

F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

RETURN TO
FAS

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS
December 12, 1951

1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.
51 - 9

U. S. SCIENCE BEHIND THE McCARRAN WALL

SAMPLE DATA:

Illustrative of visa-rejection cases reported in the press is the twice-denied application of Dr. Ernest B. Chain, Nobel Prize-winning biochemist. Typical was the State Department's unilluminating comment that Dr. Chain was regarded as inadmissible under the terms of the new Internal Security Act of 1950 (*N. Y. Times*, Dec. 5). Also typical was Dr. Chain's incredulity at his exclusion. With information from one side and none from the other, public evaluation of any visa action is difficult. As with loyalty and security cases, the tendency to avoid publicity is understandable. Also, it is impossible to judge whether the publicized cases are representative of those confronting the State Department. Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that cases like this one, with all that they imply for our international reputation, will be judged here and abroad on the information available (*N. Y. Times*, Dec. 5):

Dr. Chain, a German refugee and British citizen, now in Rome, requested a visa last spring to visit the U.S. on one leg of a five-week scientific survey mission for the UN World Health Organization. His application was rejected in April and a subsequent formal request by WHO dragged on without action into the summer. WHO was eventually compelled to make other arrangements.

This fall Dr. Chain was invited to speak at a New York fund-raising dinner for Israel's Weizmann Institute of Science. When this visa application was turned down, Dr. Chain wrote in a strongly worded letter to an Institute official that the denial of visas would ultimately be detrimental to the U.S., "because no country, not even the United States, can develop its science in isolation." The letter termed his exclusion "ludicrous" since he was largely responsible for the creation and development of the prosperous penicillin industry. He reaffirmed his disinterest in politics and lack of political affiliation, describing himself as "no more a Communist than Acheson." Dr. Chain said a trip for WHO to Czechoslovakia to restore a penicillin plant might have been the cause of the visa denial, or "slandorous statements to the FBI." He also pointed out that his inability to get the first visa was, in effect, a denial to WHO and noted that the U.S. is an important WHO member.

It is noteworthy that the "highest officials" of the *N. Y. Times* article of Dec. 9 (see adjacent column) did not cite particular cases of refusal or delay of visa, believing that "their case is built not on individual names but on the general effect of the restrictions among many influential persons abroad." The *Times*, however, felt it necessary to illustrate the generalities with three specific examples. And the *Washington Post* (Dec. 11) in a thoughtful editorial, with Chain and the non-arrivals at the international chemistry meetings as examples, deploras that we "arbitrarily" bar men and women "who have won the world's respect." The designation, "arbitrarily," is well used since the individuals involved are given no opportunity to defend themselves either privately or, if they choose, before the bar of world opinion. Such procedures in the peculiarly sensitive area of international relations are damaging not only to the individual but to the national interest.

AAAS to Hear About Scientists' Visa Difficulties. On Dec. 30, at a AAAS symposium in Philadelphia, a talk will be given on this subject by Dr. William H. Pearlman of Jefferson Medical College.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON VISA PROBLEM. Last week all FAS members received a questionnaire asking for information on the interference with exchange of scientific personnel through visa or passport difficulties. This is a project of the Executive Board of the Washington Association of Scientists, one of the nine FAS chapters. The results will be referred to FAS as a basis for deciding policy and action. Names are requested of individuals concerned so that the report will not unwittingly include duplicate cases. The names will not be divulged under any circumstances.

STATE SEES THE DANGER

The State Department has at long last recognized the seriousness of the damaging effect on U.S. prestige abroad of present policies on visa applications, according to the *New York Times*, December 9. Adverse comment on visa difficulties of scientists and intellectuals has particularly worried the Department. Attributing his information to "State Department officials at the highest level," reporter Walter H. Waggoner said that Congress would be advised of State's concern and would be asked to modify the McCarran Internal Security Act, whose provisions have produced chaos in the processing of visa applications. The *Times* story contrasts the feelings of officials responsible for policy with the present practices of State's own Visa Division.

This is the first open indication of strong administration pressure to resolve the contradiction between U.S. propaganda and practice which has been embarrassing scientists for more than a year. Scientists make up only a small fraction of the potential visitors affected by the strictures of the McCarran Act, but their influence is far beyond their numbers. Inordinate delay and occasional denial of visas has had the effect of exasperating and alienating some of the international-thinking people whose sympathetic understanding we most want. According to the *Times* story, State Department officials report increasingly cynical reaction in influential circles abroad to the "hypocrisy" of our pronouncements on intellectual freedom and international exchange of persons.

