

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. 55 - 1

January 24, 1955

SECURITY PROGRAM UNDER ATTACK

A.A.A.S. ON SECURITY

Alarm and resentment over injustices in the present security system broke out in full force at the Berkeley year-end meeting of the American Assoc. for the Advancement of Science. When protests against overly stringent security procedures steal the headlines from the strictly scientific sessions -- as they did at Berkeley -- it can fairly be concluded that the scientific community is aroused as rarely before.

DIRECTORS SPEAK Even before the trek to California began, the AAAS Board of Directors key-noted the meeting with a formal statement (*Science*, Dec. 10) on "Strengthening the Basis of National Security." Noting that "the security of the nation requires the most favorable circumstances for the advancement of science," the board criticized the present negative approach to security and called for a reorientation. It proposed, first, that greater weight be given to potential contributions of individuals and that these be balanced against risk; and second, that, in assessing risk, distinction be made with respect to sensitivity of work involved. The board protested "screening persons engaged in unclassified research... by the standards appropriate for screening" individuals engaged in highly secret work.

COUNCIL SPEAKS The board and the larger AAAS council returned to the second point at Berkeley. A council statement, interpreted by the *Christian Science Monitor* as aimed at the grant program of the US Public Health Service under the Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare, voiced "growing concern over procedures under which scientists are judged worthy of receiving federal money for unclassified research." Without mentioning DHEW, the council took cognizance of, and approved, efforts in recent months to obtain uniform regulations for the several federal granting agencies, and pointedly urged the general adoption of the procedures of the Nat'l Science Foundation. NSF excludes persons established by avowal or by judicial process to be Communists or to advocate or to have committed high crimes against the national security. This policy was interpreted to represent exclusion "based only upon due process of law," with other discrimination among applicants on the basis of professional criteria alone.

OFFICERS SPEAK The security problems of the scientific community stood forth at Berkeley not only in official statements but in personalities and very human emotions. Retiring president E. U. Condon, who has borne for seven years the vicious burden of misplaced security, was silent on the subject in his presidential address. But the incoming president,

(Continued on Page 6, Column 2)

WITHERING CROSS-FIRE

The controversy over the federal security program is rapidly approaching a climax with the imminent investigation of the program by the Democratic Congress. A succession of widely publicized cases -- the most recent being Ladejinsky's -- and the importance of the security issue in the last election have led to a number of proposals for study of the program.

NUMBERS RACKET Already aroused by Republican talk of "20 years of treason," Democratic tempers flared still higher when, on Jan. 3, the Civil Service Commission issued the latest list of "security separations." From May, 1953 to Sept., 1954, the CSC counted 8008 "risk" separations. Sen. Johnston (D, S.C.) immediately attacked these figures as a continuation of the "numbers racket." Sen. Monroney (D, Okla.) pointed out that the figures did not indicate how many employees were discharged for subversion, but only the number of cases with such accusations in the files. On Jan. 5, the *Washington Post* quipped that the new total of 8008 had the virtue of readability, either sitting upright or standing on one's head, and was "devoid of meaning when read either way."

REAPPRAISALS PLANNED Congressional action to investigate the security program is already under way, with authorization on Jan. 19 of \$125,000 by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee for such a study. The request must be approved by the Rules Committee and the Senate, and public hearings will not be held for some time. Support for the investigation came from outgoing chairman Frank Carlson (R, Kan.), who called for a non-political investigation, not "anything like the televised Army-McCarthy hearings." The hearings would be run by committee chairman Olin D. Johnston (D, S.C.).

A resolution (S. J. Res. 21) calling for a 12-member bipartisan commission to "study and investigate the entire Government security program" was introduced Jan. 18 by Senators Humphrey (D, Minn.) and Stennis (D, Miss.). The commission would consist of 2 members of the executive branch, 2 senators, 2 representatives and 6 private citizens, to be appointed by the President, Vice President and Speaker of the House. The resolution calls for administration of the program "which will protect the national security and preserve basic American rights." A radical revision of procedure in security hearings will be proposed by Rep. T. J. Tumulty (D, N.J.). In order to take employee security entirely "out of the arena of politics," Tumulty suggests that the President junk the existing loyalty board set-up. A panel of retired judges would be chosen and each case would be heard in private by

(Continued on Page 2, Column 2)



In the case of **AEC vs. ALSOPS**

The Atomic Energy Commission has taken the unusual step of issuing a special memorandum purporting to refute the Alsops' charges of injustice in the handling of the Oppenheimer case. This memo, prepared by C. A. Rolander, Jr., deputy security director of the AEC, consists of excerpts from the Alsops' We Accuse article (Harper's, Oct. '54), followed by what the AEC contends are "the facts." In US News and World Report of Dec. 24, the Alsops state that when they became aware of the memo they asked the AEC for the distribution list to which it had been mailed so that they might defend their position, but they were refused this. US News, however, offered them the opportunity to refute the refutation, which they have attempted to do item by item throughout the long AEC document.

