

F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS
January 16, 1952

1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.
52 - 1

US VISA POLICY STILL UNDER FIRE



FAS MEMBERSHIP MEETING

When? 4 - 6 PM, Saturday, February 2

Where? See announcement near Registration Desk, Physical Society, Pupin Hall

FAS Membership Meeting. To sharpen discussions on the future significance of FAS, the Executive Committee has called a General Meeting of the membership in New York on Saturday, February 2, between 4 and 6 PM. The meeting will follow the sessions of the American Physical Society at Columbia University. The membership meeting will precede the regular session of the FAS Council, which also is open to the membership. It is urged that you attend, participate, and contribute if you expect to be in New York on Feb. 2. If you are unable to attend, suggestions may be offered by writing the Chairman, Lyle Borst, c/o the FAS Washington Office.

At the General Meeting, a panel of speakers will outline the present program of the Federation and analyze its accomplishments and prospects. The financial position will be briefly presented, and activities to date of the Brookhaven membership committee will be reviewed. Comments, criticisms, and suggestions will be solicited from the floor. In the discussion, it is hoped that guidelines can be established enabling the Council and Executive Committee to crystallize a vital, productive FAS program for the coming year.

Thanks to many FAS members and friends, the financial position of the Federation is now more favorable than a year ago. The
(Continued on Page 3, Column 2)

Critics are becoming increasingly vocal on current US visa policy and its effect on international cultural and scientific exchange. The McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950 and its narrow interpretation by the State Department have resulted in (1) inordinate delays in action on applications, (2) denial of visas in several instances to scientists and scholars who have earned the world's respect, (3) exasperatingly detailed interrogation of visa applicants. Officials in the State Department, and many private citizens, are concerned over the seriously damaging effect on US prestige produced by these restrictions (see NL 51-9, Dec. 12, 1951). Comments from official and scientific circles give evidence of the growing concern.

Rep. Emanuel Celler (D., N.Y.), at a press conference in Rome, December 11, said that it would be his "studied purpose" as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee to "mend the Internal Security Act so as to give it some semblance of decency and sense." Calling the Act "asinine," he blamed it for ECA's difficulties in obtaining visas for 400 Italian factory workers to visit the US under its exchange programs.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science, one of several leading professional societies known to be studying the problem, decried the official restrictions on scientific interchange in a Council resolution adopted at its December meeting in Philadelphia:

"The Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science is profoundly disturbed over the present world conditions which so severely impede the free interchange of knowledge even among friendly nations. Danger to the future of our nation is implicit in such restrictions.

"The Council recognizes the need for measures which will effectively safeguard our security, but expresses its troubled concern over the manner in which such measures, in particular the McCarran Act, are being administered, to prohibit American citizens from going abroad and citizens of other nations from coming here to interchange knowledge of science which does not affect security.

"The Council strongly urges that the administrative procedures under the McCarran Act be reviewed and modified so as to minimize injustices and to increase both our internal strength and our prestige abroad.

"The Council further urges revisions and improvement of the relevant portions of the Act, to retain the objectives of necessary security, but with adequate provisions to maintain free interchange of knowledge that has no security implications."

One reaction to this resolution came from Herbert Nichols of the Christian Science Monitor, January 7. Coupling it with an earlier statement by the American Philosophical Society warning against the dangers of academic loyalty oaths, Nichols remarks: "The action taken by these two learned societies are not of academic interest only. They have a bearing on every man's right to 'pursuit of happiness;' to think and speak his honest thoughts whether they are right or wrong; to travel among his fellow men and collect whatever wages in knowledge accrue from the free exchange of ideas."

The quizzing a visa applicant must undergo is described in a letter to the N. Y. Times, Dec. 19. The applicant, a "well-known young writer" of Mexico invited to visit a US cultural group, was asked such questions as: Why do you want to go to the United States (after already having explained his purpose)? Do you have any intention of destroying the Government at Washington? Did you sign the Stockholm Petition for Peace? What other organizations do you belong to? The letter further describes the case of the rector of the University of Paris, also president of the World University
(Continued on Page 2, Column 1)

The FAS Newsletter is published approximately 10 times a year by the Federation, Lyle B. Borst, Chairman, to bring to scientists information necessary for an active role as citizens.

