4, the White House released a report of the Committee on Loyalty in Relation to Government Support of Unclassified Research, which recommended that the only test in the award of grants and contracts for non-secret research should be the scientific integrity of the applicant and the merit of his program. The committee was appointed by National Academy of Sciences (NAS) President Detlev W. Bronk, as a result of a White House request Jan. 11, 1955 that the Academy "counsel with the Government on its policy in this matter." [Text of report: *Science*, 4/20]

**USPHS SHIFTS POLICY** By Apr. 20 the report, though not publicly commented on by the White House, clearly was beginning to affect the thinking and policy of executive agencies. Bellweather was the US Public Health Service, whose security policies on unclassified research grants have aroused much controversy. Replying to an inquiry from the AAAS, Surgeon General Scheele stated: "In the past several months the PHS has, within the limits of available appropriations, approved all recommended research and training grant applications on the basis of scientific merit assessed by our advisory groups. We follow a practice similar to that described by the Nat. Science Foundation in its 5th Annual Report [see NL 56-3]. . ."

This was in sharp contrast to the statement in 1954 of Mrs. Hobby, then Secretary of Health, Education & Welfare, that "it is the practice of the Dept. to deny support" when an individual has engaged in subversive activities or "there is serious question of his loyalty." In adopting its new policy, USPHS joined NSF in employing essentially the procedures outlined and endorsed by the Academy committee. According to Anthony Lewis (*N. Y. Times*, Apr. 22), consideration is being given to making these procedures uniform for all executive agencies.

**ORIGIN OF PROBLEM** The committee noted that "there appears to be no Act of Congress, including the appropriation Acts relating to awards for unclassified research, which provides guidance" (or for that matter statutory regulations -- Ed.) concerning the course of action to be followed when serious question of a grantee's loyalty is brought to a grantor's attention. Indeed, the committee observed with tacit approval, that by and large the Government has refrained from initiating inquiries into the personal character of those carrying on unclassified research. The fact that questions of loyalty nevertheless have been raised, and that in several instances grants have been denied or terminated at the discretion of the grantor because of loyalty considerations, indicates that such information probably was furnished by private individuals or groups and not by legally constituted investigative bodies.

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS** Though few in number and briefly stated, the findings and recommendations of the committee are fundamental in nature. The committee observed: (1) "Unclassified research by its very nature and definition requires no secrecy but thrives on the dissemination of new knowledge;" (2) progress in science is based upon the integrity of the investigator, and his moral and political beliefs "have no bearing on the merit of his research;" (3) "Lack of scientific integrity from whatever cause will be revealed inevitably by the normal critical scrutiny to which the free and open work of every scientist is subjected;" and (4) "There is no reason for singling out research for the application of loyalty requirements which set it apart from the multitude of other unclassified activities engaged in by the Government through contracts and grants."

Based upon these findings, the committee recommended that the scientific integrity of a researcher and the merit of his program should be the only test in the award of grants and contracts, and that "an allegation of disloyalty should not by itself be grounds for adverse administrative action." In those cases where indications of disloyalty appear to warrant any action at all, it was recommended that the Government "has no other course than to bring formal charges and to produce the evidence in open hearing before legally constituted authority."

Committee members: J. A. Stratton, chairman (MIT), R. F. Bacher (Cal. Tech.), L. Bell (Chicago), R. F. Loeb (Columbia U.), W. O. Fenn (Roch.), E. B. Wilson (Harvard), H. M. Wriston (Brown).

**MURRAY FOR RATIONAL A-ARMAMENT (Cont. from Page 1)** appraisal of the military applicability of atomic weapons. Calling for a clear distinction between different kinds of nuclear warfare, Murray said, "It would be fatal to permit ourselves to drift into the habit of thinking about nuclear war only in all-out terms... A limited nuclear war is a feasibility that our consciences can face and accept." The US Atomic Energy Commissioner contended also that the proposed policy would effectively advance international disarmament.

**A MODERATE'S ARSENAL**

Murray's specific proposals: (1) An upper limit should be set to the size of bombs. (President Eisenhower expressed a similar opinion in a press conference Mar. 21.) (2) The number of big bombs should be limited. (3) The production of very small A-bombs should be greatly intensified, despite the increase in cost and recognized inefficiency, to form a broad base upon which a pyramid of intermediate and large-size bombs could be superimposed. (4) The testing of multi-megaton thermonuclear bombs should be stopped, since we already have enough.