The McCarran criteria are rigid and sweeping. Exceptions are possible in some areas at the discretion of the Attorney General. In practice, the exceptions are rare. And delays are common. In case of doubt -- and Congressional criticism of State makes doubt preferable to risk -- visa applications are sent for decision to Washington by the overseas consulate. In consequence, the Visa Division is swamped and action sometimes takes months. For most active foreign scientists there can no longer be on-the-spur-of-the-moment visits to America. For many, there can be no visits at all.

This state of affairs must be considered the logical result, if not the intent, of deliberate Congressional action, since the McCarran Act was passed overwhelmingly over the President's veto. The Act leaves little latitude for interpretation, but the Departments of Justice and State, wary of further Congressional investigation, appear to have made little use of what latitude there is, preferring the conservative course and the narrow limits.

The *Times* story cites three possible remedies which the State Department's "highest officials" have in mind:

"(1) Revision of the law itself, to allow for more liberal application of the statute's terms relating to former members of organizations cited as totalitarian.

"(2) Speedier application of the law, to enable a decision, whether favorable or otherwise, to be made on the application for entry in fewer than the several months it now sometimes requires.

"(3) An altered interpretation of the law by the authorities operating under it that would give visa officials here or consular officers abroad greater freedom for weighing the merits of the individual visa application."

Editorialized the *New York Times* on December 10: "No doubt some individuals are undesirable and should be barred, but our policy should always be to keep the number...as small as is consistent with the national security. Both law and administration of law must take account of the many facets of the national interest, balancing always possible dangers to security against the clear advantages of acting in accordance with our professed ideals. Changes in the McCarran Act to give administrative officials greater leeway are obviously needed. But even before this can be attained, improvement can be had by less fearful administration of the present law and a relaxation of the secrecy about its applications in individual cases."

UN DISARMAMENT DEBATE

The Big Four Disarmament Committee, which has been seeking a middle ground between proposals made to the UN by the U.S. and amendments submitted by the USSR, reported its meagre results on December 11. The single concrete step was an agreement to form a 12-member commission, under the Security Council, to begin work early next year. For the rest, the negotiations succeeded in again defining their differences, and in conducting their talks in what UN Assembly President Luis Padilla Nervo called a remarkable spirit of cordiality.

Despite this new discouragement, there continues to be cautious optimism in some quarters. The optimists point to several factors which may lead to a new look at disarmament and atomic control:

(1) Mounting obstacles, both economic and political, to the early successful completion of the Western military build-up; (2) A resulting shift in U.S. foreign policy toward greater emphasis on diplomatic easements before realizing "situations of strength everywhere"; (3) The altered strategic picture produced by the large atomic stock-pile accumulated in the U.S. and growing in the USSR; (4) Evidence in negotiations in Korea and the UN that the USSR genuinely wishes to reduce tension and avoid general war.

United Nations World for December views the Truman-Acheson disarmament proposals, launched with full fanfare last month and widely interpreted as a simple propaganda maneuver, as indication of a long-planned "change in America's approach to the East-West conflict." It says that "the mounting evidence that the military arm of U.S. foreign policy was not gaining strength with the anticipated speed and momentum" has forced a downward revision of armament goals. Recognizing that "the military and economic shortcomings had to be counterbalanced," the State Department launched a political offensive -- which led into the current negotiations.

In the same issue of United Nations World, George W. Herald suggests that "the A-bomb race has become pointless for the United States" since its stockpile, estimated as "running in four figures," is already adequate to blanket worthwhile enemy targets. "Hereafter, each bomb the Reds add to their stock is going to endanger one more U.S. city, whereas new bombs built in America will no longer materially increase the threat hanging over Stalingrad." On the other hand, "The atomic race must appear just as pointless to the Kremlin" since it is "hopelessly outdistanced by the West," whose surplus atomic power will be harnessed for tactical A-weapons to neutralize the major Soviet weapon -- large land armies.