STILL HOPE FOR A-CONTROL?

The Soviet Union, in what looks to be a concession on the central issue of inspection of atomic energy installations, made a new proposal to the UN Political Committee in Paris on January 13. Foreign Minister Vishinsky asked that atomic weapons be unconditionally prohibited and that international agents should be empowered "to conduct inspection on a continuing basis," but that any international control organ "shall not be entitled to interfere in the domestic affairs of the states." The Soviet delegate further conceded to the UN majority proposal in suggesting that prohibition and control should take place at exactly the same time instead of consecutively, as previously recommended.

Although American delegation spokesmen minimized the value of the plan which Vishinsky himself characterized as a "tremendous and momentous step forward," US Ambassador Ernest A. Gross stated that the US would consider the proposal, suggesting that the place to discuss it was in the UN's new 12-nation disarmament commission. Vishinsky's plan also provided that within one month after a decision for prohibition of atomic bombs and his often-urged 1/3rd reduction in Big Five armed forces, all countries would submit complete official information on their armaments and armed forces "including data on atomic weapons and military bases in foreign territories."

Visa Policy Critics (Continued from Page 1).

Union. The rector was to deliver the principal address at the 400th anniversary celebration of the University of Mexico. "This man, picked to represent the scholarship of the globe, [was] refused a visa which would permit him to travel by air from LaGuardia field to the Mexican border. This, it seemed, would endanger the safety of the United States!" After prestige-damaging publicity, the visa was obtained at the last moment.

Chemical & Engineering News, in an editorial on December 17, calls on "Congress and/or the State Department" to devise a realistic and workable plan -- one which will not destroy the international aspect of science but will nevertheless prevent subversive actions by individuals approved for attending scientific meetings. The editorial notes the Washington rumor that State is delaying visas of prominent scientists in hopes of arousing enough public indignation to force Congress to change the present law.

A rare dissident voice, however, was lifted in a letter to **Chem. Eng. News** of Jan. 7. To W. M. Lauter of Gainesville, Fla., our intelligence services "appear to have become more intelligent and less naive." He is not worried by the "dire threat that we suffer from reprisals," because "technologically we are five years ahead of Europe in matters of scientific importance."

A survey of scientists' passport and visa difficulties was given at the recent AAAS meetings by William H. Pearlman of Jefferson Medical College (Philadelphia). Pearlman's report, available in mimeograph form, summarizes both published material and a number of private opinions of scientists who unanimously but anonymously deplore the situation.

FAS' Washington chapter has received word of 22 unpublished instances of passport and visa difficulties in early responses to the questionnaire mailed last month to FAS members. Three involve passport denials, the remainder visa difficulties, attributed to -- relatives behind the iron curtain, writing for Communist journals during the Nazi occupation, a trip to Prague in 1948, "unorthodox political views," etc. Names and identifying details given by respondents are being held confidential, but it is hoped that a general summary of the returns will provide a basis for judging the effect of the visa provisions of the McCarran Act. Information may still be sent to the Washington chapter, c/o FAS Washington Office.

Note. The apparent conservatism -- and certainly the slowness -- of actions on visa applications arises in part because the McCarran Act makes it a felony (\$5,000 or 5 years or both) to knowingly assist an alien excludable under the Act to obtain a visa. This naturally encourages "passing the buck," and consuls abroad refer cases involving any doubt to Washington.

State Department Science Office. The spreading discussion of visa policies prompted a visit last week by a Newsletter representative to Dr. Joseph B. Koepfli, head of the year-old Science Office in the Department of State. The establishment of such an office on a high policy level was one of the principal recommendations of the Berkner report, "Science & Foreign Relations," issued in May 1950 after a survey made at the request of the Secretary of State.

