

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS  
June 6, 1951

1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.  
51 - 5

## from the WASHINGTON SECRETARY

**Financial Plight.** Since the meeting of the FAS Council at the end of April, there has been no marked improvement in the financial situation of the Federation. While in April net worth was slightly negative, it now has shifted to slightly positive. The difference does not appear statistically significant. With expenditures of some \$300 anticipated this month, it appears that we are just about holding our own and have not by any means eliminated the threat of financial emergency during the less lucrative summer months.

There has, however, already been a positive response to explanation of the financial situation in the May 2 Newsletter. Since May 1, over \$600 has been received from the following sources: personal contributions, \$165; chapter contributions, \$65; contributions in the form of gift subscriptions to the Newsletter, \$38; chapter dues, \$200; member-at-large dues, \$150. These receipts have permitted the issuance of this Newsletter, and payment of current bills. Several chapters have not yet been heard from with regard to dues payments, and only one (Washington) has met the membership formula set up by the Council (See NL 51-4) to ensure financial solvency until fall. A reminder was mailed to all chapters at the end of May, urging that action be taken before people disperse for the summer.

The Council in April reaffirmed its belief that the operation of the Washington office should continue at its present level. Since income to date will not provide for this through the low-income summer months, a letter to the membership has just been mailed, describing the situation and urging gift contributions. The letter makes clear, however, that such contributions are an expedient, and a permanent solution can only come with an expanded membership.

**Membership.** The Federation has done little to solicit new members during the last year and a half. A campaign now is being initiated by the Cornell chapter, with continuing responsibility to be assumed by a committee at Brookhaven. To make this campaign effective, it would be appreciated if members would send to the Washington office suggestions as to prospects interested in FAS membership. Names will be checked against the present membership list and forwarded to the membership committee.

**A New Chapter.** The recently formed Illinois Association of Scientists (Champaign-Urbana) has been formally accepted by the Council and Executive Committee, and welcomed into the FAS.

**FAS Moves into Two Rooms.** Until May, the Federation held a 5-year lease on the building at 1749 L Street. We now lease on a yearly basis two of the upstairs rooms at the same address, and though the actual cost will run about the same, the responsibility for the entire building is no longer ours. The reduced space necessitated consolidation of the files, disposal of excess literature, and sale of some office equipment, resulting in a more compact -- and more crowded -- office.

**NSF 1952 Budget.** On May 18, the President submitted to Congress in a proposed supplementary appropriation act for 1951-52, a request for \$14 million for the operation of the National Science Foundation during the next fiscal year. The statutory limit for NSF is \$15 million. Hearings have been scheduled for this week by the House Appropriations Committee. In 1952, according to the President's message, NSF "will give first priority to development of a national policy for promotion of basic research and education in the sciences. It will also initiate a graduate fellowship program ...and it will sponsor basic research on significant problems now receiving inadequate attention." In reply to a letter from FAS Chairman Lyle Borst, in which he stressed FAS interest in a comprehensive study of current utilization of our national scientific resources, NSF Director Alan T. Waterman indicated that NSF, "in its efforts to encourage the development of a sound national policy on basic research," is considering such a comprehensive study.

## LOYALTY MUDDLE

The problem of loyalty reached new levels of complication and confusion during the past month. The U.S. Supreme Court shook the foundations of the federal loyalty program by refusing to permit the Attorney General to list organizations as subversive without first giving them a hearing and an opportunity to defend themselves. Nevertheless, on the same day, the Court upheld a lower court decision permitting the firing under the federal loyalty program of a government employee without opportunity to confront accusers or hear charges. The Presidentially appointed Nimitz Commission, which was to investigate government loyalty procedures, was stymied and turned in resignations because a Senate Committee dominated by the author of the Subversives Control Act of 1950 refused to waive a technicality obviously designed for completely other circumstances. Meanwhile, the Subversive Activities Control Board, established under the McCarran Act over strong objections of the President, was bogged down in its hearings on the Communist Party, because of bickering within the Board. And the Loyalty Review Board, operating under authority of the Presidential Order of 1947, announced that a total of only 308 firings had occurred during its tenure but that it would reopen 846 old cases under the new "reasonable doubt" instructions given by the President. At the same time, it was reported that the Commerce Department had by-passed the regular loyalty program and divested itself of 31 employees under the power of "summary dismissal" granted by Congress last year. The news from California -- that the University Board of Regents had narrowly voted against appealing the State Appeals Court decision invalidating the loyalty oath -- was encouraging. But the sum total of the month could only be seen as half a step forward and two and a half steps back.

