

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS  
March 29, 1950

1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.  
A - 795

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION -- DECISION IN SIGHT

The Senate-House conferees on NSF have been announced (see list below) and the legislation now moves into the final lap. The task of the conference committee is unusually important because of the unwise loyalty provisions inserted by the House. The differences between the House and Senate versions on this point are so crucial that final passage of the entire bill may depend upon their wise resolution by the conference committee. Certainly the conferees' decision will strongly affect the attitude of the scientific community toward the Foundation if and when it comes into existence.

The House loyalty provisions are three in number: a committee amendment requiring loyalty affidavits of all fellows and scholars; a floor amendment by Rep. Smith of Virginia stipulating FBI clearance of all employees and scholars; and a floor amendment by Rep. Flood of New Jersey stipulating similar FBI clearance of all foreign nationals associated in any way with the Foundation. There are no comparable provisions in the Senate version. Additional significant innovations in the House version include a limitation of appropriations to \$15 million annually, and improved specification of the powers of the Director and Board.

The Smith and Flood amendments hold the major interest. They have drawn heavy fire from scientists and have received national press and radio attention in the past three weeks. Influential newspapers, including the Washington Post, Washington Star, San Francisco Chronicle, and Christian Science Monitor, have condemned the amendments editorially. Letters of protest from members of the FAS and other scientists have been carried in the press of New York, Washington, Madison, and other cities. Effective cartoons in the Washington Post and Star, and commentators of both press and radio, have laid bare the threat of the Smith amendment in particular -- not only to science, but to democratic procedure in general.

From the chorus of protest, three points have emerged clearly. First, FBI investigation is not only obnoxious in the sphere of basic research and education, but unnecessary in the case of the Foundation since adequate protection is already given elsewhere in the bill (Sec. 14(k)) to what little classified research the Foundation may sponsor. It may be noted parenthetically that such protection is required since both Senate and House bills, contrary to FAS hopes and suggestions, authorized the Foundation to initiate research relating to the national defense.

Second, the kind of FBI investigation specified by the Smith amendment is dangerous and unjust because it automatically declares an individual disloyal on the basis of a single membership, past or present, in a purportedly subversive organization. In this respect, the amendment goes far beyond anything previously considered for a federal agency.

Third, the amendment is precedent-shattering in making the FBI judge as well as investigator. It is the FBI, and not the NSF, which would certify to the loyalty of a candidate for employment or a fellowship under the Foundation.

Typical of scientific protest is a letter from A. N. Richards, President of the National Academy of Sciences, to President Truman. Said Dr. Richards: "We are convinced that this provision (the Smith amendment), if made into law, would so distort the purpose of the original bill as to work serious damage to the development of science in the U.S. and to those persons upon whom that development depends." Agreeing that security measures are essential in secret research the Academy President insisted, however, "that the selection of persons who may justly receive federal aid under the act on the basis of character, loyalty and competence can be accomplished by the administrators of the Science Foundation without resort to FBI. Investigation by

FBI of large numbers of young persons who are not suspect is not only unnecessary but may be positively detrimental to the objectives of the bill.

"Knowledge of the nature of FBI investigations and reports among prospective applicants for scholarships may well be expected to develop in their habits of caution, reticence and suspicion, which are the antithesis of frank truthfulness which science demands. A deplorable trend to conformity and a deterioration in the intellectual climate could be expected to follow." Resolutions along these same general lines were adopted by the American Council on Education and the Council of Learned Societies.

From an entirely different quarter came equally vigorous protest. In a letter to the chairmen of the Senate and House committees concerned, Peyton Ford, the Assistant to the Attorney General, expressed the views of the Justice Department with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense and the Budget Bureau. Mr. Ford pointed out that enactment of the Smith and Flood amendments "would not only effect an extremely radical and undesirable change in the basic responsibilities and functions of the FBI but also, in my opinion, they would bring about a departure from American concepts of justice and democratic government." Laying emphasis on the fact that the FBI "has carefully restricted its activities to the making of investigations," he gave it as the opinion of both the Director of the FBI and himself that to make the FBI an evaluative agency would "lay a foundation for criticism of the Bureau as a state police organization." The letter concluded by urging the deletion of both the Smith and Flood amendments in entirety before enactment of the legislation.