Koepfli's title is Science Adviser to the Department of State, and he reports directly to the Undersecretary. His staff in Washington is intentionally small -- J. W. Joyce, deputy, and Neil Caro-

thers and Walter M. Rudolph. Both Joyce and Rudolph participated actively in the preparation of the Berkner report. Other staff positions envisaged in the report -- separate assistants for Technology, Physical and Life Sciences, and liaison officers -- have not been established as yet, because Koepfli has a deliberate policy of proceeding slowly towards full implementation.

The Science Office is advisory rather than operational. They operate no programs, they have no funds to disburse, they do not carry out action on scientific or technical issues in foreign affairs. In the "officialese" language of the Berkner report, the Science Office serves in a "facilitating" capacity. It exists to see that scientific considerations get their deserved attention in the various branches of the State Department -- including the Passport and Visa Divisions. Inquiries, suggestions, or problems received from American scientists are forwarded by the Science Office to the appropriate place in the Department, with whatever follow-up seems needed. The Office is called into consultation when problems arise in foreign affairs which touch on science or technology. Koepfli has arranged for science attachés in three foreign capitals, selected personnel, guided their work, and otherwise provided "support."

One of the vital jobs facing Koepfli and his staff is to become known and recognized within the State Department. Integration is not something done quickly. The group must solidify contacts and gradually get the other branches of the Department accustomed to turning to the Science Office when suitable problems arise. The Office has also been concerned with the appointment of official delegates to international scientific meetings. And in this first year an unexpectedly large amount of effort has had to be given to the visa problem.

The Office has various contacts with other government agencies. The Science Adviser is a member of the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development, together with representatives from each of the federal agencies concerned with science. On specific problems, the Science Office turns to a specially designated liaison officer in the agency concerned. Contact with non-governmental science is almost entirely through the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council, with its expanded International Relations Division.

Establishment of the State Department's Science Office is a formal recognition of the important influence of scientific developments on world affairs. The operation needs to be much larger abroad and somewhat larger at home. But the qualifications for senior officials are hard to meet and the qualified men are seldom available even on a one- or two-year basis. It will take several more years before the potential value of the Science Office will be realized. For the present, it appears that Dr. Koepfli's controlled energetic approach is making slow and steady progress towards giving scientific counsel its due influence in US foreign policy.

The International Atom. There has been considerable news of international atomic energy developments in the last month. Argentina announced somewhat enigmatically that it is negotiating with a "highly industrialized foreign country" for interchange of atomic energy information and materials. An Argentine official arrived in the Belgian Congo while a Belgian chemist reportedly fled Argentina for the safety of Uruguay.

A more important development was a meeting at UNESCO headquarters in Paris of scientists from twelve European countries to discuss the founding of an International Atomic Laboratory in Western Europe. Headed by such luminaries as Britain's G. P. Thomson, Denmark's Niels Bohr, Germany's Werner Heisenberg, and France's Perrin, the delegates set up a working party to formulate a draft agreement under which a twelve-nation board would be set up to supervise the 1952 planning program. Present plans call for a large laboratory with high energy machines and reactors to be set up in 1957 or '58. Copenhagen appeared high on the list of possible sites for such an institute.

From Yugoslavia comes the announcement of the receipt of the first shipment of radioactive isotopes from Britain's Harwell Laboratory and the first operation of a Swiss-built high voltage accelerator. The Yugoslav Institute for the Study of Structure of Matter was founded in 1947 and now has about 80 research scientists.

While the Churchill-Truman talks resulted in the British obtaining a voice in any decisions to use British bases for atomic bombing of Russia, there was no mention of any conclusions on the exchange of technical information. An amendment to the Atomic Energy Act last year permitted such exchange with friendly countries under certain conditions, but there are still complaints, notably by Canada's atomic chief, C. J. Mackenzie, of the "one-way flow" of atomic information.

