

F.A.S. NEWSLETTER

Published by the
FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS
1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.
M. Stanley Livingston, Chairman

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

No. 54 - 10

December 7, 1954

PRODUCTION LINE SECURITY

While public concern is growing about the pressure for conformity which has risen to unprecedented heights, it has not yet brought any effective check. In the words of Broadus Mitchell, Rutgers economics professor (*The Nation*, Nov. 6), "Inquisition into the opinions and associations of teachers in New York's municipal colleges has reached the stage of mere processing within the framework of law, ordinance, and directive. There is no questioning of the premises of declared policy. There is no 'rule of reason' to temper the automatic application of prior pronouncement."

NOT SO QUIET ON THE ACADEMIC FRONT

Mitchell referred specifically to the recent dismissal of 3 professors from the faculty of New York City's Hunter College. The three were admitted former Communist party members, two offering evidence that they had left the party before the end of 1941. There was, according to Mitchell, "no effort to show that the once-held beliefs or party loyalties of the defendants had entered into their teaching to mislead their students." In fact, "service to institution, pupils, and colleagues was long and exemplary." But the rules -- and the temper of the times -- decreed sacrifice of "expensive training, rich experience, and acknowledged accomplishments," to say nothing of the careers and personal lives of the individuals concerned.

Hunter is not alone in the continuing loss or incapacitation of members of faculties of institutions of higher learning. On Nov. 23, indictment of 8 persons by a Federal grand jury was announced -- for contempt in refusing to answer questions before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Included were present or past members of faculties of Temple University, M.I.T., Cornell Univ., and Vassar College. On the same day, the Board of Trustees of Fisk Univ. announced that it would not rehire a member of its faculty who had refused to answer questions before the same House Committee. In most of these cases, the individuals concerned had admitted or indirectly conceded their own past membership in the Communist party, but had refused to name associates.

At the Univ. of Michigan, 3 faculty members similarly came under fire. A series of faculty hearings following their suspension led to the reinstatement of one and dismissal of two. The reinstatement is significant as the first case in which a state-supported institution retained an individual who took refuge in the 5th amendment. The individual concerned admitted past membership in the Communist party but reportedly testified to university officials on present disagreement with the party. One of the others accused defended himself on grounds provided by the 1st amendment and plans to test in the courts the constitutionality of the powers of the House Committee.

RUMBLINGS ON THE FEDERAL FRONT

The academic security headache is no more painful or incapacitating than the one which continues to plague government service. Any lingering doubts of the political ramifications and significance of the Federal security program must have been dispelled during the recent election campaign when leading Republican orators cited numbers of government employees separated in the past 2 years to bolster their charges of Democratic coddling of Communists. Out of this may emerge a congressional appraisal of the effects of Executive Order No. 10450, which governs the current Eisenhower security program,

since piqued Democrats returning to committee chairmanships in the House and Senate are reportedly determined to use their investigative authority to uncover the facts in what has been called the security "numbers game."

CONTINUED STUDY Meanwhile, the mounting pressure of criticism -- aroused by the Oppenheimer case and continuingly aggravated by such incidents as the dismissal of career diplomat John Paton Davies -- apparently has registered in the White House. At his press conference Nov. 23, President Eisenhower indicated that the security risk program was under constant study to eliminate any faults in its effects on individuals. According to the *N.Y. Times* of Nov. 24, "the White House [has] requested security officers of the various Government departments and agencies to submit any ideas they had about revising the program." Requests for recommendations from aggrieved individuals or from organizations which have severely criticized existing practices were not mentioned. Nor was there any hint that serious thought was being given to the suggestion, repeatedly made by the FAS, *Washington Post*, and others, that a special commission of eminent citizens is needed to bring reason and justice into a situation which is too far out of hand for ordinary measures.

SUPREME COURT IN THE ACT The case of John P. Peters, professor of medicine at Yale, has been scheduled for argument before the Supreme Court and may provide the first statement of high court views since the constitutionality of the federal employee loyalty program was upheld by a 4-4 vote in the Bailey case several years ago. Peters, after two prior successful defenses, was dismissed as a consultant to the US Public Health Service after a third hearing. He challenges the validity of his dismissal as denial of his constitutional rights, since he had no opportunity to cross-examine witnesses or to make rebuttal to statements accepted in testimony. The legality of much of past and present federal practice in loyalty and security cases may be strongly affected by the Court's ruling.