With these "hard indisputable facts" as background, and regarding both the U.S.-originated UN plan and the USSR alternative as unrealistic, Herald sketches a comprehensive plan suggested by unidentified scientists. Step one would be "to forbid the use of existing atomic weapons and the production of new ones." Step two would be a world-wide UN stock-taking of all uranium and thorium deposits. Step three would be delivery by each producer country of a percentage of its yearly uranium or thorium output to the UN. The delivered material would be used for the benefit of underprivileged areas. The portion retained by the producer country would be of known amount, isotope separation plants would be limited in size by agreement and subject to continuous inspection by control officials, and detailed annual reports would have to be filed with the UN. Finally, the incentive for cheating would be reduced by the possession by both sides of the original stockpile of A-bombs.

The objections that can be raised against partial control plans of this kind are well-known. Nevertheless, it is clear that if agreement is to come at all it will be on some such partial scheme. Lawrence H. Fuchs, writing in The Nation for December 8 on "Disarmament: Facts vs. Propaganda," points out that there has already been more agreement than is generally recognized, and that the area of disagreement, while still large, is now concrete and definable. Joint consideration of atomic and conventional armaments, originally a Russian demand, is forcibly urged by the U.S. -- possibly because of the growing tactical possibilities of A-weapons. Disarmament is sought by both sides, as are an armaments census and subsequent inspection. The U.S. seems to have no objection in principle to a prohibition of atomic weapons -- a prime Russian demand -- providing a control scheme is set up first. An international commission is accepted by both, though U.S. insistence on international ownership is categorically rejected by the USSR. In many of these issues, the differences are ones of timing and degree, with distinct possibilities for compromise. Korea has taught that in these circumstances agreement can be gained, but only when patience is great and the desire for accord is genuine.

Atomic Artillery Ready. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, stated in a recent radio broadcast that we have developed and tested an artillery piece capable of firing atomic shells. He voiced the opinion, however, that this new step in weapons design would not make conventional artillery obsolete, since the amount of fissionable material is insufficient to service all guns. He reiterated his firm belief in the tactical use of atomic weapons.

The continued emphasis on the broad application of atomic weapons raises anew the threat of transfer, to the military, of custody of at least a portion of the national stockpile of fissionable material -- for quick use to fend off potential attack.

British Want A-Veto? The coming visit of British Prime Minister Churchill to the U.S. has stirred considerable speculation as to its objectives. There is more than a hint that the subject topping the agenda will be joint U.S.-British consultation before any unilateral U.S. decision to use A-bombs in case of war. This suspicion has been re-enforced by Mr. Churchill's recent Guild Hall speech. In it, he pointed out that the previous British administration had risked incurring Soviet antagonism by providing "the principal atomic base for the U.S. in East Anglia." Churchill concluded that he therefore had "every right to seek and receive the fullest consideration from Americans for our point of view, and I feel sure that this will not be denied us." Mr. Churchill stated, moreover, that he wanted to concentrate the coming talks on politico-military subjects and not bring up the dollar problem at all. He is, in fact, leaving the Chancellor of the Exchequer at home. Thus far, no official U.S. comment is available on the coming talks.

More on Collier's War. Collier's controversial issue on a "War We Do Not Want" continues to evoke well-deserved adverse comment. To many, the series of articles is fuel for the Soviet propagandists' charge of U.S. war-mongering and helps freeze the American public mind in acceptance of the inevitability of war.

Alexander Werth (The Nation, Dec. 1) quotes significant examples of European reaction. He notes, in particular, strong resentment of the Collier's-implied superiority of the cultural blessings of a U.S.-UN victory; wonderment at the naive assumption that any atomic war could be good and just; skepticism that "liberated" Russians will welcome us with open arms in the rubble of their atomized cities and over 32 million new graves. "What would people say if a Moscow magazine appeared with the Collier's story turned around?" asked L'Observateur, Paris weekly.

Four British writers, in a letter addressed to Collier's and printed in The Nation of December 8, say, "We cannot recall any previous publication which has caused such widespread alarm and indignation. Not only have you frightened and offended your friends, but you have put a God-given weapon in the hands of everyone who hates or distrusts your country, and dealt a crippling blow to those of us who do not equate peace with militant anti-Americanism." The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (November, 1951), voicing domestic indignation, characterizes the whole enterprise as a "ghastly example of editorial presumption and irresponsibility." If the intentions of the Collier's editors were as good as they claim, they owe the world some handsome compensation.