Preceding the memo and the rebuttal, there are statements by the Alsops and by Roger Robb, who acted as counsel for the Gray Board in the Oppenheimer case. The Alsops hold that "many of the facts paraded by Mr. Rolander . . . are totally irrelevant." They take particular exception to the manner in which they were denied access to the document prepared "at public expense, a document attacking private citizens," and to the denial of access to the list of persons to whom it was distributed by the AEC. Robb declined, he said, to "descend to the level of answering the Alsops' shrill abuse and malicious insinuations." In reply to the Alsops' contention that Chairman Strauss, when he voted clearance of Oppenheimer in 1947, had essentially the same facts before him as those which were the basis for firing in 1954, the AEC quoted from the Gray Board and from General Manager Nichols' statements on the case.

SAMPLE EXCHANGES The 18-page US News article, including 43 separate quotations taken from the Alsop article, does not lend itself to summary. The form of the printed debate is indicated by the following items quoted in full:

II

"The Alsop article states: 'But General Groves had already come to know Oppenheimer rather well. He had no doubts whatever, and he still has none, about Oppenheimer's loyalty.'

"AEC Memo: 'The facts': General Groves' views as to Dr. Oppenheimer's loyalty is not the whole story. General Groves testified before the Gray Board that he did not regret having made the decision to clear Dr. Oppenheimer in consideration of all of the circumstances which confronted him in 1943 but that under the present requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as he interprets them, he would not clear Dr. Oppenheimer today.

"The Alsops' rebuttal: Mr. Rolander's statement does not alter the truth of what we wrote. Gen. Groves's testimony, that he doubted whether he would clear Dr. Oppenheimer under the existing security rules, will be interpreted by Americans with some sense of this country's traditions as an implied criticism of those rules, which do not hold loyalty and discretion to be sufficient proof of security. As to Gen. Groves's personal attitude towards Dr. Oppenheimer, that was rather clearly displayed when the verdict of Adm. Strauss and the AEC majority was finally published. That evening, with witnesses present, General Groves called Dr. Oppenheimer to express his shocked regret. He was one of the few who did not hesitate, in our present mephitic national atmosphere, to make this individual gesture of reparation for the American Government's unjust act."

XIX

"The Alsop article states: 'The AEC voted Strauss down, but that did not stop him. And in 1949, Strauss charged before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy that American atomic secrets were being endangered by the export of certain isotopes to Norway.'

"AEC Memo: 'The facts': Mr. Strauss opposed the 1949 shipment of the isotope, Iron 59, to the Norwegian Ministry of Defense Research Institute, because the use of this isotope could reveal information of military and industrial significance. The Norwegian researcher who worked on this project left his post on Feb. 15, 1950, because of Communist activity and affiliation.

"The Alsops' rebuttal: Whether the Norwegian researcher was a Communist, a Republican, or a Swedenborgian does not alter the point that the export of the isotope revealed nothing of value to the enemy."

WITHERING CROSS-FIRE (Cont. from Page 1).

one member. Many of the customary court room procedures not now observed would be introduced, according to Tumulty's plan.

Freedom House, in a study prepared for the Robert Patterson Memorial Conference held in New York Jan. 21, called for a commission to determine whether the nation's security policies carry "the risk of losing our lead in science and technology which freedom of inquiry has given us."

The security program will also be scrutinized by private organizations. The Fund for the Republic, a subsidiary of the Ford Foundation, has awarded a grant of \$100,000 to the New York City Bar Association for this purpose, it was announced on Jan. 21. The Fund is also supporting a fact-finding study of individual security cases under the direction of Adam Yarmolinsky, Washington attorney.