SECURITY CREEPS OVER FREEDOM

"There is an ominous trend in this nation," says Associate Justice Wm. O. Douglas of the Supreme Court, in the N. Y. Times Magazine of January 13. Decrying the pressure of orthodoxy, Douglas warns that "we are drifting in the direction of repression, drifting dangerously fast." The Department of Justice marked the trend in two ways recently. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover was reported (Washington Post, Jan. 11) to have appealed to the nation's taxi drivers to act as volunteer eyes and ears for the FBI, reporting conversations suggesting espionage or subversion overheard in their cabs. And the Associated Press, on December 31, stated that Atty. General J. Howard McGrath is quietly taking steps to set up detention camps for potential subversives in accordance with provisions of the McCarran Act. According to AP, "it is a big-scale operation, providing for a possible roundup of many thousands as potential spies and saboteurs." Editorial comment in several influential periodicals shivered at these beginnings of officially incited mass peeping, and of concentration camps independent of ordinary criminal prisons.

A Reward for Service. John S. Service, career diplomat in the State Department, was dismissed on December 13 on recommendation of the President's Loyalty Review Board after he had previously been cleared five times by State's own Loyalty Security Board. Chief immediate interest lies in the case's demonstration of the effect of President Truman's executive order of last April which made "reasonable doubt" of loyalty sufficient justification for dismissal of a federal employee. FAS protested the order at the time, saying that it not only made the federal loyalty program considerably more stringent, but established a flexible criterion which could be tuned to the political temper of the times or to the prejudices of the members of the board.

In a review of the case on January 7, the Christian Science Monitor notes that "the fact that the diplomats of the State Department Board and the lawyers on the review board were impressed by quite different things gives reason for suggesting, without disrespect, that this could be due in part to their different backgrounds and vocations." This is only to say that in the determination of loyalty, when resting on something other than actual overt acts of espionage or treason, the attitudes of the judges may be of greater weight than the specific behavior of the accused. This is particularly dangerous when the behavior in question, as in the case of Service, relates to matters of opinion and judgment and is evaluated after a lapse of years during which the climate of opinion altered drastically.

Service has appealed the Review Board decision directly to the President for impartial review and it appears possible that the case will ultimately receive consideration by the Supreme Court.

Struik Indictment. Massachusetts, which has long pondered deeply on both liberty and witchery, may have another go-round in a modern setting. Dirk J. Struik, M.I.T. mathematician and professing theoretical Marxist, was indicted on September 13, 1951 under an Anti-Anarchy law passed in 1919 in fear of the then-young Old Bolsheviks. The law went unused for 30 years while many of the Old Bolsheviks met their demise in Soviet political trials. In 1951, Herbert A. Philbrick, FBI spy, denounced Struik as a Communist during the Manhattan trial of the eleven top U.S. Communists. Struik denies party membership or any subversive intentions, asserting that he is "a Marxist in the broadest sense" and believes that necessary social change can be accomplished under the Constitution "which allows ample and generous possibilities for social action." Before the Un-American Activities Committee in July, he was "uncooperative," refusing on constitutional grounds to answer a number of questions including one on Communist Party membership. The indictments charge him under Massachusetts law with conspiracy to overthrow both the state and federal governments. Defense committees have formed and the battle promises to be both hot and significant.

Less Gaggling at Ohio State. Ohio State University's speaker-screening rule, which kicked up controversy locally and nationally, has been modified through trustee-faculty conferences. Originally the University president was given authority to evaluate the "subversive" potential of off-campus speakers before approving them. The new rule concedes that this "is now and has always been primarily a faculty responsibility subject to university administrative procedures." A faculty member having "doubt" about a speaker he wishes to invite is to consult with other faculty members and the president. Although not thoroughly satisfied, the Ohio faculty is inclined to feel that it has won a victory. When coupled with the recent victory in California, this may indicate a turn for the better on the academic freedom front.