U. M. T. Universal Military Training, enacted in principle by Congress last June, is likely to become an actuality early next year. The report of the National Security Training Commission, a group set up by law to study the problem of establishing UMT, calls for the induction of as many as 800,000 18-year-olds when the program is in full effect. Six months' continuous training at a cost of \$2 billion per year is provided. The Commission proposes very few deferments, and these only until the end of a school year already started. Students granted such deferments would remain liable for training until they were 35 years of age.

Chairman Carl Vinson has ordered his Armed Services Committee to start hearings on January 9 and has announced that on January 8, the day that Congress convenes, he will submit legislation embodying the recommendations of the Commission. While the issue promises to be highly controversial, the Congressional action of last June assures that UMT will come to a vote in both houses by late March.

The proposals have received powerful support from the Truman administration, Gen. Marshall, and the American Legion. However, the entire UMT program is forcefully opposed by a number of groups, including the Friends' Committee on National Legislation, on the ground that UMT is excessively expensive, that it would be not an emergency but a permanent departure from American practice, and that it is neither a genuine nor an adequate peace program.

SCIENCE FOUNDATION

NSF -- Big-time in 1952-53? The National Science Foundation will be seeking a significantly larger appropriation in the coming session of Congress. The Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, which will include NSF, also covers such agencies as the Civil Service Commission, the AEC, and the FCC. The President's January budget message will recommend the amounts to be appropriated for each agency, and a House subcommittee will hold hearings giving opportunity to the agency to justify its budget. Much later, after the bill has been passed by the House, a Senate subcommittee will hold what are usually briefer hearings prior to Senate action. The appropriations subcommittees (and, to a lesser degree, the full committees) play the major role in setting the size of appropriations. Their membership will be set soon after the new session gets under way.

The figure set by the President in his budget message is the practical maximum limit to the appropriation of any agency, especially in an election year with much talk of economy. Last year, the NSF request was for \$14 million. This year the amount probably will be less, but likely much more than the present \$3.5 million. The hurdle of the Budget Bureau, the President's fiscal policeman, is one which NSF must get by on its own. It should have had relatively little trouble this fall in view of the consistent administration backing of the agency. However, the Budget Bureau does take the temper of Congress into account in preparing the President's recommendations and compromises desirable budgets with what Congress is likely to accept.

The justification for a large NSF appropriation is not easy to get across to the average legislator. The important benefits of the Foundation are largely intangible and long range. It is therefore essential to point up specific examples of NSF accomplishments whenever possible. This ammunition is best provided by the Foundation itself in frequent public reports on their present programs. Such information is essential if the nation's scientists are to continue to teach Congress the hard facts of scientific life.

New Chairman for NSF. Chester I. Barnard, President, Rockefeller Foundation, was elected chairman of the National Science Board at its meeting on December 3, succeeding James B. Conant. Re-elected vice chairman was Edwin B. Fred, President of the University of Wisconsin. The four members of the 9-man Executive Committee of the Board, whose terms expired, were re-elected.

Two recent changes in the National Science Board are: Earl P. Stevenson (President, Arthur D. Little Co., consulting engineers, Cambridge) and George W. Merck (President, Merck & Co., pharmaceutical manufacturers, Rahway, N.J.). Stevenson succeeds Edward L. Moreland, deceased, and Merck replaces Charles E. Wilson, who resigned. The new appointees represent fields of science similar to those of their predecessors.

The 24-man part-time National Science Board has had about ten well-attended meetings in its first year. Under the National Science Foundation Act, it is charged with detailed responsibility for operation of NSF. Organization, policy, and budget matters have been paramount during this first year; this winter the Board will begin consideration and approval of research grants and fellowship applications.

NSF Research Grants -- How to Apply. A guide for preparing proposals for NSF research grants has been distributed by the Foundation to all types of prospective "grantees." For once, there is no prescribed form for application, no exhausting questionnaire. NSF suggests that proposals be submitted by the scientist concerned, who may want first to have informal discussions with a staff member of the Foundation. The proposal itself should cover the usual outline of a research project -- description, procedure, facilities, personnel, and budget. The payments under an NSF grant are to the institution, not the scientist. Allowed overhead will normally be 15% or less. Title to equipment purchased with grants is retained by the "grantee." Quarterly or semi-annual financial reports and annual and final research reports will be requested by NSF.

A large number of research proposals have been received and were being evaluated by NSF even prior to release of this guide. Announcement of the first group of awards is expected later this winter.