LADEJINSKY The 'horrible example' that has received most attention recently is that of Tokyo Agricultural Attache, Wolf Ladejinsky. On Dec. 15, he was notified of his suspension from this post for security and technical reasons. The reported grounds for dismissal were his Russian birth, relatives in Russia, employment in the thirties as translator in N.Y.C. for Amtorg, the Soviet trade organization, and a trip to Russia in 1939 to visit his relatives. This suspension evoked a storm of Congressional and editorial criticism. Rep. Judd (R, Minn.) pointed to Ladejinsky's work on land reform in Japan as an assistant to Gen. MacArthur as one of the most effective anti-communist measures in Asia and noted his numerous anti-communist articles dating back to 1933. To John Cassity, security officer of the Agriculture Dept., these articles only constituted further derogatory evidence since "it is doubtful anyone would do it unless he had reason to believe his family would not be harmed."

Apparently alarmed by the barrage of unfavorable comment, the White House intervened, according to James Reston (N. Y. Times, Jan. 6), and Foreign Operations Administrator Stassen hired Ladejinsky for a land reform job in crisis-ridden Vietnam. The White House has refused to take a firm stand on Ladejinsky's new appointment, with the President saying it was Stassen's responsibility. Thereafter Stassen issued a 3-page statement citing 12 points, including Ladejinsky's "unblemished record of 19 years' service with the US Government," to support his action. In his news conference of Jan. 19, the President said that a unit in the Justice Dept. was now operating to study cases in which two departments of the government reached different decisions in security cases. He repeated his view that the security system "was the best we have been able to devise in view of the conflicting considerations that applied."

AEC REVIEW A review of AEC security procedures was held Jan. 17 by Chairman Strauss and the heads of AEC laboratories. "It was the consensus," Strauss announced Jan. 18, "that the overall operation of security clearance procedures was excellent." Some "improvement and clarifications should be achieved in some minor aspects," the laboratory directors felt, and "suggested further study to this end." An AP dispatch had quoted Strauss as saying, on Jan. 11, that it was his personal feeling that the security system "is okay as it is now."

In another move, Sen. Clinton Anderson (D, N.M.), new Atomic Energy Committee chairman, said the Senate-House committee may "make some suggestions" to the AEC for changes in its security program, based upon proposals coming from physicists at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.

CRITERIA UNREALISTIC The most outspoken attack on the security risk program came Jan. 15 from former Sen. Harry Cain, now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. Cain's speech, inserted in the Jan. 18 Congressional Record by Sen. Humphrey, called for re-examination of the basic criterion in the federal security program. He said, "It almost makes the employee affirmatively prove that the national interest requires the retention or continuation of his services. Who among us could do that? . . . We might better work toward the latitudes included in language like this: 'No person should be dismissed or denied employment from federal service as a security risk unless it is affirmatively found that his retention or employment is reasonably inconsistent with the national interest.'"

PETERS CASE -- CRUCIAL TEST

The Supreme Court will shortly hear arguments in a case testing the validity of procedures under President Truman's Loyalty Review Program. The case -- Peters vs. Hobby -- may have a major impact on all personnel security programs as presently operated by the government, for it presents to the Court the basic question: Whether, following a loyalty board hearing producing only favorable evidence, a person may be dismissed from non-sensitive federal employment as a result of secret information given by informants who were not under oath, who were not presented at the hearing, and whose identities were not disclosed to the employee. In 1951, the Court considered the same question in the Dorothy Bailey case, and split 4-4 as to its legality, with the effect of refusing to condemn such a procedure. In their brief submitted last month, however, Peters' attorneys point out that "the three years of experience with the loyalty program since the Bailey case have shown what could not be accurately determined at that time, to wit, the punitive character of this procedure and its lack of connection with actual national security."

SCIENTIFIC BACKGROUND John P. Peters, John Slade Ely Professor at Yale, is an eminent physician. As a teacher and as the author of more than 150 scientific articles and (with D. D. Van Slyke) of the classical work, *Quantitative Clinical Chemistry*, he has had an outstanding role in the development of American medicine. During World War I, he served as a medical officer and during World War II conducted research for the military services. From 1947 to 1953, he served as a member of a Public Health Service study section, a group of eminent and public spirited scientists who meet several times a year to advise the PHS on applications for research grants. The work was non-sensitive; Peters at no time had access to confidential or strategic information.

CLEARED TWICE In January, 1949, Peters received a letter from his agency notifying him that information "relating to his loyalty had been received." Enclosed was an interrogatory relating to his various political activities and a request that he supply the information called for therein. Peters completed the form and returned it on Jan. 17, 1949. Shortly thereafter, the FSA Loyalty Board notified him that it had no evidence for holding him disloyal.