These strong statements, coupled with communications to Congress from scientists and their organizations all over the country (one from the faculty of the University of Rochester with over 400 signatures), have almost certainly doomed the amendments in their original form. What is not certain is whether they will be deleted entirely, or whether they will survive in some weaker, compromise wording. Friends of the legislation have been seeking a formula which will not be obnoxious to scientists, but which will satisfy a majority in the painfully security-conscious House. For, it is to be recalled, the bill must yet return to both the House and Senate for approval of the work of the conference committee.

In the complex tactical situation which now exists, scientists can serve best by maintaining steady pressure against the principle of FBI investigation in non-secret research and education, along the lines of the Academy statement quoted above. Communications should be addressed to as many as possible of the following and particularly to the Chairmen of the House and Senate delegations:

House Conferees (address -- House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.)

J. Percy Priest (D) Tennessee, Chairman  
Andrew J. Biemiller (D) Wisconsin  
George Howard Wilson (D) Oklahoma  
Carl Hinshaw (R) California  
Joseph P. O'Hara (R) Minnesota

Senate Conferees (address -- Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.)

Elbert D. Thomas (D) Utah, Chairman  
James E. Murray (D) Montana  
Herbert H. Lehman (D) New York  
Robert A. Taft (R) Ohio  
H. Alexander Smith (R) New Jersey

The H-Bomb and Foreign Policy. A Hydrogen bomb may never explode -- but its power nonetheless has already been felt. Under threat of its detonation, the past month has seen the beginning of the break-up of the intellectual ice-pack induced by the Cold War. A major American foreign policy debate -- the first in over ten years -- is in the making.

The intensity of the pressure the Administration is feeling is clear from the fact that Secretary Acheson has been driven to the hustings. Speaking at the University of California in Berkeley, he outlined the U.S. indictment of Soviet policy. "We are always ready to discuss, to negotiate, to agree," said the Secretary, "but we are understandably loath to play the role of international sucker." Picturing the conflict between the U.S. and the USSR as one between good and evil, Mr. Acheson pointed out that "good and evil can and do exist concurrently in the whole great realm of human life." "But," he said, "it does not follow from this co-existence of good and evil that the two systems, theirs and ours, will necessarily be able to exist concurrently. That will depend largely on them, for we ourselves do not find impossibility in the prospect of co-existence with the Soviet system."

Having thus assigned responsibility for accommodation to the Soviet leaders, Mr. Acheson listed seven specific things they might do to alleviate tension. These seven -- including peace treaties with Germany, Japan, and Austria; withdrawal of Soviet forces from the Satellite States, cooperation in the UN, agreement on effective international control of atomic energy, and relaxation of Communist pressure on non-Communist governments -- are a brief statement of the issues outstanding between the U.S. and USSR since the end of the war. The Secretary concluded with a warning not to be too hopeful because a long hard struggle lies ahead.

This firm re-statement of Administration attitudes and objectives conceded little either to the Soviet Union or to domestic critics and Acheson was subjected to raking fire from both. Many Americans, while agreeing with the Secretary's insistence on some evidence of Soviet good faith, found him weak in offering similar concrete evidences of American good faith. The Washington Post spoke of the need of the American people for "something that will unite them dynamically and activate their energies in consolidating the free world." Sen. Tydings renewed his demand for a disarmament conference; Sen. Benton called for a world-wide propaganda campaign to bring America's message to the peoples of the world.

Dissatisfaction with the existing situation cropped out in perhaps the least influential but most significant place -- the letters-to-the-editor columns of daily newspapers. Said one correspondent, "There is little satisfaction in debating which hemisphere is likely to be blown to pieces first. Our immediate task is to see that this doesn't happen to either."

The debate has yet to focus, has yet to dig down and bring to light the fundamental issues which American policy so far has not squarely faced. Under attack both by those who would toughen our attitude toward Russia and those who would moderate it, Acheson has the advantage as well as the disadvantage of appearing to be on middle ground. With the conflict widening, however, the area of middle ground is diminishing. There are increasing signs that as Walter Lippman has been insisting, the entire American foreign policy, undermined by the break of our atomic monopoly and Communist success in China, will have to come under review. Three major facts, it is pointed out, must form the foundation of any successful foreign policy: the permanence of the Soviet state within its present limits, the power of scientific technology as exemplified by nucleonics, and the deep-felt need of people all over the world for programs which point toward a hopeful, expanding future of peace and well-being.