New Editor for "Impact of Science on Society," the quarterly journal published by UNESCO, is Dr. Gerald Wendt, formerly editorial director of *Science Illustrated*. The December 1 announcement from Paris says Dr. Wendt will also direct UNESCO's program of public education in science beginning next month.

Scientists' Moral Responsibility. From England come two leaflets full of the same concern which led to the founding of the FAS. One announces the formation of the Science for Peace Committee (Sec'y, A. H. Gordon, 49 Flower Lane, London N.W. 7), endorsed by a distinguished roster including 18 Fellows of the Royal Society (e.g., Orr, Pirie, Bernal, Born, Needham, Lonsdale, Waddington). The Committee has as its specific purpose the prevention of a third world war, and its duties are (a) "to appeal to peoples and Governments for a negotiated and lasting settlement which will prevent a recourse to these instruments of extermination," (b) "to provide the public with information both on the destructiveness and misery of modern war and on the benefits that constructive science can bring," (c) "to strive for the removal of all barriers that restrict or embarrass the free intercourse of scientists throughout the world."

The second leaflet is Bulletin No. 1 of the Medical Association for the Prevention of War (Sec'y, Dr. Richard Doll, 24 Lansdowne Rd., London W.11), an association based on the premise that doctors, because of their ethic, have a special responsibility for peace, and having as its objects (a) to unite doctors -- having the same aims, in all countries -- in efforts to prevent a third world war, (b) to study the causes and results of war, (c) to examine the psychological mechanism by which people are conditioned to accept war as a necessity, (d) to consider the ethical responsibilities of doctors in relation to war, (e) to oppose the use of medical science in war for any purposes other than the prevention and relief of suffering, (f) to urge that the energies and money spent in preparation for war against man be directed into the fight against disease and malnutrition.

Individual Responsibility of the Scientist is the subject of a panel discussion arranged by the Society for Social Responsibility in Science for 3:00 p.m., Dec. 28, at the Hotel Bellevue-Stratford, Philadelphia, in connection with the AAAS meetings. Speakers will be Charles C. Price, Carroll C. Pratt, and William F. Hewitt, Jr.

"Special Offer" to New Members. Arrangements have just been completed to offer prospective members a "combination package," containing an introductory one-year subscription to the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* and a year's dues to FAS, for only \$7.50. For students and others with annual incomes under \$2500, the cost is \$5.50. Make checks payable to FAS and send to the FAS office.

The FAS Executive Committee meets in Washington on December 15 to discuss FAS policy and pending action on most of the topics covered in this Newsletter. The policy-forming FAS Council next meets in New York in early February.

For the first time in several months, the Executive Committee will not be faced with an immediate financial crisis affecting the continued operation of the Washington Office, where one paid secretary facilitates the work of many volunteers. The crisis has temporarily been alleviated by a broad and healthy response to FAS appeals, with funds coming from contributions, additional chapter dues, member-at-large renewals -- at a very good rate, new members, and Newsletter subscriptions.

The current FAS membership drive is beginning to show results. The mailings of the membership committee at Brookhaven now emphasize the "combination package," described above, as well as the "watchdog," alerting, action, and information functions of FAS. Members are reminded, however, that personal contacts are the most effective way to build up membership. Graduate students and the younger scientists should be made aware of FAS and given an opportunity to join. The Washington Office would appreciate the names and addresses of prospective members.

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION or SUBSCRIPTION

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

Highest Degree Received	Institution	Major Field
_____	_____	_____

Check enclosed Send statement

Annual Dues for Members-at-Large:

Regular Member* \$5 & \$3; Supporting \$10; Patron \$25

*Regular members with more than \$2500 annual income pay \$5.

Annual Newsletter subscription for non-members is \$2

Information Controls. Surviving its controversy-ridden birth, President Truman's order for uniform safeguards for "security" information is off to a precarious start in the various executive agencies. Appointments are expected to be announced soon to staff an interdepartmental subcommittee to "furnish advice and assistance" to the various departments and agencies in connection with Executive Order 10290. A former newspaperman will serve as executive secretary of the subcommittee.

The order extends, to other agencies, regulations very similar to those long enforced in the State and Defense Departments. The "broad ramifications of our national security effort," requiring additional agencies to handle classified information, are cited in justification of the extension. Other avowed purposes of the order were: to prohibit classification of non-security data, to ensure use of the lowest appropriate classification, and to downgrade or to declassify information as rapidly as conditions permit. The President hoped the result would be to increase, not diminish, the flow of information to the public.