In December, 1951, the case was reopened. Among the 16 charges of questionable activity against him was that of membership in the Communist Party. In answering the allegations, Peters categorically denied the latter charge. A Loyalty Board hearing was held in New Haven. In their answer, the defendants state: "The sources of the information as to the facts bearing on the charges against plaintiff were not identified at the hearing or made available to counsel for plaintiff for cross examination. The identity of one or more of the informants furnishing such information, but not of all such informants, was known to the Board. The Chairman stated that the Board did not know whether or not the information given by a confidential informant as to facts bearing on Charge No. 1 against plaintiff had been given under oath." Charge No. 1, that Peters was a member of the Communist Party since 1939, was denied by Peters under oath. No other witnesses were called. Within 2 months, Peters was cleared.

Some 11 months later Peters received a letter from Loyalty Review Board chairman Hiram Bingham, informing him his case was to be reopened to conduct a "post-audit" of the action of the Agency Board. At this hearing, the third proceeding on the same material, Peters again affirmed his complete and unswerving loyalty to the US. The Board called no witnesses. Again, Peters' attorneys charge, the identity of confidential informants was not disclosed to Peters and even the Board did not know the identity of all the informants. The Board decided there was a reasonable doubt as to Peters' loyalty to the government and on June 12, 1953 he was discharged by the Surgeon General.

MAIN BRIEF In their brief to the Court, Peters' attorneys -- Arnold, Fortas and Porter of Washington, D.C. and Professors Harper and Countryman of Yale Law School -- considered the contention of the Government in the Bailey case that "no punishment was involved within the terms of the Constitution when an employee was severed from his position, and that the hardship

CONDON CLEARANCES. To scientists, the case of E. U. Condon has been a particularly disturbing example of the operation of the security system. Two days after it was publicly reported (*Washington Post*, Oct. 19, 1954) that Condon had been cleared for the fourth time, his security clearance was suspended by Navy Secretary Thomas (see *NL* 54-9). On Dec. 13, Condon resigned as Director of Research and Development for the Corning Glass Works, stating that, "at the present time, I do not feel there is any possibility of my securing a fair and independent judgment . . . I now am unwilling to continue a potentially indefinite series of reviews and re-reviews. . . . The long-drawn-out clearance difficulties . . . began to affect my ability to perform my duties efficiently, and even to impair my health."

After Condon's resignation, the Atomic Scientists of Chicago (FAS' Chicago chapter) released a statement expressing concern over "this new example of political interference with the personnel security system," and stated that "Vice President Nixon and Secretary of the Navy Thomas owe the country an accounting of their actions." Thomas, on Dec. 15, denied to an ABC newsmen in an interview that Nixon had ever talked to him "directly or indirectly, or through any person, about this case." ASC responded: "We are glad to have Mr. Thomas' comment, because we feel that the record must be set straight." The organization then referred to an Oct. 23 story in the *N. Y. Times* which had quoted Mr. Nixon as saying, to a reporter in Cheyenne, Wyo., "Before I left Washington I asked that the Dr. Condon matter be re-examined." Commented ASC, "We are still very perturbed that the Secretary of the Navy should overrule, after less than 24 hours' consideration, a decision in which the Eastern Industrial Review Board had labored for about a year."

of discharge under a finding of disloyalty was not a penalty in the constitutional sense. Peters' attorneys argue that time has shown that discharge for disloyalty is indeed punishment. This was stated by the Oklahoma Supreme Court in the Public Servants' Oath case (*Wieman vs. Updegraff*): "There can be no dispute about the consequences visited upon a person excluded from public employment on disloyalty grounds. In view of the community, the stain is a deep one; indeed, it has become a badge of infamy. Especially is this so in time of cold war and hot emotions when each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy." The Court also maintained "that constitutional protection does extend to the public servant whose exclusion pursuant to a statute is patently arbitrary or discriminatory."

It was further noted "that the other contention for abandoning due process, i.e., that it is connected with national security, is equally invalid. The complete and utter lack of any connection with national security in the use of this procedure is dramatically illustrated by this case." Peters was in no way connected with sensitive work. If it can be established that due process does hold in this situation, as is implied in the *Wieman* case, the Government must hold hearings with full opportunity to confront witnesses in conformity with traditional American practice.

SUPPORTING BRIEFS The Court has also received briefs in support of Peters from the Engineers and Scientists of America, the Amer. Civil Liberties Union, and the CIO. The Engineers and Scientists of America, formed two years ago, is a federation of 13 labor unions representing some 40,000 engineering and scientific professional and sub-professional employees of companies throughout the nation engaged in work closely related to defense activities. The ACLU is interested in the Peters case because they believe the "hearing" afforded him was a "sham" hearing with denial of basic constitutional rights.