Such an arsenal of diversified nuclear weapons, Murray said, would allow a moderate and localized use of force, and thus would reduce the menace of all-out nuclear war. He labelled unrealistic the current policy to increase the size of bombs while at the same time disclaiming any intent to use them. The concept of a "balance of terror" he called dangerous, because such a balance can be upset easily and can lead to a preventive nuclear blitz. On the other hand, the concept of deterrence is in itself valid. Stressing the idea that our stockpile should include only those weapons we intend to use, Murray said, "the deterrent value of nuclear weapons is drained out of them when there is any doubt about their actually being used." The size and nature of our atomic stockpile, Murray suggested, should be planned by the military but only with the collaboration of Congress and other governmental agencies, taking due account of the problems of radioactive fallout in the light of our present limited knowledge.

**NO BAN ON BOMBS**

Murray recommended no blanket renunciation of atomic bombs. The Soviet invitation to "ban the bomb" he termed a slogan of "false idealism."

Nonetheless, in Murray's view, the disaster to the civilians of Hiroshima cannot now be justified. The time has come, he said, for the US to establish its own program of rational disarmament without waiting "for the establishment of an international disarmament control agency." Such a policy, announced and publicized "on the highest possible level," would halt the present precipitous race to more destructive weapons, and hence be a step toward general disarmament.

**Arms Race Appraised by Anderson**

Constructive alternatives to the hectic arms race were outlined by Sen. Clinton Anderson, chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, in a soul-searching address to the 6th annual High Energy Nuclear Physics Conference at Rochester, N.Y. on Apr. 6. Anderson noted that, with the growing stockpiles of nuclear materials and the coming widespread utilization of atomic energy, disarmament -- as it was proposed and as it may have been possible from 1945-48 -- is no longer feasible. On the other hand, the necessity for lessening international tensions and for a concomitant decrease of armaments has been greatly accentuated by the enormous destructive power of nuclear weapons.

**TECHNOLOGY FOR PEACE**

Senator Anderson asked how this conflict could be resolved in a constructive manner. He proposed that new areas of technology, which have not yet led to practical results, be developed jointly for peaceful purposes by all nations in world laboratories. He cited, as three fields "in which joint efforts may prove especially useful," climate control, exploration and maybe conquest of space, and controlled thermonuclear power.

"If the great powers find themselves in an atomic stalemate today," Anderson asserted, it is through "carry-over of patterns of 'national security' which modern science has rendered obsolete." "In fact, it may be just because of the possible military applications from these new technologies that we shall wish to develop them jointly with all the principal powers participating in world laboratories created for the purpose." The problems are simpler than with already achieved weapons because no one nation has yet a vested interest in them, he argued. Since the new technologies may very well displace the old, "a war-weary world" may thus "achieve in time a form of disarmament by obsolescence." Thus the race for atomic arms may well be halted best by having new fields of science developed jointly by all nations -- through the UN as the "natural agency" to supervise the world effort.

**WORLD PASSPORT**

Complementing these proposals, the Senator urged removal of "many of our restrictions on free travel and exchange of information," measures which "foster fear and suspicion rather than cooperation and understanding." He proposed "establishment of a world passport, which... would permit its holder to travel freely in lands of all member nations. A list of nominees... would be prepared by a committee of participating nations, and the honor would be conferred only on those who received a unanimous vote of approval from all member nations." The list might include leaders in art, religion, government, science, education and business. It "could become a highly coveted award [and] promote a degree of mutual trust and understanding that might... help to halt the race for atomic arms and forestall a war that nobody wants."

\* \* \* \* \*

The FAS is a national organization of scientists and engineers concerned with the impact of science on national and world affairs. The Newsletter is edited by members of the FAS Washington Chapter.

- 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 - \$8.50 (with income below \$2500 - \$6.50).
- SUBSCRIPTION to INFORMATION BULLETINS** -- \$10 to individuals; \$25 for Societies, etc. (including Newsletter)
- NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIPTION** -- \$2 to non-members (all members receive the Newsletter)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

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

Check enclosed  Send bill   
 MAIL TO: FAS, 1805 H Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.



### SOVIET EXCHANGE OF PHYSICISTS

Three Russian nuclear physicists from the Lebedev Physics Institute of the Moscow Academy of Science were among scientists from 18 countries attending the 6th Annual High Energy Nuclear Physics Conference at the University of Rochester April 3-7. They were Prof. V. I. Veksler, the co-inventor of the synchrotron, Prof. Markov, a mathematical physicist, and Prof. Silin, a theoretical physicist. The Russian scientists contributed a number of papers and participated freely in the discussions. They also gave an interview to the local press, in which they stressed the beneficial effects of scientific collaboration.