EINSTEIN REACTION Characteristically blunt, if somewhat disconcerting, was Albert Einstein's reaction when asked his opinion of a recent article in the *Reporter* magazine outlining the situation of American scientists in the face of military and security pressure. Einstein opined that if he could do it over again he would be a plumber or peddler rather than a scientist, scholar, or teacher. Only in this way, he felt, could he find the "modest degree of independence still available under present circumstances." The remark brought him chiding editorial comments in the *N.Y. Times* and *Washington Post*. Both felt that this was poor advice for young people, particularly in view of the current decline in scientific and technical training in the US in contrast to the marked rise recently reported for the USSR (*N.Y. Times*, Nov. 7). Neither, however, noted where Einstein really erred, as was revealed in recent news stories in the *Washington Post*. Challenged in the District of Columbia are refusals to grant a liquor license and a second-hand piano dealer's license to two individuals who invoked the 5th amendment before Congressional committees. Apparently, Einstein will have to look still further afield if Higher Authority grants him a new start in life.

UN PASSES A-POOL PLAN

Climaxing three weeks of rapid progress, the UN General Assembly on December 4 approved 60 to 0 a modified version of President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan (see NL 54-9). The earlier approval (Nov. 23) by the UN Political and Security Committee was also unanimous.

RUSSIA REVERSES The first break in the Soviet's previously uncooperative point of view came on Nov. 12. In a speech before the UN, Russia's chief delegate Vishinsky revealed that a "fire" was "burning in his breast" to have the world achieve an atoms-for-peace plan, and that he did not consider the prohibition of nuclear weapons a prerequisite to the achievement of such a plan. However, he immediately offered several unacceptable changes to the U.S. atom plan. Chief among these were that the supervising agency of the program should come under the jurisdiction of the Security Council where Russia has veto power, and that all interested countries--notably Communist China--be invited to attend the conference of nuclear scientists to be held in Geneva next summer. In the same speech, Vishinsky posed Russia as the champion of underdeveloped nations by also calling for the immediate provision of abundant supplies of electrical energy for them.

WEST PUTS UP The leading role of the U.S. was reasserted when Ambassador Lodge announced on Nov. 15 that the U.S. had allocated 220 pounds of fissionable material for atomic reactors abroad when such reactors are ready. The next day, Britain's Minister of State, Anthony Nutting, gave further indications of the sincere intentions of the West by announcing that his country would add 44 pounds. In both cases, the material was thought to be of less than weapons grade, though suitable for reactors. The U.S. allocation will be enough for 15 experimental reactors, Admiral Strauss said Dec. 2.

Although these announcements were enthusiastically received, some of the smaller countries, main benefactors of the plan, expressed concern about the composition of the group to undertake further discussions. India's delegate Menon proposed that places on the planning committee should be open to "all member states able and willing to participate in such an agency." In rejecting this view, Lodge observed that this would permit more than 60 nations to take part and that matters would be delayed "for such a long time as to jeopardize this whole project, if not, indeed, to destroy it."

FIND FORMULA In private talks the U.S. and the six nations co-sponsoring the resolution arrived at a formula acceptable to Russia for the relationship of the supervising agency and the UN. The solution in essence evaded the whole question by providing that "once an agency is established, it negotiate an appropriate form of agreement with the UN." Further minor concessions on the part of the West made it appear that the USSR would back the resolution. However, Vishinsky took another about face when he subsequently submitted formal amendments supporting Security Council jurisdiction and unlimited membership in the agency (inclusion of Communist China). Though both amendments were defeated at the Nov. 23 session of the UN Political Committee (and later in the General Assembly), Russia voted for the West-sponsored resolution.

To be sure, the vote does not assure that the future will be smooth sailing. This was indicated by A.A. Sobolev (acting head of the Russian delegation following Vishinsky's death Nov. 22), who stated that the resolution contained "important" shortcomings and that the USSR vote was for the principle of international cooperation in this field. Sobolev did not indicate whether Russia would join the International Atomic Energy Agency when it is being organized or later. Although the whole plan does not bear directly on the all-important question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons, the N.Y. Times editorialized on Nov. 21: "...any agreement among nations, and particularly between Communist and non-Communist nations, that affects the uses of atomic energy contains hope."