The CIO states that it is concerned that the jobs of its members be not placed in jeopardy through procedures which are not consonant with the guarantees of the US Constitution. The brief points out that mushrooming nature of the loyalty and security programs by extension to workers in defense plants, waterfront workers, workers employed by firms under contract to the AEC, workers in state and local governments, and perhaps in the near future workers in private industrial facilities indirectly related to national defense such as railroads and utilities. (This brief includes the Preliminary Study of Personnel Security Programs of the Federal Government, by Sandra Weinstein, authorized by the Fund for the Republic.)

A-POOL PLANNING PROGRESSES

On January 17, a 7-nation advisory committee of experts began a series of meetings at UN Headquarters in New York to make plans for the first international conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The representatives, all specialists in the physical sciences, were: I. I. Rabi (US), Sir John Cockroft (Great Britain), D. V. Skobeltsyn (Russia), H. Bhabha (India), B. Goldschmidt (France), W. B. Lewis (Canada), J. De Barros (Brazil).

GENEVA IN AUGUST The New York conferees convened amiably and quickly agreed that the international conference should be held in Geneva under UN auspices. Aug. 8, 1955, was tentatively set for the first session. The agenda items agreed upon have not been made public. Undoubtedly the conferees will devote subsequent sessions to details for the conference -- scientific, technical and engineering areas to be covered, degrees of participation by delegates to the conference, and mechanics of running the conference so that it will fulfill its promise of benefits to all concerned. No doubt there will be considerable wrangling about which nations may send delegates. Since the conference is sponsored by the UN, the most formidable decision will be encountered when the question of Communist China's participation is considered. Obviously, the 7-Nation Advisory Committee has an extremely difficult task in planning for this conference, since the delegates cannot assess what kind of contribution will be made by each nation until the very day the papers are presented.

SOVIET OFFERS Three days before the N.Y. meeting, a dispatch from Moscow announced that Russia would make available at the international conference the information and experience developed in operating the 5000 KW atomic power plant they have had running since June 27 last year. While the extent and value of the data to be offered cannot be evaluated until actually presented, the apparent shift in approach may constitute the first major break-through of the 8-year-old stalemate on atomic energy negotiations.

At the same time, the Russians offered some know-how to all nations. They revealed that they would make fissionable material and technical assistance available to Iron Curtain countries specifically. This contrasts with US and British offers of exact quantities of fissionable material and of technical assistance to a world pool. Presumably, allocation of pool materials would be controlled by the donor nations, as indicated by information already released, which reveals that the US has received several requests for shares of the 100-kilogram reservoir of fissionable material. The Russian choice of action may reflect her concern that Iron Curtain countries, especially Communist China, will not get much consideration from us.

It is heartening to realize that negotiations on the diplomatic level have finally achieved a position where it is possible for eminent, highly qualified scientists to represent their countries in discussions about a real cooperative effort. Perhaps the hands of The Clock have been pushed back at least a few minutes.

"SPONSORED RESEARCH POLICY of Colleges and Universities" is the title of a recent report by a committee of educators and natural scientists of the Amer. Council on Education. The report (\$1.50 from the ACE, 1785 Mass. Ave., NW, Washington 6, D.C.) states that "since World War II, proper emphasis on basic research has not been maintained" and that as a result, the ultimate "progress and security of the nation may be in jeopardy." The report is particularly critical of government-sponsored research in colleges and universities that is classified, developmental or applied in character, or large-scale to the point where it seriously disrupts and causes an imbalance in the educational program.

While recognizing the government's right and duty to screen university personnel working on secret projects, the committee warns against the danger that, particularly as a result of congressional action and pressure, the granting agencies may take "the position that the provision of government funds to any institution gives the government the right to dictate the selection of personnel to be used on the non-classified work paid for by the government. Obviously, this kind of requirement drives at the heart of intellectual freedom and provides one of the most serious hazards in the acceptance of government funds."

A-WEAPONS ALTER MILITARY PLANS

The availability of tactical A-weapons is exerting increasing influence on military planning both at home and abroad. The widely publicized recent NATO Council meeting in Paris centered largely on whether an atomic defense should be planned for Western Europe and who should have final authority for ordering the use of such weapons. The results of these discussions augur well for greater sharing between the US and our NATO allies of information on A-arms use and effects. At home a much discussed proposal for reduction of the US military budget was interpreted by some analysts as heralding a greater reliance on A-weapons for our military security. Such a shift in emphasis would have very important implications with respect to scientific manpower and training.

