

F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

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

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

No. 55 - 6

July 25, 1955

IKE: REVEAL ALL MILITARY FACILITIES

President Eisenhower's bold proposal at Geneva on July 21 may have provided the long-needed new approach in the field of disarmament. The essence of the proposal resides in the President's words: "I propose, therefore, that we... give each other a complete blueprint of our military establishments, from beginning to end, from one end of our countries to the other [and] provide within our countries facilities for aerial photography to the other country..." The proposal comes as the climax to growing hopes, over the past weeks of planning for the "summit" conference, that substantial disarmament may be achieved and may be associated with a relaxation of international tensions and eventually with world peace.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT Although, at this writing, there has yet been no Russian reply to the proposal, it has generally been hailed in the rest of the world as an immensely valuable step toward at least an amelioration of international troubles. Except for the more conservative members of the President's own party, Congressional leaders in the US applauded the proposal. Senate majority leader Johnson (D, Tex.) called it "the daring, imaginative stroke for which a war weary world has been waiting." According to the *Washington Post* of July 23, despite reported vigorous administration urging, Sens. Knowland (R, Cal.), Bridges (R, N.H.) and Millikin (R, Col.) have withheld public support of the plan.

It has been pointed out that the proposal may need some modification before Russian acceptance, since it provides no information about US bases abroad, from which any US military action against Russia would presumably begin. Russian aerial reconnaissance over US bases in countries such as Iran and Morocco would presumably have to be approved by the governments of these countries as well as by the US. One factor which has been suggested as militating against Russian acceptance of the proposal is the supposition that Russia already knows much more about the US military establishment through espionage than we know about theirs. Despite these reservations, the proposal is widely considered as a means for testing the peaceful intentions of the major powers and for attempting a disarmament program providing the requisite security for all nations.

EARLIER DEVELOPMENTS Even before the Geneva meeting became definite, the apparent gap between the East and West on disarmament had been narrowed.

The US had taken a more favorable view toward the Soviet plan of May 10 for reduction in armed forces and for nuclear weapons control (see *NL* 55-5). Specifically, the US has placed emphasis on what is now called the "alarm" system of nuclear weapon control. President Eisenhower has put this country in the position of supporting this system, saying in Geneva on July 18: "Perhaps therefore we should consider whether the problem of limitation of armaments may not best be approached by seeking -- as a step -- dependable ways to supervise and inspect military establishments, so that there can be no frightful surprises, whether by sudden attack or by secret violation of agreed restrictions."

This plan is understood to have been developed by Harold E. Stassen, presidential adviser on disarmament matters, and is considered to be less restrictive than that of the Soviet -- thus enabling it to be put into effect immediately, before agreement on nuclear weapon reduction is achieved. In essence, the alarm system is one in which key points and installations are observed so that the international inspectors can sound an alarm if it appears that a nation is massing weapons or the means to transport them.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS President Eisenhower has also emphasized that the maintenance of large armed forces was a drain upon all nations' economies and proposed that a part of the savings resulting from disarmament be used to help

(Continued on Page 4, Column 2)

LODGE ASKS UN TO GATHER RADIATION DATA

On June 21, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge announced from the UN commemorative meeting in San Francisco that the US would propose that the next UN General Assembly "establish a procedure to receive and assemble radiological information collected by the various states, as well as the results of national studies of radiation effects on human health and safety." He reaffirmed the AEC view that nuclear bomb testing "is not a threat to human health," but asserted that a program of collecting and regularly publishing radiological data "could set at rest unjustified fears, combat sensational distortion in the light of truth, and lead to humanity's learning how to deal best with the problems of atomic radiation."

LODGE MOVE COMMENDED Favorable editorial comments by the press quickly followed Lodge's proposal. The *Washington Post* said June 24 that "Ambassador Lodge could not have found a better way to relieve fears about radioactive fallout," while the *Washington Star* of the same date observed: "Our government has acted wisely." The *N. Y. Times* of June 27 expressed the view that "the suggestion deserves the serious consideration of the General Assembly."