The Federation itself has not coped fully with these facts. We have viewed with concern, we have called for a new official Commission to re-evaluate American atomic policy in light of the current realities. But the former is only a motivation, and the latter a rejected hope. In an earlier critical period we offered optimism and direction. Both are badly needed now. Do we have the initiative and imagination to be in front again? From all sides have come constructive proposals -- for top-level conferences between the U.S. and USSR, for special sessions of the UN Security Council involving foreign ministers or heads of State, for disarmament conferences, for louder more effective American propaganda, for constructive economic assistance to the nations of the world. Any one of these might be useful; none is complete, and none as yet is going forward. Can the best of

them be fused into a single program and given content by specific short-range proposals on the more pressing issues such as atomic energy control? Could such a program attract the support of the hopeful people of this country and the world?

It is worth recalling that a prominent science writer, having perused the Federation statement calling for a special commission to re-evaluate atomic policy, snorted, "Hell, this isn't what we want from you guys. Give us a plan." We have since had time to think. Are we ready to produce?

Statement to the President on the H-Bomb. On March 15, the FAS joined the leaders of ten other national organizations, including the League of Women Voters and the United World Federalists, in releasing an open letter to the President urging the appointment of a commission. The text of the statement follows:

"The decision to make the Hydrogen bomb has heightened the importance of issues which are basic to our democratic system. We are driven to defend ourselves by measures which could destroy the way of life we seek to preserve. These new threats to our freedom compel us to find ways of strengthening democratic participation in the formulation of public policy.

"Informed, extensive, and wise public discussion of issues of this magnitude is, in our judgment, essential.

"Confident that the President and the Secretary of State share this belief, we urge that a commission should be appointed to clarify and facilitate such discussion. This commission should consider all weapons of mass destruction in the context of overall foreign policy. Its report should illuminate possible courses of action and the political, economic, and moral consequences of each, in order that the public may exercise an informed judgment.

"The commission should consist of persons chosen for breadth of experience, judgment and a belief that peace is possible. The members should be free to concentrate for a period of weeks -- even months -- on these problems. Their concentrated thinking when shared with the people, would stimulate and promote a sounder and more constructive public opinion. The nation would be better prepared to safeguard our freedoms and support our government in whatever steps become necessary in the critical years ahead."

Report from England. Dr. Richard L. Meier, former Executive Secretary of the FAS, has been in England since last summer on a Fulbright grant. Following are some of his comments on the atomic scene, viewed from the other side of the Atlantic:

"The thinking about atomic energy here is mainly that of impatience. The matter has no relation to the problems they are faced with either as individuals or as a nation. ... From this side it appears even to observers most sympathetic to the U.S. that the Americans are being intransigent. Among the sincerely honest, and benevolent sort of persons one especially runs across in the UN associations, the feeling that is so common among their counterparts in the U.S. also prevails -- the problem of atomic energy control is so all-important that there simply must be a satisfactory solution to it. It does not strike them at all that this is not a logical statement.

"All people are glad that they are not bedevilled by the decisions. Nor does the government worry except that the U.S. should be appeased whenever necessary. They take it impersonally, more like they would view a serial fantasy by H.G. Wells or Aldous Huxley, with none of those nightmares that seem to plague such a large section of the urban middle classes in the U.S. No one is looking for lonely lead-lined valleys here -- not yet, anyway.

"...Tonight Stew Alsop was on BBC describing McMahon's speech in the Senate and its reception by the public. His action has been the only encouraging sign of fresh and radical thinking on the horizon; yet I have not been able to elicit a single comment one way or another around here. Occasional comment was evinced about the request for non-use of hydrogen bombs by the 12 "big name" scientists, but international coverage of that item was very poor. The FAS statement (on re-evaluation of U.S. atomic policy) received general attention, a third to a half column or more in every newspaper, even though the subject matter was less moralistic in tone.

"In general the Fuchs case received less attention in the British press than the FAS statement. Everyone here thought that they could perceive the fine hand of the FBI in the affair, and the Labour newspaper intimated as much out loud. The American Embassy immediately repudiated the accusation, but it was not printed here. Physical chemists scheduled to go to pluck jobs at Harwell changed their minds overnight."

**The Security-Conscious Capitol.** The Fuchs case and the Hiss trial quite evidently have affected the atmosphere of the Capitol. In addition to the FBI investigative provisions written by the House into the National Science Foundation bill, extension of security measures appears in at least three active, pending bills in Congress. At least one has far-reaching implications, setting a pattern for more exacting security requirements for government employees, even those remote from classified defense work.