Science and Segregation. In a letter in the January issue of Science (January 4), Charles C. Davis (Biology Dept., Western Reserve University) calls attention to a serious anomaly in American science. Asserting that "Discrimination in the US against Negro citizens in all walks of life raises questions concerning our boast of democracy," Davis points out that "especially in science, where we commonly speak with enthusiasm and pride of the contributions of all nations to our disciplines, we should be alarmed at the fact that Negro citizens do not have equality with the rest of us when they desire to better mankind through science." He suggests that the AAAS appoint an "interracial committee to make a thorough investigation of discrimination against American scientists." He urges that an anti-discrimination clause, such as that suggested by Boyden, Lorch, et al (Science, Aug. 10, 1951) to ensure full participation of all members in all mathematical society affairs, should be incorporated into the by-laws of all scientific organizations.

Emphasizing the difficulties which Negroes in this country have in acquiring an education and becoming scientists, Davis outlines their continuing difficulties even after achieving this status. "Commonly we associate discrimination with our Southern states," he says. "Paradoxically, however, the majority of our Negro scientists are able to find employment only in the segregated schools of the South, with all this implies. Such scientists, because of legal and extralegal restrictions, find themselves isolated in large part from social and scientific contact with most of their fellow scientists....the problem exists also in our Northern states." It would be desirable, according to Davis, "...for the AAAS and all its affiliated organizations to make concerted, though belated, efforts to break down some of the gross discriminatory practices that besmudge the training and hiring policies of most of our schools and laboratories, both in the South and in the North."

Internals (Continued from Page 1).

future of FAS can now be decided, not in terms of a threatening financial collapse, but in terms of actual needs for activity by citizen-scientists and the available enthusiasm and energy of the membership.

With regard to internals, several problems exist. One is raised by the gradual shift of the Federation from an organization of chapters to one principally of members-at-large (members-at-large now constitute 57% of the total). A method is needed for getting wider participation and sharing of responsible jobs by members-at-large. Another problem is membership. The annual rate of renewal for members-at-large is between 70 and 80% which, though relatively high, points up the need for continuing solicitation of new members if the Federation is to hold its own and grow. A way must be found to interest more graduate students and younger scientists in the organization. A first prerequisite is a program which will attract their support.

FAS viability depends upon membership activity and support of a membership-evolved program. This means reestablishment of the committee on loyalty problems, formerly at Princeton. It implies also continuance of the committee on visas and passports, establishment of a continuing membership committee, watch-dog committees for AEC and NSF, and similar committees in other areas of FAS interest. The ability to staff and operate such committees is one of the best tests of the organization's strength.

The Last Executive Committee Meeting was held in Washington, Dec. 15. An arrangement was completed with the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists for reimbursement to the Washington Office for news and other services rendered. A budget of \$6250 for 1952 was recommended for the Council's consideration.

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION Newsletter SUBSCRIPTION

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

Highest Degree _____ Institution _____ Major Field _____
Received _____

Check enclosed Send bill

Annual dues are \$5 for regular members-at-large (\$3 for those with income below \$2500/annum), \$10 for supporting members, \$25 for patrons. Non-member Newsletter subscription \$2/annum.

Note. New members adding \$2.50 to their dues will receive an introductory subscription to the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists (regularly \$5).

NSF REPORTS

The first annual report of the National Science Foundation (Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.; \$.20) was transmitted to President Truman on Nov. 1, 1951 and submitted by him to Congress on January 15 in accordance with the requirements of the NSF Act of 1950. As was to be expected, the report deals more with plans than accomplishments. Possibly also to be expected, in view of NSF appropriation difficulties last year, considerable space is devoted to justifying "basic research" in a period of national emergency. The document is obviously designed primarily to strengthen NSF chances in Congress and it answers few of the questions scientists might ask.

Commenting on NSF's statutory mandate to formulate a national science policy, the report cautions that this "will take time" and that "At the outset it must be approached with care and thoroughness." A current factual background will be required and is not now available. "Among its first tasks the National Science Foundation plans to make a thorough review of the present national pattern of research and development. As soon as practicable, the Foundation will review in the main fields of science the total effort, its breakdown in terms of funds and manpower and the state of the art to show in what areas additional work is needed."