Prof. Veksler described USSR plans for a 50 billion volt accelerator. A 10 billion volt supercyclotron is to be completed within a year and 10 US scientists have been invited to its unveiling (see Newsletter 56-3). Veksler addressed the conference banquet April 6, expressing hope for more such occasions for scientific exchange.

Continuing their new policy of opening their research to scientists from other countries, the Russians received on April 10 six Swedish atomic scientists for a 10-day tour of Soviet atomic research institutions. Reuters also reports that scientists from Communist China, Poland and East Germany arrived in Moscow for a conference on radioactive substances and chemical research opening March 31.

### TO EXPAND TECHNOLOGICAL MANPOWER

A National Committee for the Development of Scientists and Engineers was created Apr. 4 by President Eisenhower, to "foster the development of more highly qualified technological manpower." Howard L. Bevis, president of Ohio State U., is chairman; the 18 members are leaders in science, engineering, state and local government, management, labor and the humanities. A special inter-departmental government group had studied the problem and agreed that citizens' groups had the "basic responsibility" for encouraging technological personnel. Establishment of a President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School was also announced Mar. 28. It will look into education problems, teaching and housing for the expected enrollment increase in the coming years, and the shortage of scientists and engineers.

FAS views were sought recently on the scientific manpower problem, which is the subject of hearings Apr. 17-19 and 24-26 by the Research & Development Subcommittee of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. Subcommittee Chairman Melvin Price (D, Ill.) had earlier solicited FAS opinion "on what aspects of the problem should be covered [in these hearings] and particularly what areas you yourself believe important..." In his reply, FAS Chairman Donald J. Hughes urged the Subcommittee to take into consideration the "detering effect of loyalty and security practices on scientists relative to Government supported research."

### F A S NEWSLETTER

Federation of American Scientists  
1805 H Street, N. W.  
Washington 6, D. C.

56 - 4

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.

### PRICE NEW F A S CHAIRMAN

Charles C. Price, chairman of the Department of Chemistry at the University of Pennsylvania and former department head at Notre Dame, was elected FAS chairman for 1956-57. Price is an old hand at elections, having run unsuccessfully for Congress from the 3rd District of Indiana in 1952. Elected vice-chairman was Martin Deutsch, professor of physics at M.I.T., and a member of the faculty there since '41. Deutsch has been a delegate-at-large to the FAS Council since '55.

**COUNCIL DELEGATES** Members-at-large chose the following delegates to the Council: S. H. Bauer (chem, Cornell), P. G. Bergmann (phys, Syracuse & Brooklyn), G. F. Chew (phys, U. Ill.), E. U. Condon (phys, Berkeley), H. W. J. Courant (phys, U. Cal.), S. De Benedetti (phys, Carnegie Tech.), P. M. Doty (chem, Harvard), L. C. Dunn (zoology, Columbia), J. T. Edsall (biochem, Harvard), I. Fankuchen (phys-chem, Brooklyn Poly.), B. T. Feld (phys, MIT), S. E. Luria (bacteriol, U. Ill.), P. Meier (biostat, Johns Hopkins), L. S. Osborne (phys, MIT), W. Rall (phys, Yale), A. Rapoport (math-biol, U. Mich.), M. B. Visscher (physiol, U. Minn.), J. S. Youngner (bacteriol, U. Pittsburgh) and E. Zwilling (embryol, University of Connecticut).

The newly elected delegates join 11 hold-over delegates-at-large, 10 chapter delegates, and 4 officers, to make up the new 44-member FAS Council.

### SCIENCE ATTACHES: USSR = 2; US = 0

Diplomatic sources in Stockholm indicated that Soviet scientists are being assigned to Russian embassies in all important capitals, the AP reported on April 11. A metallurgist and an agricultural expert have joined the Stockholm mission as councillors, the dispatch said.

A similar program was initiated by the US State Dept. in 1951 and, at its peak, 10 scientists were assigned to US embassies abroad. Recently, the last two American scientific attaches were withdrawn, a move the AP reported was "for lack of funds." At a meeting of the Washington FAS chapter on Mar. 13, however, Acting State Dept. Science Adviser Walter M. Rudolph, in answer to queries, said that the attache program has been under review by the Department and it has not seemed advisable meanwhile to appoint replacements for those attaches whose terms expired. Reliable sources indicate that this "review" has been under way at least since early 1954, and probably since the inception of the present Administration's economy drive in 1953. Rep. Daniel J. Flood (D, Pa.) has shown a lively interest in the State Department's inaction, and has written to Secretary Dulles for an explanation of the program's demise, particularly in view of the new Russian appointments.

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

DR. ROBERT SIMHA  
6505 SLIGO PARKWAY  
W. HYATTSVILLE, MD.