**Nimitz Commission.** Parliamentary maneuvering is now in progress in an effort to save the President's Internal Security Commission from death at the hands of Sen. Pat McCarran's Judiciary Committee. The Senate Committee refused to grant to the Commission exemption from the conflict-of-interest statutes designed to prevent abuse of federal appointments. The statutes place restrictions on government employees doing business with the government and prosecuting claims against the government. Eight members of the Commission submitted resignations after the Judiciary Committee action, but the President has not accepted the resignations pending attempts to overcome the McCarran roadblock. In a letter replying to a Presidential request for reconsideration of his Committee's refusal to grant the exemption, McCarran made clear that he would continue his opposition. Significantly, the Senator noted that his own Senate Internal Security subcommittee, whose work he regards as "similar to that of the commission," obtained competent personnel without exemption from the conflict-of-interest statutes. He expressed his confidence in the current loyalty program and indicated that the Nimitz Commission was not needed to ferret out subversives.

The scope of the Presidential Commission is, of course, far broader than Sen. McCarran implies. Set up by the President in response to the expressed fears of many that the current furor over loyalty may be doing more harm than good, the Commission is to examine loyalty procedures and other security measures objectively and in broad perspective. It is an executive policy group, not a legislative group, as is the Senate subcommittee; nor is it an operating group, as are the Loyalty Review Board and the Subversive Activities Control Board. Friends of the original purposes of the Commission are rallying to its defense. The House Judiciary Committee has attached an exemption rider to a routine bill to exempt Robert T. Murphy, Washington lawyer, from the conflict-of-interest provision so he can serve as temporary counsel for the Senate Rules Committee. If the measure with the rider is accepted by the House, it can be acted on by the Senate without intervention

(Continued on Page 4, Column 1)

## ON THE CONSTRUCTIVE SIDE

As the debate continues over how much war to have in the Far East -- and tension mounts in Iran -- news of effective planning and action on the constructive side remains meager. From the UN and the State Department come reports on technical assistance to backward areas, from the Quakers a critique on American foreign policy and suggestions for forwarding international control of atomic and other weapons. The U.S. has proposed merging the U.N. commissions on atomic weapons and conventional armaments, and both houses of Congress have passed a joint resolution proclaiming the desire of the American people for peace and friendship with all other peoples of the world.

**UN Point Four.** A report presented to Secretary-General Trygve Lie by five UN economic experts ("Measures for the Economic Development of Under-developed Countries," UN Publ. II.B.2, Columbia Univ. Press, \$ .75) points out the need for development of scientific and technological research in under-developed countries. The report notes that: "Large sums of money must be spent on research into the special needs of under-developed countries. Some of this work can very usefully be done inside the research institutes of developed countries, where, indeed, much of it has been done in the past. But there is needed also a vast multiplication of research institutions inside the under-developed countries themselves." The experts see this need as arising from the different economic emphasis in experimental work conducted in under-developed as against developed countries. "...in developed countries much technological enquiry is designed to save labour, whereas in some under-developed countries, where labour is over-abundant, the problem is rather to find fruitful new techniques which are capital-saving. Another instance is that students of fuel-economy in industrial countries have concentrated their thought upon coal and oil, which these countries possess in relative abundance; whereas the scientists of other countries may well come to concentrate upon other basic sources of energy available to them, or energy taken directly from the sun, or even atomic energy."

The report offers the first global estimate of the costs of a full-fledged effort to achieve rapid development of backward nations -- over 19 billion dollars annually. The largest share of this, approximately 13 billions, is recommended for South-Central Asia and the Far East, excluding Japan. The remainder is divided among Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. Of the 19 billions, approximately 15 billions is assigned for industrialization, on which the experts place major emphasis; the remainder is earmarked for agriculture. Little is said of how to obtain the necessary funds, but to put into perspective what appears to be a huge sum, the report notes that net investment in the U.S. "now runs at between \$25 and \$30 billion a year for a population 1/10th the size of that which we are considering, and for an economy that is already highly developed."