ENRICO FERMI 1901-1954

■■■ "Civilization will not soon forget" ■■■

"COEXISTENCE"

The importance of achieving a state of "peaceful coexistence" as the only alternative to an atomic holocaust has been receiving special emphasis recently in public pronouncements by leaders of both our country and Russia, and in events on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

NO ALTERNATIVE Following a statement on Oct. 19, that "since the advent of nuclear weapons, it seems clear that there is no longer any alternative to peace if there is to be a happy and well world," President Eisenhower, in a speech the next day, pointed up his determination to find a "modus vivendi" with the Communist world without losing ground to it. He delineated three avenues along which this country must seek "peace in freedom -- where all men dwell in security:--first, establishment of the conditions of peace through the UN and all other available means; second, promotion of the unity and strength of free peoples; and third, maintenance of sufficient military strength to deter aggression. Secretary Dulles reiterated the peaceful intentions and goals of the US, rejecting Sen. Knowland's assertion that coexistence would result in the nibbling up of the free world a "bite at a time" once Russia had attained atomic parity with the US.

The theme of peaceful coexistence of the capitalist and communist worlds has been repeated often in Moscow radio and



Courtesy of the Washington Post, 1954

press releases since the statement last Mar. 12 by Premier Malenkov that the Soviet government "takes a strong stand against the policy of cold war because this policy is one of the preparations of a new world slaughter which, with modern means of destruction would mean the destruction of world civilization."

Recent events testifying to the pursuit of these more conciliatory policy lines on the part of the world's 2 major powers are the exchange of notes over the shooting down of a B-29 near Japan, and the renewed hopeful activities in the UN Disarmament Commission (see NL 54-9). Joseph Harsch, in the Christian Science Monitor, points to the restraining of Communist China's attacks on the Nationalist-held island of Quemoy -- attributed to Soviet Russia's refusal to send military aid in the event of open hostilities -- as further evidence of the trend toward coexistence.

"NEW LOOK" OLD-FASHIONED

A revision of our strategic thinking has accompanied the political developments associated with current talk of coexistence. The "New Look" seems to have been forgotten, and there is evidence that our strategic thinking has begun to include defense as a major ingredient. The opening of the Continental Air Command's new headquarters in Colorado, and the announcement that construction of a distant early warning (DEW) chain of radar stations above the Arctic Circle will begin next summer, are two signs that continental defense is out of the thinking stage. "The US could have more confidence in its 'Sunday punch' if it were associated with more capacity to absorb punishment," said Prof. K. E. Knorr in a memo of Princeton University's center of International Studies on Oct. 23. One feature of the "passive" defense program advocated by Knorr, the dispersal of industrial and population centers, has yet to receive active attention.

POWER DEBATE EMBROILS AEC

On Dec. 2 the Senate unanimously confirmed the appointment of Willard F. Libby, professor at the Univ. of Chicago, as a member of the AEC, after Sen. Kefauver (D, Tenn.) withdrew his objection to the appointment of anyone who was not an expert on electrical utilities operations. Kefauver's action derived from the bitter political controversy concerning the Dixon-Yates contract which has injected political considerations into AEC operations to an unprecedented extent. (The later recess appointment of John Von Neumann has not yet been considered.)

POLITICS The AEC, a major consumer of electrical power, **IN AEC** was brought into this field by the Administration's opposition to further TVA expansion. Accordingly, on Apr. 12, the AEC was instructed to negotiate a contract with the Dixon-Yates group for the financing of 600 megawatt generating plants to sell power to TVA. These were to replace the AEC power drain on TVA. Earlier this year, the AEC Commissioners voted 3-2 -- Murray, Smyth and Zuckert in the majority -- against approval of the contract. Murray, in particular, objected to the lack of a "recapture" clause. On Oct. 5, it was announced that the AEC had approved the contract. Subsequent

FAS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PRESS RELEASE

The FAS is gratified by the naming of two distinguished scientists, Dr. Willard F. Libby and Dr. John Von Neumann, to membership in the Atomic Energy Commission, and encouraged that Dr. Libby has already been confirmed on a non-political, non-partisan basis. We are happy that the initial partisan objection to his confirmation has been withdrawn.

It is most unfortunate that the AEC has become deeply involved in political controversy in recent months. While the relation of public and private power agencies in this country is an issue which must be resolved by the traditional American procedure of public debate, this issue should not have been injected into the AEC's operations by the Administration and the Congress. By accepting the Dixon-Yates contract as lying within their sphere of action, the AEC Commissioners have created confusion in the public mind regarding the true purposes of the AEC and have diminished the confidence of the Congress in the AEC's non-partisan status.