The FAS Executive Committee, which on Mar. 6 had released a proposal (submitted earlier to Lodge and to the State Dept.) for a UN commission "to study and assess" the potential dangers of nuclear bomb tests, welcomed the Lodge announcement in a statement issued June 22. The Committee called for an evaluation "by an international panel of competent scientists" of the information collected by the UN and said: "Only in this way can the results of the study have maximum value and most widespread acceptance." Sen. Frederick G. Payne (R, Me.), whose Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 introduced Apr. 13 had called for a similar UN study, expressed gratification at the Lodge move and called upon Congress, as did the FAS statement, to approve S. Con. Res. 22. "There then would be no possible doubt... that the US was solidly behind this proposal to once again exert our moral leadership in world affairs," Payne said.

PAYNE RESOLUTION PASSED Subsequently, Sen. Payne revised his resolution and substituted in its place S. Res. 134, endorsing "efforts of our chief delegate to the UN to take appropriate steps to work to establish within the UN procedures to receive, assemble, and report on radiological information collected by the various States with particular emphasis on radiation effects on human health and safety." Payne explained the change to a simple Senate resolution would make it possible for the "Chamber most directly concerned with foreign affairs... to act finally on this matter before adjournment." Reported favorably by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 14, S. Res. 134 was passed by the Senate July 18 by a unanimous voice vote. No action has so far been taken on House Con. Res. 123, which was introduced on May 5 by Rep. Barratt O'Hara (D, Ill.) and is identical to Payne's original resolution.

UNESCO READY Luther H. Evans, director general of UNESCO, said on July 11 that UNESCO would undertake a study of the worldwide peril of radioactivity as soon as the UN requested it (*N. Y. Times*, July 12). The study would include not only the hazards that would result from a nuclear war but also the effects of continued peacetime testing programs. Information from the US, Britain and Russia, the only three powers which so far have set off nuclear detonations, would be essential to the success of the study and the cooperation of other nations with nuclear research programs would be required in a survey of the hazards resulting from peaceful applications of nuclear energy. Evans said funds already available could be used for such a study.

International concern over the radiation hazard problem
(Continued on Page 2, Column 2)

BREAKTHROUGH ON PASSPORTS

A major breakthrough and perhaps victory has been achieved in the fight to establish that the right to a passport is constitutionally guaranteed -- that freedom to travel can be abridged only by due process of law. Following a basic ruling on June 23 from the US Court of Appeals that the 5th Amendment protects the right to travel, the Department of State early in June issued passports to several individuals whose foreign travel had up to then been prevented. In particular, Martin Kamen, whose case has been supported by the FAS, received an unrestricted passport, and the State Dept. retracted the charges it had made against him. Secretary Dulles conceded that, unless the Court decision is successfully appealed, new passport procedures must be set up. The government has not yet decided whether to make an appeal to the Supreme Court.

Underlying these developments is the growing realization on all sides that the US passport is in most cases necessary as a permit to travel, and is not merely an endorsement from the Secretary of State. Historically, the government has argued that passport refusals are a matter of foreign policy in which the Secretary has exclusive jurisdiction, but the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution states: "No person shall . . . be deprived of . . . liberty . . . without due process of law." On this basis several suits against the State Dept. were filed within the last year by persons whose passports had been arbitrarily denied. The first case to achieve a decisive court ruling was that of Max Shachtman, chairman of the Independent Socialist League of New York. Shachtman's passport apparently was denied because he was the leader of an organization which had been listed by the Attorney General as subversive.

BASIS FOR DECISION

Three essential points formed the basis for the unanimous decision handed down by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the Shachtman case: (1) "The denial of a passport causes a deprivation of liberty . . ." contrary to the Fifth Amendment; (2) the use of the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations to deny a passport is arbitrary and therefore invalid; and (3) substantive as well as procedural due process is required in passport refusals. This last point requires that denial must be accompanied by sufficient reasons which are not arbitrary, and that adequate opportunity for rebuttal must be allowed. Implicit in all of this is the precedent-setting action that decisions concerning passports are subject to Court review.

In the Shachtman case, the Court of Appeals returned the case to the District Court which is to decide if the requirements of due process have been met. It is the opinion of legal experts that this action will ultimately lead to full hearings with complete charges and specifications and the right of the applicant to confront and cross-examine witnesses.

KAMEN CASE None of these rights were granted in the case of Martin D. Kamen, a radiobiologist at Washington University in St. Louis. Kamen's suit against the State Dept. was pending in the District Court at the time of the Shachtman decision. By then, Kamen's counsel, Nathan H. David of Washington, D.C., had obtained a Stipulation from the government admitting that the State Dept.'s decision to refuse Kamen a passport "was based in part upon reasons and supporting information of which neither the plaintiff nor his counsel has ever been apprised, and that neither the Passport Office nor the Board of Passport Appeals nor the Acting Secretary of State who ultimately denied the application were informed of the identity of the informers supplying any of the information upon which the decision was based."