**Progress of U.S. Point Four.** In its May 1951 progress report on the Point IV program, the State Department records that by March "about 350 Point Four technicians were at work on 108 technical-cooperation projects in 27 countries." 35 governments had applied for specific help and general agreements had been concluded with 22 of them. 236 trainees from 34 countries were in the U.S. for advanced study under a still-expanding Point Four training program. State Dept. Publ. #4203 describes in detail several specific projects in which the mutual interests of the U.S. and a particular under-developed country are being served under Point Four.

**Quaker View of Disarmament and Foreign Policy.** In "Steps to Peace," a 64-page report prepared for the American Friends Service Committee, 15 distinguished Quakers, almost all of whom "have given years of their lives to Quaker service in Europe, the Middle East, or Asia," call for a new look, "from a strictly technical and scientific point of view," at the problem of international control of atomic weapons without international ownership. Asserting that "real progress toward laying the foundations of a peaceful world requires a new effort to achieve disarmament," the group stresses what it regards as four new elements in the current situation which make a fresh approach possible:

"(1) The Soviet Union's possession and development of atomic weapons, which destroys whatever possibility of security might have existed -- without international control -- when the United States had a monopoly of such weapons;

"(2) Some concessions in the Soviet proposals on control of atomic energy, which now seem to be moving toward a system of

international inspection, to be established simultaneously with an agreement to outlaw the use and possession of atomic weapons;

"(3) The belief of some careful students of the problem that international ownership and management of all atomic facilities -- upon which the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have been in continuous deadlock -- is not the only satisfactory technical means to prevent atomic energy from being used for military purposes;

"(4) Willingness of the United States, as evidenced by President Truman's October 24th statement, to consider atomic and conventional weapons as parts of a single problem of disarmament rather than insisting that regulation of conventional weapons be accomplished apart from, and after, the institution of atomic control."

The group further cites Mr. Vishinsky's statements of Oct. 23, 1950 in which he detailed "thorough and full investigation" from the Soviet point of view. The comment is offered that, "If the present opinion of many scientists indicates that international inspection may be adequate without ownership, proposals for inspection of this kind seem worth exploring." It is felt that on the issue of international ownership "new light has been shed ... by the passage of time and the indication that large-scale industrial use of atomic power is not likely to develop in the near future. This would mean that atomic production could now be concentrated in a few small-scale plants for research purposes. It would reduce the difficulties of insuring that no nuclear fuel was diverted to armament, and increase the effectiveness of inspection as the principal means of control."

These suggestions are made as part of a sober, reasoned critique of American foreign policy which the authors are convinced "is likely to bring closer the very holocaust it is designed to prevent." "There is a great danger," the authors maintain, "in our continuing to make the assumption that a policy of containment which virtually challenges Russia to a test of military strength is actually a policy for building peace." In Asia, for example, in which area the authors feel their experience has given them special competence, "our policy has failed to lead us to the real objectives of the American people because its preoccupation with strategy and ideology has prevented our giving sufficient weight to the economic, social, and political realities." "We forget too easily," the authors assert, "that freedom has a different meaning for two-thirds of the human race still submerged in a basic struggle against hunger, poverty, and disease. To them freedom has largely an economic meaning: freedom from antiquated systems of land holding or taxation, freedom from the crushing effects of poverty. They have had little opportunity to know the meaning of political freedom, and Communism is attractive largely because it talks in the economic terms they can understand." Hope for peace and security is placed in "an imaginative creative foreign policy in which military planning is subordinate, not predominant, as at present." Outlining their alternative program they discuss, besides conventional and atomic disarmament, the requirements and substance of a new initiative for peaceful settlements, the essential role of the United Nations, and the development of large-scale programs of mutual aid.

**Congressional Resolution of Friendship.** The House, on June 4, passed a resolution (House Concurrent Resolution 57) reaffirming "the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples" and inviting "the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship" to "resolve the differences standing between the United States Government and the Soviet Government." The resolution declares that "the American people and their government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war," and deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." Previously, the Senate had passed a companion resolution, introduced by Senator McMahon.