We urge that the Administration, the Congress, and the Commission undertake to keep the AEC out of further irrelevant controversy and to channel its activities clearly back into its vital non-political task of developing atomic energy in the national interest.

-- released at the direction of the FAS Council by the Executive Committee, meeting in New York City, Dec. 4, 1954

Congressional hearings brought out the fact that this approval was by a 2-0 vote -- Strauss and Campbell reaffirming their original stand, Murray abstaining, and acting Commissioner Libby not present. Libby had given verbal approval at Strauss' request.

RUSHED THROUGH On Oct. 10, the AEC asked the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy to waive the statutory 30-day approval period for the contract, so as to allow construction to start immediately. Certain controversial features of the contract were at this time brought to light: (1) a \$40,000,000 contract cancellation charge against AEC if authorization were subsequently withdrawn; (2) no provision against paying service charges to the parent organizations of the Dixon-Yates group; (3) no provision against using, as capital, surplus fund of the parent organizations otherwise taxable as excess profits at 52%; and (4) apparent high rate of return to Dixon-Yates on its investment in the plants.

On Nov. 11, the Commission signed an amended contract, which included a "three-year recapture" clause, Murray joining the majority on the basis of this clause. Libby, not present, was officially quoted as approving. The 30-day approval period was then waived by the Joint Committee, 10-8 on a straight party vote.

Libby, in hearings on his confirmation, explained that he had first voted against the cancellation clause in the Dixon-Yates contract, but then had written a letter to Strauss indicating approval. He said that the approval was largely based on his "confidence of the competence" of the other Commissioners.

PASSPORT for PAULING

Linus C. Pauling, awarded the Nobel Prize for chemistry on Nov. 3, has since been issued an unrestricted passport by the State Department. Nobel laureates must travel to Sweden to receive the award. According to the N. Y. Times of Nov. 24, Pauling's passport is valid for 2 years and renewable for another 2 years.

In this action the State Department reverses its stand of the past 3 years. Three times in 1952, Pauling applied for a passport to attend scientific meetings. The one he finally received was limited to England and France and valid for less than 3 months (FAS NL 52-6). Following the second refusal, Pauling stated, according to Science News Letter of Nov. 13, that he had been informed that his "anti-Communist statements have not been sufficiently strong." In 1950, he had been accused of "Communist front" activities by Sen. McCarthy and of Communist party membership by Louis Budenz. He has denied both of these charges. In accordance with State Dept. request, Pauling submitted an affidavit in 1952 that he was not and had never been a Communist. Science Service also reports that Pauling was invited to India last year, but was refused a passport to that area, which the Department considers "hotter and more sensitive" than Europe. Pauling's 1954-55 itinerary, they report, will include visits to India and Japan at the invitation of scientists in those countries.

The Issue (Dec. 1) reports that the Voice of America turned down a French request for a recorded interview with Pauling for use in France. Everyone interviewed by VOA must be "cleared," the National Issues Committee's publication said.

VOLUNTARY CENSORSHIP ?

On Nov. 5, the Department of Commerce established an Office of Strategic Information to "work with the business community in voluntary efforts to prevent unclassified strategic data from being made available to those foreign nations which might use such data in a manner harmful to the defense interests of the US." Although the voluntary aspects of the OSI program are emphasized, these are not very reassuring according to the report filed with the American Society of Newspaper Editors by J. R. Wiggins, chairman of its Freedom of Information Committee and managing editor of the Washington Post. The report predicts that, "in the present national temper... it is quite clear that 'guidance' directives, whatever their legal force, quickly will acquire the practical force of regulations and rules." The report characterizes proposed OSI activities as "a species of censorship of the most offensive and dangerous kind."

Commented Chemical & Engineering News (Nov. 22), "In the long run, however, wide dissemination of technological advances would help to keep the US in the forefront in any race with Russia."

* * * * *

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 - \$7.50 (with income below \$2500 - \$5.50).
- 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, 1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

THE FUTURE of H-BOMB TESTS

The debate on whether to test the super-hydrogen bomb is the gravest since the debate on whether to make a hydrogen bomb, according to the Alsops (Wash. Post, Nov. 22). Like the latter, the former is going on behind closed doors in the highest government circles. Principal concern is with the biological hazard from long term exposure to increasing levels of radiation. There seems to be general agreement that through cumulative effects, explosion of enough bombs will result in dangerously high radiation levels. The question is: how many bombs are enough?