NATO A-WEAPONS The discussions abroad centered around the Dec. 17-18 annual meeting in Paris for review of NATO by its Council. Military Committee Report "M.C. 48," the contents of which had previously been essentially revealed, maintained that "the new [atomic] weapons" are the only means of cancelling Communist superiority in manpower and in weight of ordinary weapons. The issue was widely discussed in the days before the Paris meeting. When the Council met Dec. 17 it decided with surprising swiftness to let the military commanders go ahead with plans for an atomic defense, but ruled that the final decision on the use of A-weapons in any specific case must be left to the civilian governments. Although no procedures were provided for arriving at such a civilian ruling, the principle of the decision has apparently had considerable effect in quieting the fears of some European nations that a NATO military commander might initiate the use of A-weapons in connection with a local incident and precipitate a full-fledged atomic war.

The NATO decision has stimulated progress toward US sharing of A-arms information with its allies, as provided in last August's revision of the Atomic Energy Act. Deputy Sec'y of Defense Anderson said in Paris on Dec. 17 that he hoped agreement for such sharing could be concluded in January, 1955.

A-WEAPONS PERMIT CUTS? Military manpower cuts permitting the proposed US defense budget reduction were announced on Dec. 20 by Sec. of Defense Wilson. Present plans call for a cut in the armed forces from 3,218,000 men to 2,850,000 by June 30, 1956. Wilson said the cut has been made possible by the diminution of the global war threat. On the other hand, Secretary Dulles says this threat "has not diminished" and that the cuts are made possible by the development of new weapons, presumably atomic artillery and the like.

This reduction is coupled with a proposed new national manpower policy unveiled by the Defense Dept. Dec. 17. The policy calls for a combination of a period of military training or service plus a period of reserve responsibility for all physically fit young men. The longer the active military participation, the shorter the total of active plus reserve participation. An alternative which might permit a minimum of interference with the training and development of scientific manpower calls for 6 months' active military training, beginning as early as age 17, plus 9½ years in the ready reserves.

A PANEL DISCUSSION ENTITLED "What is the Security System doing to our Security?" was held Dec. 16 by the Washington Chapter of FAS, with editorial writer Alan Barth of the Washington Post as moderator. Joseph A. Fanelli, the lawyer who successfully defended Navy clerk Chasanow, called the security system a "political shell game" which is "driving scientists into non-defense areas," and described the difficulties of defending a client who had "no opportunity to accost an accuser."

Professional-level government employees in Washington are policing their reading and thinking habits and are wary of their associates, Marie Jahoda, associate director of the N. Y. Univ. Research Center for Human Relations, told the meeting. In interviews with seventy high-ranking government workers, one finding was that "a person who takes an active part in voluntary organizations is a target for suspicion." (See "Considerations regarding the loyalty oath as a manifestation of current social tension and anxiety," by Cook and Jahoda, Yale Law Journal, 61: 295-333, 1952.)

COMMERCE DEPT. CENSORSHIP

The Commerce Dept. tightened its control over the export of technical information in a new order on Dec. 27, setting up mandatory controls on the transmission of data concerning 53 different types of equipment and processes. This information embargo, while not initiated there, received the approval of the Commerce Dept.'s newly created Office of Strategic Information, set up to promote "voluntary efforts" on the part of the business community to prevent the flow of unclassified strategic information to Iron Curtain countries.

OSI NOT NEEDED In a strongly worded Jan. 1 editorial, Chemical and Engineering News, official house organ of the American Chemical Society, objected to OSI as unnecessary and potentially damaging to our own technical advancement. The editorial states that "the principal objection to the OSI program is that we know of no practical way that the objectives can be obtained by such an agency short of mandatory censorship. ... it is possible to keep information from a given group, such as an enemy or a potential enemy. It can only be done effectively, however, by keeping it away from our own people at the same time." C & EN's position is that the classification of secret information is already a function of the defense agencies. The editors state flatly, "There is no need for an agency like OSI."

MCCARRAN-WALTER ACT

J. R. Oppenheimer, in an interview on Edward R. Murrow's TV program Jan. 4, stated that the McCarran-Walter Act "seems a wholly fantastic and grotesque way to meet the threat of espionage." He went on to deplore the fact that great scientists from other nations frequently send representatives to meetings in this country because they, themselves, are prevented from attending by our laws.