**Combined Armaments Commission.** Mr. Frank Nash, of the U.S. Delegation to the UN, has proposed to that organization that the work of the UN Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments be coordinated. President Truman had recommended such a step in his UN Day speech last October (see NL, 50-9, Oct. 24, 1950). In place of the existing two bodies, Nash suggested that a new commission for the control of armaments and armed forces be established under the Security Council. While the move was generally considered a natural and constructive development, the attitude of the U.S.S.R., as expressed by its delegate, Semyon K. Tsarapkin, did not auger well for the success of the plan. The Soviet delegate accused the United States of having led both existing commissions into a dead end and charged that the move was aimed at war, not at peace.

## AEC MISCELLANY

**Eniwetok Tests and Sequelae.** The AEC and the Defense Department announced on May 25 the successful completion of a program of atomic weapons tests at Eniwetok by the Joint Task Force 3 under Lt. Gen. E. R. Quesada. Dr. A. C. Graves of Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory was scientific commander. The Air Force cooperated with the Eniwetok Task Force by making available all types of planes in operation, including jet bombers.

No official information has yet been released by the AEC beyond statements that information obtained from research on nuclear detonations, the major purpose of the tests, is secret and that the program included experiments contributing to thermonuclear weapons research. Much of the information in the fields of biology, medicine, and radiology, and on blast and thermal effects on structures, aircraft, and other items will be declassified and made available to appropriate agencies of the government after analysis and evaluation.

A considerable amount of speculation by commentators has developed to fill the vacuum left by the meager official releases. On the basis of data already available, Stewart Alsop notes that almost any city in the world could be completely destroyed by two or three bombs of the latest Eniwetok type, which he estimates to be 5 or 6 times as powerful as the Hiroshima bomb. The results of the series of tests recently made near Las Vegas, Nevada, he says, showed the American atomic potential to be nearly double what it had appeared to be. With this effectively increased stockpile, the tactical use of atomic bombs against troops in the field can be seriously contemplated.

Rep. Brooks (D., La.) recently stated that the U.S. has also perfected atomic artillery shells. It is reported, moreover, that the Army is training crews in the use of two new types of atomic artillery pieces, both of which must be towed by locomotives. Rep. Jackson (D., Wash.), member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and an observer at the Eniwetok tests, pointed out that because radioactivity does not remain long after an atomic explosion, civilian defense crews can go immediately into an atom-bombed area; further that the way is now clear for tactical use of the A-bomb against ground troops. Another new tactical use of the Bomb is suggested by Sen. Magnuson (D., Wash.), who has disclosed that either an H-bomb or an A-bomb will soon be exploded in the Aleutian Islands, at a depth as great as 300 feet. The immense ensuing shower of radioactively contaminated soil accompanying such an underground explosion would make it extremely difficult for an advancing army to pass through an area so mined. Whether or not such a quasi-mobile Maginot line would be decisive is difficult to say. It certainly could have a profound effect.

**Atomic Power.** Speaking on May 24 to the New Jersey Bankers Association Convention, Commissioner H. D. Smyth, confirmed by the Senate on May 31 for a new 5-year term, said, "...we expect to have power-producing reactors running within a year or so, but... we do not yet know when or whether such reactors using uranium as fuel will be able to compete economically with power plants burning conventional fuels."

**Industrial Atomic Energy.** The AEC has announced five competitive group surveys on production of atomic energy by private industry to meet wartime demands and peacetime uses for power. The Monsanto Chemical Co. will team up with Union Electric Co. of St. Louis, and Dow Chemical Co. with Detroit Edison. The others, listed in an AEC press release of May 16, are Commonwealth Edison with Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois, Pacific Gas & Electric with the Bechtel Corp. of San Francisco, and the Bendix Aviation Corporation of San Francisco. The last named will concern itself with a reactor for isotope production.

The objectives of the surveys are: (1) to determine the engineering feasibility of designing, constructing, and operating a materials- and power-producing reactor; (2) to examine the economic and technical aspects of building this reactor in the next few years; (3) to determine the research and development work needed, if any, before such a reactor project can be undertaken; and (4) to offer recommendations to the Commission on such reactor projects and the possible role of industry in them. The studies, which are to be completed in not more than 12 months, are said to represent the first step in a 3-point program that could result in industrially produced atomic power for the consumer.