WHETHER This debate reached the House of Commons on Nov. 2 when Laborite Arthur Henderson suggested to Prime Minister Churchill that he propose a cessation of nuclear explosions. Churchill, while emphasizing the hazard of the cumulative effect of an undue number, replied that he was not convinced that the proposal would be advanced by his personal intervention.

Prince Louis deBroglie, Nobel laureate and Secretary of the French Academy of Science, said it would be reckless to continue H-bomb experiments because the danger mark had already been reached for the world's animal and plant life (Washington Post, Nov. 23).

WHERE? A further problem concerns the site of future tests. Since those of last March, the Japanese have been alarmed at the prospect of further tests in the western Pacific. As recently as Nov. 15th, highly radioactive rain reportedly fell on Tokyo. Also, a stir was created in New Zealand over reports that the U.S. might be seeking bomb testing sites in the Antarctic, making a possible health hazard for New Zealand. In its denial, the U.S. reaffirmed that the purpose of the proposed expedition to the Antarctic is to collect map-making information and "scientific data" (N.Y. Times, Nov. 11 and 12). This problem was dramatized by James R. Arnold in the November Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, who proposed that further tests be conducted within the continental U.S. because it is not fair to expect others to incur the risks. Arnold said, "A nation which feels itself in danger has some right to ask certain of its citizens to run special risks in behalf of all."

WHEN Despite these concerns, it appears that tests will continue. On Oct. 26th the AEC confirmed reports of a series of nuclear explosions in Soviet territory starting in mid-September, resulting in some but not significant fall-out on the U.S. In addition to the coming tests already announced for Nevada, Hanson Baldwin (N.Y. Times, Oct. 28) states that there will probably be a second series in the fall of 1955 at Eniwetok and Bikini.

F A S NEWSLETTER

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

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.

SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER SHORTAGE

The growing disparity between the rates at which the US and Russia are graduating scientists and engineers has been worrying leading educators and governmental authorities -- notably the NSF -- in recent months. According to M. H. Trytten of the National Research Council, Russia has nearly as many engineers of comparable quality as the US and is producing 2 1/2 times as many per year. A detailed review of technical education in the US and USSR, by Benjamin Fine (N.Y. Times, Nov. 7), shows that "while the Soviet Union is stressing science, mathematics, chemistry and physics in the secondary school curriculum, the US is taking an easy-going attitude. Many high schools report that fewer students are taking science courses than ever before."

It is the feeling of many that the reductions in the number of technically trained graduates reflects, in part, the fact that there are not enough teachers in the secondary schools with adequate training in science. Other factors involved are the relatively low birth rate 22 years ago, and the effect of the draft.

President Eisenhower, in his news conference Nov. 10, stated that the federal government might support scholarships for scientific education, but did not have any firm plans. The desirability of fellowships granted by non-profit institutions was recently increased by a US tax court ruling (Nov. 17) to the effect that such grants are gifts and are income tax-exempt.

An INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR (IGY) has been designated during the period of 1957-58, when the nature of our planet and its surroundings will be the subject of intensive investigation by scientists of all nations. A plan of World Days will ensure simultaneous observations in affected fields when unusual geophysical activity is prevalent -- e.g., magnetic, ionospheric, auroral, cosmic ray -- and any associated solar activity.

Overall coordinating group is the Special Committee for the IGY of the International Council of Scientific Unions. Developing the American program under the Nat. Academy of Sciences is the US Nat. Committee for the IGY (USNC-IGY). The Nat. Science Foundation has accepted fund procurement responsibility.

Participation is expected from at least 38 nations, including Russia, East Germany and Czechoslovakia, each monitoring its own national program. The overall effort will represent an investment of about \$100 million; the US will expend 13 millions of which 2 million have already been appropriated by Congress.

This is the third such effort; the others were the limited Polar Years, 1882-83 and 1932-33. The IGY is far more encompassing and comes at the peak of the 11-year solar cycle. Researchers will delve into the nature of the earth and its core, the oceans, the atmosphere, and its electrical and magnetic properties. All portions of the globe will be under scrutiny, including Antarctica. Chairman of the USNC-IGY is Joseph Kaplan, of the UCLA.