Rep. Walter (D, Pa.), in an address to the Assoc. of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers Jan. 15, attempted to refute Oppenheimer's criticism. He stated that Oppenheimer was no more qualified to discuss our visa problems than he (Walter) was to discuss atomic energy. He went on to suggest that Oppenheimer's statements as to the exclusion of foreign scientists from our meetings were groundless and that he could "see no reason why they [scientific meetings] cannot be held here."

The **FAS STANFORD VISA COMMITTEE** is continuing its survey of visa problems of visiting scientists. Letters requesting information have gone to some 40 US and 50 foreign and international scientific and engineering societies. Documentation of actual visa cases has been undertaken by the committee to guide FAS in proposing constructive legislative changes and to illustrate the damaging effects of current visa policies and the need for improvements. Anyone with information of value to this survey should write to the FAS Committee on Visa Problems, P.O. Box 1191, Stanford, Calif. Please indicate to what extent the information given must be treated as confidential.

LOYALTY -- SCHOOLS AND SCOUTS. A sophomore at the U. of Maryland signed an ROTC loyalty oath under protest when it became clear that refusal to sign would mean expulsion. * * * * Rep. Robeson (D, Va.) asked for the names of the Duke University faculty members responsible for the debating team in connection with the recent collegiate debates on recognition of Communist China. * * * * A Nat'l Education Assoc. committee investigating the Houston (Tex.) public schools reported that more than a third of the teachers responding said they had experienced some kind of unwarranted pressure, mostly in regard to social or political activity and teaching. * * * * Five former U. of California professors have received full payment of their claims from the Regents. The five, plus 16 others, sued for salary or severance pay after refusing to sign a special loyalty declaration which was later declared unconstitutional. * * * * The new revised edition of the Girl Scout Handbook contains about 40 changes, in answer to criticism that it was slanted and internationalist. The Girl Scouts regard these changes as superficial, but Robert LeFevre (former Florida telecaster and UN critic), whose attack led to most of the changes, claimed they verify "the validity of my criticism." One of the revisions was the deletion of a statement likening the Declaration of Human Rights to the Bill of Rights.

FAS NEW YORK MEETINGS

Open Meeting: "SCIENCE AND SECURITY" Thursday, Jan. 27
North Ballroom, Hotel New Yorker 4:30 PM

SPEAKERS will include two members of FAS' Scientists' Committee on Loyalty & Security: Ralph Brown (Yale Law Professor) and John Phelps, SCLS Secretary. George Cowan, chairman, FAS Los Alamos chapter, will summarize chapter suggestions on personnel security problems.

FAS Council Meeting: Saturday, January 29, 4:30 PM
Columbia University Men's Faculty Club, 400 W. 117th St.
(Member observers welcome)

FIFTH AMENDMENT PROBLEMS

In Sen. McCarthy's Investigations Subcommittee hearings during Dec. and Jan., a number of employees of Westinghouse, Bethlehem Steel, and other industrial plants were identified as Communists. Even though none of the workers had access to defense secrets and, in some cases, the employers had no defense contracts, Sen. Mundt (R, S.D.) demanded discharge of those who invoked the 5th Amendment and also government blacklist of defense-essential plants which employ security risks. The final report of the Subcommittee (Jan. 10) recommended that the Defense Dept. "prepare adequate security regulations preventing the employment of and ordering the removal of Communists in establishments producing materials under the national defense program, regardless of whether employment is in connection with classified work."

G. E. FIRINGS Supporting the Subcommittee's position is a recent decision given by Judge McLaughlin on December 30 in a suit brought against the General Electric Co. by the left-wing United Electrical Workers. He held that GE has the right to fire employees who use the 5th Amendment to avoid answering Congressional inquiries about subversion. The union claimed that GE's action violated a collective bargaining contract, but the judge ruled that such discharges by a private employer are no less justified than by a governmental body and that they were "for obvious cause." The union said the decision would be appealed.

FURRY INDICTED In the academic world, Wendell H. Furry, associate professor of physics at Harvard, was indicted Dec. 17 for contempt of the US Senate. In appearing before Sen. McCarthy's Subcommittee Jan. 15, 1954, Furry abandoned his reliance on the 5th Amendment, admitted his own past Communist connections, but refused to testify about the activities of others. Harvard's President, Nathan M. Pusey, issued a statement citing the facts of the case but refused further comment while it was still pending. Also indicted for refusal to answer the Committee's questions was Leon J. Kamin, former teaching fellow in the social relations department at Harvard.

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.