On July 6, the Kamen case came before Judge Keech for a decision on a motion filed by Kamen's counsel for summary judgment. This motion was based on the theory that there were no significant facts in dispute and that Kamen was entitled to win the case as a matter of law. Thirty minutes before the case was due to be argued, the government's attorneys advised Kamen's lawyer that the State Dept. would issue a standard passport to Kamen. This was done 2 days later. Judge Keech refused, however, to dismiss the case as the government requested until he had given consideration to whether or not Kamen was entitled to some relief against the defamatory findings made in his case without full hearing privileges. On July 14, in a Stipulation filed by lawyers for both sides, the State Dept. conceded that the issuance of the passport constituted "a ruling by the Secretary of State that under the applicable law and regulations, Martin D. Kamen is entitled to such passport and this ruling has the effect of superseding and reversing the contrary findings heretofore made by the Passport Office of the Dept. of State and by the Acting Secretary of State that the plaintiff was a person who . . . engaged in activities which support the Communist movement and who was going abroad for

the purpose, knowingly and willfully, of advancing that movement." The outcome of the Kamen case appears to have justified the action of the FAS in supporting the litigation. It is apparent that the government had no desire to litigate the procedural due process question on the facts presented in this case. There is reason to believe that the extreme nature of the State Dept.'s action caused the Justice Dept.'s lawyers charged with defending the government's position to reconsider their assumption of absolute discretion in the Secretary of State. There is also reason to believe that the wide publicity given the Kamen suit contributed heavily to the government's decision to abandon its defense.

ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENTS

Another illustration of the arbitrary decisions reached by the Passport Office is the case of Otto Nathan, economics professor at N. Y. U. Nathan, executor of Einstein's estate, had been trying to get a passport for 2 1/2 years. The Court of Appeals ordered the State Dept. to give a specific hearing by a specific date, and to "show cause" if a passport was to be denied. By suddenly reversing its stand and granting Nathan a passport, it appeared that the State Dept. was trying to short-circuit any legal arguments which might tend to jeopardize its historically assumed authority over passports.

Congressional interest in the passport situation is evidenced by the fact that the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights announced on June 27 that it would initiate hearings on this subject. Committee Chairman Thomas C. Hennings (D, Mo.) said that there are certain aspects of the problem "only Congress can authoritatively determine" and that the hearings "will be directed to formulating a constructive solution of the legislative aspects."

On July 9, the FAS Passport Committee released a public statement welcoming the issuance of Kamen's passport as evidence of a real change in State Dept. policy. The statement said in part: "In the near future, we expect to see new procedures set up which recognize that every citizen has a right to a passport and that freedom to travel can be abridged only by due process of law. We hope that no further efforts on our part are necessary to secure these ends, but we stand prepared to take action if necessary."

The FAS Passport Committee wishes to take this opportunity to express its deepest thanks to the several hundred FAS members and friends who contributed to the Kamen fund. A total of \$4300 was raised, of which nearly all has been committed for legal expenses. When costs of the appeal have been met, the Committee will consider the disposition of any remainder and report to the contributors.

POLITICAL DETENTE FOR A.E.C.

President Eisenhower took two steps on July 11 to relieve political tensions concerning the AEC. He withdrew the nomination made on Mar. 16 of Allen Whitfield, Des Moines attorney, as AEC Commissioner, and ordered the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract to supply electric power to the TVA to replace power used by AEC. Whitfield's nomination had been under fire by the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee investigating his legal activities as a trustee of an estate. The AEC, which has been without a full membership for many months, again requires another presidential nomination to fill its ranks.

The cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract was attributed to the decision of the city of Memphis to build its own electricity generating plant. This city's need for electric power had been a major factor cited in the original placing of the contract. On June 30, the President had ordered an immediate re-study of the contract to determine whether "to continue or cancel" it. The long-controversial contract had produced new discord with the Senate Anti-Monopoly subcommittee investigating connections between the administration and business representatives concerning the contract. It may be hoped that the above Presidential actions will result in less political distraction of the AEC from its vital functions.