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

Stanley C. Bunce
Box 68
Grafton, New York

Not for Release

1749 L St., N.W., Washington 6, D.C., Dec. 7, 1954

COUNCIL MEETS IN CHICAGO

An active and productive meeting of the FAS national Council took place at the University of Chicago on the afternoon and evening of Nov. 27, following sessions of the Amer. Physical Society there. With FAS Vice-chairman E. C. Pollard of Yale presiding over 17 delegates and alternates, the meeting established policy on several important fronts.

CHAPTERS & BRANCHES A summary of Executive Committee and Washington Office actions since the spring Council meeting was followed by a number of heartening reports on chapter and branch activity throughout the country. Two new FAS branches -- Berkeley and Los Angeles -- were given formal recognition by the Council. (Too late for Council action were applications for Branch status from New York City and St. Louis area members. These were given interim recognition by the Executive Committee, meeting in New York Dec. 4.) The Los Alamos Branch, now numbering 83 members, presented its newly adopted constitution, and its application for chapter status was approved. Delegate Hill reported on recent activities of this group. An outstanding event was a luncheon Oct. 21, at which Sen. Clinton Anderson (D, N.M.) spoke to some 230 persons on "Science and the National Security."

Rosenfeld, Chicago chapter chairman, reported on efforts to establish a useful interchange with press, radio and TV contacts in the area; as a result, the chapter finds itself automatically consulted for comment whenever news breaks of concern to scientists and engineers occur. They have also participated in a number of radio and TV programs. Chew of the Illinois chapter reported on a recent chapter meeting on the Ft. Monmouth situation; the Wisconsin Branch luncheon meetings were said to be continuing, and the Greater Boston Branch stated that Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists editor Eugene Rabinowitch had been its guest at a recent luncheon meeting.

Schiff pointed out that the Stanford chapter and new Berkeley Branch would co-sponsor a meeting during the AAAS-APS sessions in Berkeley (on Dec. 29, from 12:00 to 2:30, Campus cafeteria, program and speakers to be posted). Delegate Henry told of Washington chapter plans for future public meetings on security and H-bomb tests, and on the results of Operation Mi-meograph, an inspiration of Washington area members to finance the purchase of equipment for the FAS national office (see over). The Mohawk chapter reported a continuing high level of activity, with regular luncheon meetings on various topics, and special study of the civil defense value of factory and population dispersal.

A budget of \$11770, the largest since 1947, was approved; as usual there was discussion but no solution of the problem of conducting expanding FAS affairs without undue demands on a relatively few people in the Washington area.

ISSUES AND RESOLUTIONS The Council noted with encouragement the recent specific steps toward implementing the Atoms-for-Peace proposal made last December by President Eisenhower; namely, the affirmative action of the UN General Assembly on the present form of the proposal, the decision to set up an international conference of scientists and engineers next summer to explore the technical problems involved, and specific US offers of materials and information.

After spirited discussion of the possible radiation hazards associated with H-bomb testing, and a review of various political consequences of such testing, the Council view was expressed by the passage of the following resolution: "The FAS Council urges that the American government shall study seriously the question of the feasibility of a negotiated agreement among nations which would lead to the banning of further hydrogen bomb tests, and the possible advantages of such an agreement. We further urge the release of available information concerning the radiation hazards resulting from hydrogen bomb explosions so that the American people, as well as the people of other nations, may have sufficient information on which to base conclusions on this

vital subject."

The qualifications and viewpoints, where known, of the two scientists recently nominated to the AEC were reviewed, along with related events, and the consensus recorded in a resolution to the effect that the Council (1) supports the nominations of Willard F. Libby and John Von Neumann to the AEC; (2) recommends that FAS members and officers privately urge Sen. Ke-fauver to leave partisan politics out of the confirmation proceedings, and (3) urges FAS members and officers to privately communicate to Libby and Von Neumann any concern FAS people may have over viewpoints attributed to these nominees and which may affect their policy actions as public servants.

Disapproval expressed by the Council of the political involvement of the AEC in the past year resulted in a directive to the Executive Committee to issue a press statement on this point, in line with policy adopted by the Council (see p. 3, NL 54-10)

The constructive initiative of the Stanford chapter for seeking amelioration of present visa policies was again apparent in proposals made by the Stanford delegate, and led to the following statement of policy, and support by the Council: "The Council approves the objectives proposed by the Stanford chapter for action: (1) a Congressional resolution to direct the State Department to shorten the time required for action on visa applications by adding personnel if needed, and (2) a change in the McCarran-Walter Act which would create a special group of scientists and other professionals invited to the US by societies, universities, etc. who could get temporary visas without the full procedure now required; and the Council urges the Stanford chapter to pursue these objectives."