Harry A. Winne, General Electric Vice President, has predicted that some time in the future government would have the opportunity to discontinue its major operations in the atomic energy

field, and to permit private industry to take over its responsibilities. Mr. Winne refused, however, to forecast whether government would wish to take advantage of the offered opportunity.

**Reactor Technology School.** The AEC reported on May 14 that representatives of 22 U.S. industrial firms will be given specialized training in nuclear engineering at the Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology during the 1951-52 term. Among 75 students who will be enrolled, 24 are from industrial firms, 8 from government agencies, and 43 are recent college graduates selected for their potential contribution to reactor development. During the current 1950-51 term, there were 43 students, only 4 of them from private companies.

**Philip N. Powers,** formerly with the AEC and more recently manpower consultant with the NSRB, has resigned to take up duties as Executive Administrator of the Power Pile Project being initiated by the Monsanto Chemical Company. His headquarters will be in St. Louis, Missouri.

**Congress Acts on Draft Bill.** On June 1, the Senate approved the conference version of the Draft and UMT bill and the House is expected to pass it this week. The draft is extended to July 1, 1955. Registration is still at age 18 and the local boards must classify men before they are 18 1/2 (the minimum draft age) but all in the 19-26 age group must be called before calling younger men. Service will be for 24 months' active duty. Conscientious objectors must work in industry contributing to the national defense or be prosecuted as draft evaders.

The President's authority to hold volunteers beyond the terms of their enlistments is extended for 2 years. Volunteer and unorganized reservists must be released at their request after seventeen months of service, if they also served one year in World War II; this does not apply to the National Guard and the organized reserve. The new ceiling for the Armed Services is 5 million.

A new commission is to submit legislation on UMT to the Armed Services Committees of both houses within 4 months and to administer the legislation when it is passed. The Commission will consist of 3 civilians, of whom only two may be of one political party, and two retired military men. It is expected that the legislation will become law by the end of the year. It will provide for 8 years of service including reserve duty; as of now, training will be for 6 months. UMT will only go into effect after the end of the Korean crisis when the draft can be dropped.

**Student Deferral and Scholarships.** Noteworthy is the absence from the new Draft and UMT bill of a scholarship program to assist needy students otherwise qualified under the recently announced student deferral program. Such a program has been urged by FAS and others in an effort to assure equal opportunity to all young people and to guarantee full utilization of available talent.

It is felt in manpower circles that if any action on this is to be anticipated, it will be in connection with the UMT plan to be submitted by the committee set up in the Draft bill. Consideration also may be given by a new Committee on Specialized Personnel, soon to be announced by the Office of Defense Mobilization. The new committee, an outgrowth of requests for a National Scientific Personnel Board, will be advisory to the Manpower Policy Committee, but will have no operating responsibilities -- thus falling far short of the original concept recommended in the Thomas Report and endorsed by numerous scientific groups, including FAS.

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION  or SUBSCRIPTION

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address \_\_\_\_\_

Highest Degree \_\_\_\_\_ Institution \_\_\_\_\_ Major Field \_\_\_\_\_  
Received \_\_\_\_\_

Present Position \_\_\_\_\_

Annual Dues for Members-at-Large:  
Regular Member\* \$5 & \$3; Supporting \$10; Patron \$25  
\*Regular members with more than \$2500 annual income pay \$5.  
Annual Newsletter subscription for non-members is \$2.

Loyalty Muddle (Continued from Page 1).

of its Judiciary Committee, although strong objection to this procedure is to be expected. The Washington Post notes editorially that it would be more satisfying if the Senate would act directly to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the original exemption bill. It is not clear that either course can be successfully followed and the Commission's fate hangs in doubt.

"Reasonable Doubt" Order. The significance of the Presidential Executive Order of April 28, changing the criterion for the federal loyalty program from "reasonable grounds" for belief of disloyalty to "reasonable doubt" of loyalty, became clear on May 17. The Federal Loyalty Review Board decided to make application of the new criterion retroactive to the beginning of the loyalty program. It thus encouraged the reopening of all cases in which serious question had been raised -- some 9300 cases in which the FBI had made full field investigations -- and it specifically ordered the reopening of all "border-line" cases in which the Board or agency heads had reversed adverse rulings, or which the Board had checked after favorable action by lower boards. Having changed the "rules," the Board should be able to raise its score of 308 firings, now too low to satisfy the appetite of Congressional critics.