LODGE asks UN to Gather RADIATION DATA (Cont. from p. 1). had been expressed earlier in several quarters. On May 10, Swedish Foreign Minister Osten Unden announced that Sweden, possibly in collaboration with Norway and Denmark, would propose a UN study of a similar nature. The 29 Asian-African powers meeting last spring at Bandung went further and appealed for a suspension of nuclear testing until all nuclear weapons could be banned. A similar appeal for an A-ban was jointly issued by Yugoslavia and Russia on June 2, but was considerably obscured by other, primarily political statements.

Security Program to be Examined

Congressional, judicial and executive actions in recent weeks indicate that there is more and more official concern over the adequate safeguarding of the constitutional rights and liberties of individuals in the administration of the government's loyalty-security program. Three Senate committees have taken steps to initiate and carry out investigations of the security program and the effects it may have on civil rights.

The most significant of the developments was the passage, with practically no opposition, by both House and Senate of the joint resolution to establish a 12-man Commission on Government Security to "study and investigate the entire government security program" and see whether existing regulations and their administration "protect the national security and preserve basic American rights." The resolution, introduced by Sens. Humphrey (D, Minn.) and Stennis (D, Miss.), was the subject of hearings by a Senate Govt. Operations Subcommittee (see NL 55-3). Following passage of the resolution on June 29, the President pledged his cooperation with such an investigation, although previously he had maintained that an outside review was unnecessary because the Justice Dept. had the security program under continual study.

COMMISSION'S COMPOSITION

Members of the Commission are to be chosen -- 4 each -- by President Eisenhower, Vice-president Nixon in his capacity as presiding officer of the Senate, and Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn. Two of the four that each man may choose must be private citizens. All laws, regulations, and directives concerning national security and their administration fall within the purview of the Commission, and the Commission is to be given access to government records except in such cases where the President rules that release of such information would jeopardize national security. The Commission's final report must be submitted to the President by December 31, 1956.

A broader inquiry into the violation of constitutional rights has been launched by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee under the chairmanship of Sen. Hennings (D, Mo.). It is expected that such subjects as wire-tapping, due process of law, and the freedoms of speech, press and assembly will be covered by this group. Effects of the security program on these rights and freedoms will undoubtedly form a large part of the committee's activities. Preliminary staff investigations are now being carried out, and no public hearings are yet scheduled.

Another inquiry is that of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, chaired by Sen. Johnston (D, S.C.), which has been holding hearings to determine to what extent the security program is used as a cloak for the discharge of employees. Before this Committee on June 9, former US Solicitor General Phillip B. Perlman cited Vice President Nixon's intervention last fall in the security case of E. U. Condon (see NL 55-1) as an example of making the security program a vehicle of "political expediency." On July 22, a proposal to jettison the whole loyalty-security program and replace it with a system giving Federal officials power to fire employees on "suitability" grounds was made to this committee by Thurmond Arnold, former Assistant Attorney General and US Court of Appeals judge, now with the firm of Arnold, Fortas and Porter. This firm handled the only two loyalty-security cases yet to reach the Supreme Court, those of Dorothy Bailey and John P. Peters.

PETERS CASE

In the Peters case, the Supreme Court handed down its opinion concerning Yale medical professor John P. Peters, who had been suspended from his position as consultant to the Public Health Service on granting funds for medical research projects after the Loyalty Review Board had reversed the agency board's clearance and found reasonable doubt as to his loyalty. Peters appealed the suspension on the grounds that his constitutional rights to "due process of law" had been violated because he had never been confronted by his accusers or given the opportunity to cross-examine them. In its decision, the Court side-stepped the constitutional issue and ruled only that the Loyalty Review Board had exceeded its authority in reviewing a case in which the agency board had twice previously decided in favor of clearance and which it had not been specifically asked to review.

After the conclusion of the Peters case, a petition to President Eisenhower by some 1500 physicians was released on June 11 which urged "basic changes" in the Federal security program to "more adequately" safeguard the interests of individuals. Highlighting the Peters case as one which "exemplifies the injustices inherent in a procedure applied to thousands... who require security clearances in order to work for the government in one capacity or another," the petition had been presented to President Eisenhower four weeks earlier, announced Paul Klemperer of Columbia U. College of Physicians & Surgeons. The petition's

INFORMATION POLICIES

Widespread complaints that the administration has been withholding unclassified information from the public are to be investigated by a subcommittee of the House Govt. Operations Committee. Composed of Reps. Moss (D, Cal.), chairman; Fascell (D, Fla.) and Hoffman (R, Mich.), this group was charged by Rep. Dawson (D, Ill.), chairman of the full committee, to investigate: "Charges that government departments and agencies have denied or withheld pertinent and timely information from those who are entitled to receive it." The subcommittee's first step is the preparation of a questionnaire requesting all government agencies to define their standards for classification of documents.