Steps promoting corrective action on the passport situation, as recommended by the Passport Committee, were accepted as explained on the following page.

OTHER ACTIONS A review of the current status of moves to establish sounder personnel security policy in sensitive government positions led to the assertion by several delegates that the next 2 months are highly appropriate times for the FAS, its chapters, and individuals to express their recommendations, both publicly and through the various channels, to government officials.

The Council agreed to the importance of testimony on UN Charter revision on behalf of FAS (by an officer or appointed member) to the Special Senate Subcommittee on UN Charter Revision. Draft testimony prepared by John Toll (Washington chapter) was discussed by the Council, and an amended version was prepared in the light of Council comments.

Council discussion indicated dissatisfaction that the Department of State does not now have in motion any intensive study of the technical questions connected with weapons control and disarmament.

The diminishing support, and consequent inadequate staffing, of the State Department Science Office, set up in 1951, was reviewed and deplored. Comments touched upon the connection of this weak office with destructive State Dept. policy in visas, passports, and liaison with foreign scientific activities.

The next regular meeting of the Council was set to occur in association with the Amer. Physical Society meetings in New York the end of January. An informal meeting of as many delegates as could be assembled was also proposed for the Berkeley AAAS meeting, Dec. 30. (Details will be available from the FAS Washington Office, and given at the Dec. 29 FAS luncheon, if such a session is arranged. Member observers will be welcomed.)

MEMBERSHIP DRIVE

In the present membership campaign, FAS is mailing to a list that may contain names of FAS members. If you should receive an invitation to join the Federation, please forgive us, as we do not have the time nor the funds to check the list against our membership. Pass the invitation on to a friend.

COUNCIL ACTS on PASSPORT PROBLEM

The Passport Committee of the FAS reported to the Council in Chicago that they believe present procedures of the State Department with regard to passports are not in accord with the principle of due process. It appears that the final decision to grant or refuse a passport still lies with the Passport Division and is made on an arbitrary basis. This situation has led to a serious obstruction of scientific travel, of which the Pauling case is the best publicized but by no means the only example.

The source of difficulty is a very deep one. The State Dept. maintains that a passport is a privilege, not a right, of the American citizen and is to be granted at the pleasure of the Secretary of State. This position stems from the pre-World War I status of the passport as an endorsement from the US government to guarantee safe conduct, but not as a permit to travel. Foreign travel without a passport was at that time perfectly possible. Nowadays, with very few exceptions it is illegal to leave the US without a passport.

LEGAL PRESSURE In the only judicial action bearing on this general question, a special Federal Court ruled in 1952, in the Bauer case, that a passport could not be revoked except after a hearing, thus taking one step toward establishing the right of an American citizen to a passport. A US citizen may be deprived of his passport only by due process of law. This was a clearcut statement but unfortunately it was not carried to the Supreme Court. The State Dept., after a long period of indecision, decided not to appeal. Instead, the ruling effectively was ignored by the use of delaying tactics, and the original complainant, Miss Bauer, finally gave up the fight.

This situation illustrates why the Passport Division has been able for so long to ignore legal questions. Passport applicants who will institute a suit and stick with it are rare. But it seems likely that the individual who stubbornly will exhaust all possible legal resources, including the Supreme Court, and who will not compromise on the principle that he has a right to travel, will effect a real and permanent improvement in the passport situation.

The FAS Passport Committee therefore believes that the most effective activity in the passport field which our organization can undertake at present is support of legal action on the due process issue. Of the cases which have come to its attention, that of Dr. Martin Kamen, chemistry professor at Washington University in St. Louis, seems to be the most favorable for serious litigation. Kamen has been seeking a passport for 5 years and is the only applicant to have exhausted systematically all the procedures within the State Dept. itself. He has an excellent lawyer who is thoroughly acquainted with the issues involved. He is not afraid of publicity and will not make a compromise which is meaningless with respect to the general situation. Finally, his personal and professional reputation is such as not to prejudice a court unfavorably.