UNDERMINING FOUNDATIONS

The 5-man House Committee investigating the activities of tax-exempt foundations split three ways last month in reporting its conclusions on last spring's hearing. The majority report was signed by Chairman B. Carroll Reece (R, Tenn.), and Representatives Wolcott (R, Mich.) and Goodwin (R, Mass.). It accused the foundations of directly supporting "subversion" which was defined as "undermining some of our vitally protective concepts and principles," promoting "a forum directed toward world government," and derogating "American nationalism." The foundations were further charged with wielding their "enormous" power in such a way as to promote "an excess of empirical research" in the social sciences and to induce educators to become agents "for social change" as well as propagandists "for the development of our society in the direction of some form of collectivism."

3 - 2 OR In a later statement, however, Goodwin disavowed
2 - 3 ? the heart of the majority report, it was reported on Dec. 20. He stated that he had signed it only with "strong reservations and dissent from many of its findings and conclusions." Goodwin's somewhat anomalous position made the majority report partly a minority report. The two Democrats on the committee, Reps. Pfof of Idaho and Hayes of Ohio, dissented strongly. In their minority report they charged the majority with "prejudgment and bias" and, noting that the foundations had not been given an opportunity to testify in public hearing, asserted that these institutions "have been indicted and convicted under procedures which can only be characterized as barbaric." Some statements in the majority report are challenged as "untrue on their face, others are at best half-truths and the vast majority are misleading."

Two of the largest foundations, in statements by their presidents, labeled the committee's findings as false. Dean Rusk (Rockefeller) accused the committee of accepting "flimsy allegations . . . as fact without the support of trustworthy evidence," and pointed out that their "sworn written replies . . . were apparently brushed aside." H. Rowan Gaither, Jr. (Ford) charged the majority report with throwing "mud, not only at philanthropy but also at American schools, the press, business groups, and the whole area of scientific and scholarly endeavor."

CRISIS IN EDUCATION

The imminent shortage of trained scientists, teachers and specialized personnel is attracting the attention of many groups in and out of government. The lag in our training of manpower is being contrasted with the rapid progress being made by Soviet Russia in training technical and specialized personnel. The crisis is aggravated by selective service and the frequent failure of the Defense Dept. to utilize draftees in the fields of their special-

AAAS ON SECURITY (Cont. from Page 1).

Warren Weaver, in introducing Condon, spoke warmly of him as a person and deplored the conditions -- and the kind of people -- which have combined to plague him. Weaver told of "sickness in our country -- a sickness of rumor and anxiety, of suspicion and distrust, and at its worst, of fear and tragedy." He described this as, in part, "the horrid result of political pressure, of personal selfishness and of the pathological arrogance of demagogues with small and nasty minds." Some of the same emotion suggested by Weaver's words was evidenced by the audience of some 2000 scientists who greeted Condon himself with an ovation when he rose to speak.

George W. Beadle, recently elected AAAS president for the 1956 term, addressing a symposium on "Science and National Security," also deplored "the tendency to extend security procedures to unclassified areas," and American Chemical Society president-elect Joel H. Hildebrand told the same symposium that "the principal loser is the public, not the scientist" when fear operates "to withdraw support of research involving no question of security whatever." Hildebrand referred to certain types of Congressional investigation as "a personal advertising campaign."

SECURITY & POLITICS The recurrent theme that the security system is the pawn of political interest and motivation was forcefully voiced by Vannevar Bush, in an address as recipient of a prize from the Scientific Research Society of America. He referred to "the evil practice of ruthless, ambitious men, who use our loyalty procedures for political purposes." Wondering whether "this madness of ours is a passing phase," Bush warned that, if it is not, we are in greater danger at home than from abroad. "There should be an end, for all who labor in the interests of the country's safety, of trial on the basis of unsupported charges, of actions by officials of government which destroy reputation, of the assumption of guilt before trial. There should be a complete and final end of the use of the security system to discredit those who disagree. There should be a complete removal of the system from politics."

ized training. An effort is under way to modify the selective service act to prevent this manpower wastage. The US Office of Education is considering a federal scholarship program to fill the void created by the termination of the GI educational benefits under Public Law 550. The Amer. Council on Education is proposing that 30% of a student's tuition and fees be allowed as an income tax credit. Increased industrial support of educational institutions is also being encouraged. Other groups concerned with the manpower problem include: Scientific Manpower Comm'n, Nat. Manpower Council, Engrs. Jt. Council, AAAS, ACS, Nat. Educ. Assoc.

The critical nature of the problem is stressed again in the 4th Annual Report of the National Science Foundation released Jan. 14 (50¢, Gov't Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.)

F A S NEWSLETTER

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

55 - 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.

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