"ANYTHING YOU CAN THINK OF"

This action comes at a time when there has been much criticism of the administration's public information policy. An example of this policy that is causing concern to many Congressmen and newspaper writers is the recent set of instructions sent to some Army field commands to "guide" information officers in deciding whether or not a particular bit of information -- even though it is not classified -- should be released to the public. This "Balance Sheet for Strategic Information," reproduced in the Washington Post of June 20, instructs those using the form to judge the extent to which release of information will be "Helpful to US" and "Harmful to US," under the following headings: Net Effect on Military Power, Net Effect on Industrial Power, Effect on Morale, Other Strategic Angles, and, finally, Other Considerations. This last item is elaborated by a subheading reading "Anything you can think of." According to the N.Y. Times of June 20, information officers have said that, taken literally, the form would force them to refuse to release most information requested.

GOVERNMENT UNWILLING

R. Carl Honaman, former head of the Commerce Dept. Office of Strategic Information and newly appointed public relations chief of the Defense Dept., refers to "strategic information" as that information which is not classified but which might prove helpful to a potential enemy. Honaman has requested editors voluntarily to suppress information which might be of use to a potential enemy. This request has been strongly criticized by J.R. Wiggins, managing editor of the Washington Post and chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the Amer. Society of Newspaper Editors. He stated in part, "I think [the editors] will not suppress unclassified information which authorized officials release. I believe they will refuse to interpose their individual personal judgment of the possible value to an enemy of such officially released information... Mr. Honaman is asking them in effect to assume a censorship and suppression role which the government itself is unwilling to undertake."

release was withheld until after the Peters Supreme Court decision so as not to improperly influence the case, Klemperer said.

"INTERNAL SECURITY & CIVIL RIGHTS" is the subject of the July issue of The Annals, published by the Amer. Academy of Political and Social Science. The issue includes an article by former FAS chairman M. S. Livingston on "Science and Security." Copies are available at \$2 from the Academy, 3937 Chestnut St., Phila. 4.

* * *

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

- MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION -- Dues: Regular - \$5 (with income below \$2500 - \$3); Supporting - \$10; Patron - \$25. New membership and an introductory subscription to Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists - \$8.50 (with income below \$2500 - \$6.50).
- SUBSCRIPTION to INFORMATION BULLETINS -- \$10 to individuals; \$25 for Societies, etc. (including Newsletter)
- NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIPTION -- \$2 to non-members (all members receive the Newsletter)

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

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

BOMB EFFECTS REVEALED

The misfortune of the Japanese fishing boat, Fortunate Dragon, and the subsequent deductions by the physicists, J. Rotblat in England and R. E. Lapp in the US, have finally caused the AEC to reveal the nature and extent of the hazards from the thermonuclear device set off at Bikini on Mar. 1, 1954. This is the opinion voiced by many in scientific and journalistic circles following AEC Commissioner Libby's speech in Chicago on June 3. By his reference to "10 megatons of fission energy" and not fusion energy, it has been surmised that Libby was admitting, albeit obliquely, that the Bikini device was a fission-fusion-fission bomb. That this must have been the case was concluded by Rotblat (*British Atomic Scientists Journal*, Mar. 1955) and deduced by Lapp (*Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, June, 1955) in order to explain the large quantity of fission-products activity which was first brought to public attention through the fallout measurements made on the Fortunate Dragon.

NEW BOMB STRUCTURE According to Rotblat, a fission-fusion-fission bomb uses a fission "A-bomb" to ignite a fusion "H-bomb" which, by virtue of its large production of energetic neutrons, can in turn produce any desired additional quantities of fission in otherwise unfissionable material. It is thought that the second fission stage results in the splitting of U-238 which is the abundant and cheap isotope of uranium. As pointed out by Lapp in his June *Bulletin* article, the high fission yield resulting from the March 1, 1954 detonation clearly identified "the revolutionary character of the new weapon."