PLANS FOR ACTION The Passport Committee therefore recommended to the Council support of the Kamen case on the due process issue, and the following resolutions were passed:

1. "The recent record of the State Department suggests that due process is not being observed in procedures leading to refusal or revocation of passports. Because this situation has obstructed travel by American scientists to an extent which damages both our country and our science, the Federation of American Scientists has long been concerned. Our organization regards as one of its specific objectives a set of passport procedures which fulfill the constitutional guarantee of due process. "In particular, the Federation of American Scientists will lend support to legal action against the State Department, on the due process issue, by Dr. Martin Kamen. We are concerned that the procedures followed in denying a passport to Dr. Kamen were in violation of his constitutional rights."

2. "The Passport Committee is instructed to lend support to the legal action by Dr. Kamen against the State Department and is empowered to raise a special fund for appropriate expenses. The Passport Committee is urged to enlist the sup-

port and cooperation of the American Civil Liberties Union in this case to the fullest extent practicable."

LEGAL BACKING The American Civil Liberties Union has already indicated its probable willingness to participate in the Kamen case by way of a brief amicus curiae. It will not handle the case directly because its policy requires complete control of cases which it handles. In the present circumstances, it seems that direction of the case will be most effective in the hands of Kamen's lawyer, Mr. Nathan David, who is already familiar with all the details and who will devote his full efforts to the task. It is hoped, nevertheless, that some kind of official endorsement from the ACLU will be obtained.

Plans to raise money for support of legal expenses are underway. The special fund will be handled by members of the Passport Committee at the University of Illinois in Urbana, Ill.: G. Chew, Chairman; E. Goldwasser, F. Low, and D. Pines.

BRADBURY, COMPTON, INGLIS Address FAS Forum

"A TREATY TO BAN H-BOMB TESTS" was the topic of a stimulating Open Meeting, arranged by FAS' Chicago Chapter on Nov. 27, at the University of Chicago played host to sessions of the Amer. Physical Society there. Former FAS chairman David L. Hill chaired the meeting.

Speaking to a capacity audience of some 300 in the University's Kent Auditorium, David Inglis, research physicist at Argonne Nat. Lab., presented the affirmative case for banning H-bomb tests. His position, outlined in his article in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (Nov., 1954), was questioned by Norris E. Bradbury, director of Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. Bradbury voiced the feeling that, although the possibility of control of nuclear weapons should be investigated, the technical meaning, feasibility, and mode of enforcement of the suggested test ban should be clarified. He suggested that, when the implications of the proposed treaty are explored, the proposal might be found to differ very little from present US policy on weapons control and disarmament.

Closing remarks came from Arthur H. Compton, former chancellor of Washington U. and wartime head of the Metallurgical Lab. of the Manhattan Project. Compton pointed out that the early A-bombs were comparable to fleets of conventional bombers and selectively directed at military targets, whereas the nature of H-bombs raises serious political problems even in their testing. He emphasized the importance of consulting our allies in planning such tests.

CARE. The Chicago Chapter calls attention to an unusual humanitarian opportunity. Government surplus food (FOA) has been made available to CARE and as a result, for one dollar, two 13-15 pound food packages inscribed with the donor's name will be delivered to needy families abroad. In this case, the \$1 packages cannot be designated for specific families or individuals. More than a million packages are available for 31 countries. Address "CARE," Chicago, Illinois.

MOHAWK CHAPTER DISPERSAL COMMITTEE activity has led to what amounts to a public debate between Schenectady city and county officials and the Mohawk Committee over the question of dispersal of industrial targets, as a means of combatting US vulnerability to A-attack. In a series of 3 open meetings between city and county officials and the Committee, the County Chairman talked of "drawing a blanket" over the area with interceptor planes from the newly enlarged county airport; the City Manager offered Christian unity as an alternative solution to A-bomb problems. In response to a resolution passed by the City Council recommending repeal of the Federal Dispersal Program, an open letter advocating limited dispersal was prepared by the Committee. The resolution and letter went to Congressmen, officials and the press.

OPERATION MIMEOGRAPH

HAVE YOU SENT IN YOUR DOLLAR YET? The Washington Chapter reports that, to date, we have a 25% response from the membership to the appeal for funds to buy the FAS office a mimeograph machine and other sorely needed equipment. Send your contribution in the postage-paid, return envelope now -- BEFORE CHRISTMAS. Let's make it a 100% response!