To estimate present research expenditures, NSF falls back on figures supplied by the Budget Bureau, the Research and Development Board of the Defense Department, and the National Research Council. The figures are interesting -- 2 1/2 billion dollars are estimated to have gone into the entire US research and development program in 1951. Between 60 and 70% of this came from the federal treasury, only 5% from university budgets. The rest came from industry and was largely expended in its own laboratories.

No figure at all is given for basic research. Noting that the universities receive the smallest share of the research dollar, and that they are the primary centers for basic research, the report concludes that "the smallest portion of financial support is given to basic research." The portion is even smaller since "in response to the demands of the Defense Department, many universities are doing applied research and development work." This leads to the assertion that "continuing pressure upon the universities for defense research without compensating support for basic research could easily upset the present balance." The point would have been more convincing had actual data been available.

In further amplification of the need for NSF activities, data are quoted showing that in fiscal 1948-50 half of RDB contract allotments went to only 11 schools, and 65 institutions received 90% of the obligations. NSF plans to spread its support to the smaller, otherwise neglected schools from which, it notes, a disproportionately high share of US Ph.D.'s come. It hopes to help alleviate the shortage of specialized personnel both through building up more centers and through direct fellowship support of science students.

It may be hoped that the Second Annual Report will be thicker and that it will be designed not only to convince those who hold NSF's purse strings, but to provide the information essential for the understanding and improvement of US science.

Sober Appraisal of Soviet Science. In the magazine section of the N. Y. Times (January 6), Eric Ashby, President of Queens University of Belfast, attempts the difficult task of analyzing trends in Russian science and assaying its potentialities. Prof. Ashby will be remembered as the botanist-author of "Scientist in Russia," a description of experiences as scientist with the Australian legation in Moscow in 1945. In June of that year, he was present at the celebration of the 220th anniversary of the Russian Academy of Sciences at which the premier Soviet physicist, Peter Kapitza, made his famous remarks: "There is no such thing as Soviet science or British or American science; there is only one science devoted to the betterment of human welfare. Science must, therefore, be international."

It is now common knowledge to what extent this wholesome outlook has been repudiated in the Soviet Union. Ashby, however, is by no means ready to grant that science is in a decline there -- in spite of such recent developments as the totalitarian imposition of official dogma in the field of genetics. He points out that in some fields, as mathematics and geology, the work is first class, and in such others as soil science and chemistry there is an immense vitality and even an atmosphere of adolescent enthusiasm. Regarding the emphasis which Russian leaders place on applied research and the achievement of concrete aims, Ashby bids us remember that "technologically, Russia is a very backward country in comparison with the US. What modern Russia most urgently needs is not new scientific discoveries, but the efficient application of well-known scientific principles."

Perhaps the most serious weakness of Russian science is the paucity of trained personnel. Within the next decade or two, the older leaders who were trained in pre-revolutionary days will be dead or superannuated. To find competent people to replace them in many fields it is necessary to look to the most recent graduates -- those trained since 1945. It is this well-trained, realistic group which Ashby believes will pull Russian science out of its present "pedestrian, imitative, and prejudiced" phase. On the other hand, should official interference continue and increase to a point where a wholesome development of Soviet science becomes impossible, then Ashby speculates that the frustrated scientists could well become the nucleus of a new revolution.

Two recent news items are indicative of a growing strength in Russian science. The first is a repudiation of a widely publicized Soviet theory concerning the existence in cosmic rays of "varitrons," alleged particles having masses of 100 to 25,000 times that of the electron. What is significant is not that the original Russian investigators are found to have been in error, but that the error has been recognized by the Russians themselves and publicly corrected.

A second item relates that Prof. Gustav Hertz, German Nobel Laureate in physics, is working in Russia and according to the account is "comparatively happy." The Russian government has had a spacious old Czarist mansion in the Caucasus converted into a modern laboratory and there Hertz, with about 200 Russian and German experts, mechanics, and students, is carrying on his life's work. The same report, which came to the N. Y. Times via Stockholm, indicates that Kapitza, from whom relatively little has been heard of late, is one of Dr. Hertz's neighbors.

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

52 - 1

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.

Stanley C. Bunce
Box 68
Grafton, New York