On May 18, Lyle Borst, FAS Chairman, wrote to President Truman protesting the new loyalty order. Noting that "scientists have consistently opposed the extension of secrecy regulations and security procedures beyond those limited areas of knowledge where the need was compelling," Borst called the new standard "a dangerous step which adversely affects civil rights within our country." "The decision to consider 'reasonable doubt of loyalty' cause to terminate or refuse employment," he said, "puts all government jobs, in effect, on the same footing as that which presently relates to clearance for sensitive jobs." Such application "to non-sensitive jobs contributes nothing to the security of the nation."

In a reply dated June 4, Charles S. Murphy, Special Counsel to the President, said that "the finding of appropriate means to protect the internal security of the Government and at the same time protect the rights of individuals has been a problem of deep concern to the President. This was one of the major reasons for his establishment of the Nimitz Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.

"One of the things that has been of the greatest concern to him is whether the Employee Loyalty Program in actual operation did adequately protect the rights of individual employees. This concern is increased by the questions you raise regarding the use of a standard of reasonable doubt as to loyalty.

"The President is still most anxious to have questions of this sort examined impartially and with the utmost care. He hopes that the Congress will soon pass legislation that will take the Nimitz Commission out from under the operation of the conflict-of-interest statutes so that it can go ahead with this task."

Loyalty in Oklahoma. Possibly encouraged by court invalidation of the California loyalty oath, a group of professors at Oklahoma A & M and the University of Oklahoma have joined together to fight a loyalty oath required by an anti-Communist law recently enacted in that state. Malcolm Correll, A & M physics professor,

said that he and seven other faculty members have decided not to sign the oath on the grounds that it is unconstitutional. They have engaged legal counsel to defend them.

Loyalty and Conformity. In two articles on May 10 and 11, the New York Times reported the results of a survey of student and faculty attitudes made by the Times at 72 major colleges in the U.S. It found that: "A subtle, creeping paralysis of freedom of thought and speech is attacking college campuses in many parts of the country, limiting both students and faculty in the area traditionally reserved for the free exploration of knowledge and truth. These limitations on free inquiry take a variety of forms, but their net effect is a widening tendency toward passive acceptance of the status quo, conformity, and a narrowing of the area of tolerance in which students, faculty and administrators feel free to speak, act and think independently." Important among the factors producing this debilitating intellectual climate, the Times found, was "the spotlight of investigation by Government and private industry for postgraduate employment and service with the armed forces."

Science in Russia. Victor Cohn, in a series of articles appearing in the Minneapolis Tribune during April, presents an appraisal of current Russian science. The account is principally a collation of the opinions on Russian scientific strength which have been expressed from time to time by U.S. scientists. After devoting himself for several years to monitoring the Russian scientific literature, Professor John Turkevich of Princeton University has concluded that the Russians are working in every branch of science, that their budgets are adequate, and that in certain areas their contributions are outstanding. Similarly, Dr. V. A. Zworykin of RCA has praised Russian electronics and metallurgy, and Dr. K. T. Compton of M.I.T. has called Russian engineers highly competent and underestimated in America.

However, against these favorable estimates of Russian strength must be set the dangerous implication for Russian science of official interference in certain fields. Of interest is the suggestion, included in the articles, that the great Russian scientist, Peter Kapitza, has been removed from his post as a "poor security risk," presumably on the basis of his speech at the 220th anniversary of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in which he declared, "There is really no such thing as socialist science or British science. There is only one science devoted to the betterment of human welfare. Science must therefore be international."

"The Quick and the Dead." RCA Victor has just made available on records a condensed reproduction of four broadcasts by NBC during 1950 on the basic principles and eventual implications of atomic energy. Under the title, "The Quick and the Dead," the records dramatize the history of the Bomb and project the possible future, making use of the voices of such well-known personalities as William L. Laurence, Bob Hope, Paul Lukas, and Helen Hayes. Authentic rebroadcasts of speeches by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Winston Churchill, General Eisenhower, and David Lillienthal are included. The records, obtainable from local record stores, may prove useful for discussion groups and schools.

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

51 - 5

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.