According to the figures stated by Lapp, at a point 110 miles downwind from the explosion, 1000 roentgens would be accumulated in the first 5 to 12 hours, 3700 roentgens in the first month, and about 4500 roentgens in the first year. Recognizing that the effects of radiation are essentially cumulative, and that serious systemic, and even lethal, effects can be produced by a few hundred roentgens, it must be concluded that the fallout hazard could exist for weeks and months before effective decontamination could even be undertaken.

HEALTH EFFECTS Libby also discussed in detail the question of worldwide fallout due to bomb tests. He pointed out that the average yearly dose rate in the US has been about 0.001 roentgens, which is about 15,000 times less than the yearly rate from external sources which AEC employees are allowed to receive. With regard to internal sources of radiation, Libby estimates that present levels of strontium-90, which is metabolized like calcium, are too low by a factor of about 10,000 to cause bone cancer. Therefore, as far as somatic effects are concerned, Libby concludes that "tests... do not constitute any real hazard to immediate health." (Emphasis Libby's.)

For information about the possible presence of genetic effects resulting from worldwide fallout due to tests, Libby referred to a recent statement prepared by the AEC Advisory Committee for Biology & Medicine (G. Failla, Shields Warren, Chas. H. Burnett, S. T. Cantorio, E. H. Doisy and Curt Stern). This group estimates that no measurable increase in defectives will be observable due to present levels of fallout. Probably because of insufficient data, opinions still differ on the genetic hazards of widespread low-level activity resulting from bomb tests.

F A S NEWSLETTER

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

55 - 6

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.

WORLD'S SCIENTISTS ISSUE NEW PLEAS FOR PEACE

The past three weeks have been marked by the appearance of two dramatic statements issued independently by international groups of world-famous scientists concerned with the possible consequences of an atomic war. On July 9, Bertrand Russell released the text of a statement (in the form of a resolution) signed by himself, Albert Einstein, and professors Percy Bridgman, Leopold Infeld, Hermann J. Muller, Cecil F. Powell, Joseph Rotblat, Hideki Yukawa and Frederic Joliot-Curie. Appealing "not as members of this or that nation, continent or creed, but as human beings, members of the species man, whose continued existence is in doubt," this group of scientists called upon the "Governments of the world to realize, and to acknowledge publicly, that their purpose cannot be furthered by a world war, and... to find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of dispute between them."

SECOND STATEMENT Less than a week later 16 more scientists -- all Nobel Prize winners -- including Arthur H. Compton, Wendell M. Stanley and Fritz Lipmann, plus two who had signed the earlier appeal, Muller and Yukawa, issued a warning to the world's capitals that a future war might well mean the end of mankind. "All nations," the statement grimly concluded, "must come to the conclusion to refrain from the use of power as an ultimate means of statesmanship. If they won't do this they will cease to exist."

CONFERENCE IN LONDON To examine the destructive potentialities of nuclear energy, the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government is convening a conference of scientists in London on Aug. 3, 4, and 5. With an arrangements committee including Lord Boyd Orr, Bertrand Russell, Joseph Rotblat and Prof. Alexander Haddow, M.D., the assembly has been called "to enable the scientists of the world to discuss the nature and extent of the danger to mankind involved in experiments with nuclear weapons and their possible use in warfare." This conference, like the Einstein-Russell statement, is an outgrowth of a campaign begun last December when Lord Russell delivered a radio address concerned with the nuclear peril. Full details are available from the FAS Washington Office.

REVEAL ALL MILITARY FACILITIES (Cont. from Page 1) under-developed areas. Premier Faure, while echoing the US proposal for the use of resulting savings, suggested that disarmament be achieved by budgetary limitations rather than by mutual agreement and inspection.

In line with their current attitude of friendliness and co-operation, the Russians have suggested that, as a token move towards disarmament, those troops removed from Austria as a result of the peace treaty be demobilized.

Prior to the Geneva conference, both the hopes and the necessity for disarmament were emphasized in speeches and statements from all quarters. At the UN's 10th anniversary meeting in San Francisco, all nations represented pledged themselves to "press forward in the search for agreement on a disarmament plan" which would "remove the threat of atomic destruction."

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

EMERY I SIMS
1644 TAYLOR ST.
SAN FRANCISCO 11, CAL.