A barrage of criticism greeted the order, particularly from the American Assoc. of Newspaper Editors and from Republic Congressmen. The ASNE asked for a method of appeal from security classification. Senators Bricker, Taft, and Mundt decried the order as a dangerous infringement of freedom of the press. At least one Democratic Senator, William Benton (D., Conn.), apparently shared the Washington Post's editorial fear that classification might be "extended beyond the real requirements of security." Benton suggested having a "People's Advocate" to fight for release of information.

At a press conference, October 4, the President defensively asserted that the press should exercise greater care in publishing information of potential value to an enemy, even information provided by an agency of the government. As an illustration, he cited an article in *Fortune* magazine in 1949 which included air views of the K-25 plant at Oak Ridge and maps of other AEC installations. When the publishers of *Fortune* pointed out that the material in question was furnished by the AEC itself, the White House issued a clarifying statement conceding that citizens could rightly assume it was safe to publish material supplied by responsible government officials.

Industrial Participation in Atomic Energy. AEC Commissioner T. K. Glennan urged greater investment by private industry in atomic development to make it "less of a straight government operation," at the Nov. 29 meeting of the Am. Society of Mechanical Engineers.

"What I'd like to see is more industries knocking at our doors asking, 'What's in it for me?'" the Commissioner said. He gave as reasons for the present investment lag: (1) "the normal profit incentive is lacking," (2) inventions and discoveries cannot be exploited in the usual way. (3) a large investment in staffs subject to the vagaries of personnel security clearance, does not appeal to the "average hard-headed industrialist." (4) health and safety standards are unusually stringent, and therefore expensive.

Encouraging to participation by private industry is "prestige," "improvement in technical resources and staff," "the trying of new processes and equipment," and "getting in on the ground floor."

Conformity and Creativeness. A significant victory was won on November 16 when the Board of Regents of the University of California reaffirmed its October decision to drop the controversial loyalty oath which has racked the University for three years. Although important questions regarding tenure remain to be settled, and the status of non-signing faculty members remains in doubt, the symbolic value of the Regents' withdrawal is not to be underestimated. Since the beginning of the oath orgy, this is the first major instance where determined opposition has forced rescission of an oath in being. A favorable effect can be hoped for in several other academic centers where struggles are going on against the cult of conformity.

As the battle over oaths has widened, it has merged into a much broader picture. It becomes increasingly clear that education all up and down the line is embroiled in a fight almost for its very existence. Buffeted at higher levels by loyalty oaths and sports scandals, suffocated at the primary level by inflated costs and steel and teacher shortages, the entire system is in crisis. Over all is the atmosphere of the cold war, which creates in many minds the mistaken belief that education is either a superfluous luxury or a machine for stamping out so many more units of "specialized personnel."

The crisis in education is of concern to scientists in several ways. Primary and secondary schools are the cradle of the scientists of twenty years hence. No amount of activity on the part of even a vastly expanded National Science Foundation can correct the inhibitive intellectual effects of inadequate and improper primary and secondary education. Academic scientists are directly affected -- both as teachers and investigators -- by the doctrine of conformity which is converting the American campus, in the words of former Chancellor Hutchins of the University of Chicago, into "a colossal housing project." Science, along with all creative activities, cannot help but bear the imprint of our present intellectual climate.

It seems a long step from science's world of fact and logic to the theatre world of fantasy. But the comments of Brooks Atkinson, dean of American drama critics, are worth noting (*New York Times*, December 2) as he bemoaned the low state of current Broadway offerings. Bitterly he complained that "something elusive and intangible seems to have drained the vitality out of the theatre and perhaps out of other American arts as well." "Could it be," he wondered, "that the spiritual climate in which we are now living smothers art that is really creative, and that the emphasis on public expression of all kinds is toward meekness and conformity? People are playing safe. They hesitate to say what they think. The intellectual and artistic life of the country has been flattened out. The ignorant heresy-hunting and the bigoted character assassination that have acquired the generic title of McCarthyism are succeeding."

Education, science, and drama cannot be equated. But critics of education and the theatre seem to find in both wasting symptoms produced by an oppressive social climate. If science could be evaluated in the same way, and there were competent critics, would like symptoms be found?

- - C. G.

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

51 - 9

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.