**Security in the Commerce Department.** A rider has been attached to the appropriations for the Department of Commerce (Sec. 305 of H.R. 7786, the omnibus appropriations bill) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce "in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, (to) terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States." This power of summary dismissal, intended to expedite removal of poor security risks, is similar to that now held by the State and military departments. It should be noted that in the Commerce Department, (1) all employees must be checked for loyalty under the President's loyalty program, and (2) all secret work (estimated at less than 5% of the activities of the whole department and about 30% of the activities of its National Bureau of Standards) is carried on for military agencies and is subject to their rules of personnel security clearance. There is already provision, therefore, for security clearance for workers on classified projects, and employees engaged on the great bulk of non-military work, scientific and non-scientific, must have all been certified loyal to the U.S. This new power which it is proposed to put at the discretion of the Secretary would be in addition.

The rider presumes either that the Secretary knows better than the military agencies what of the department's work primarily affects the national defense, -- or that he is a better judge than the duly constituted loyalty review boards of the President's program, of the loyalty of his employees, -- or that the Secretary excels the Civil Service Commission's duly constituted committees, in assessing the performance of department employees. It is clear from testimony at the hearings on this bill, that the Secretary of Commerce means to keep all people who are possible security risks by his standards (even though cleared under the loyalty program) out of a large area of the department's work which is not primarily connected with military security. It is significant that the rider would serve as a precedent for the many other civilian agencies which have problems similar to those of the Commerce Department.

Proposed by Representative John J. Rooney (D) of New York, this rider has not as yet received the endorsement and probably does not have the support of the administration. Debate on the appropriations bill in the House is just starting and will likely take two or more weeks. The bill then goes to the Senate Appropriations Committee, headed by Senator McKellar, then to the whole Senate and eventually to a joint conference committee before final action (perhaps by June) by both houses.

**Tydings-Murray bill** (S. 3104 and H.R. 4739) provides for summary suspension of employees of State, Defense, War, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Atomic Energy Commission, Nat'l Security Resources Board, and Nat'l Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, when the agency head deems it "necessary in the interest of national security." A fairly detailed scheme of presentation of charges, hearings, appeals, etc., is provided, as described in the March 1 Newsletter. These safeguards apply only to permanent and "indefinite" employees. Temporary employees and applicants who meet technical but not "security" qualifications of jobs are left largely to the discretion of the agency head.

This bill is probably an improvement over the McCarran rider (covering the State Department as the Rooney rider would. the Commerce Department) and Public Law 808 of the 77th Congress (covering the military agencies), as well as the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. The bill does provide for suspension without pay, which if strictly applied, would discourage utilization of lengthy hearing procedures except where the employee had independent means. Some have suggested that a preferable provision would call for transfer of the employee to a non-sensitive position pending disposition of the case. Under the bill, whole agencies are declared sensitive; some feel that the sensitivity unit would better be the project or the job. The Tydings-Murray bill also gives the President power to extend coverage of the bill to other agencies as he sees fit. Technically this provision would

permit wholesale circumvention of the safeguards of Civil Service.

In hearings before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service (Rep. Murray, Tenn., chairman) on March 23, there was testimony by representatives of several government employee and veterans' groups, who urged improved safeguards in the procedures outlined. The Committee seemed to understand the distinction between loyalty and security risks. Rep. Gross (R. Iowa), Rees (R. Kan.), Miller (D. Cal.), and others participated in the calmest discussion of the security problem in recent months. Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee (Sen. Tydings, Md., chairman) will be held within the next few weeks. There is no schedule for consideration by either house, though it is quite certain that the bill will be acted on this session.

**Increased Penalties for Security Violations.** Passed by the House March 15 and sent to the Senate for future action, H.R. 4703 provides stiffened penalties for officials and unauthorized persons using restricted data in a manner they have reason to believe could be detrimental to the U.S. or advantageous to a foreign power. The statute of limitations was extended from 3 to 10 years (or even longer in the case of government employees). An amendment offered by Rep. Cole (D., NY) was passed which specifically included restricted data relating to "nuclear energy." Other provisions of the bill, which make it an important change in the security code, would:

(1) make it a crime for those having lawful possession of National defense secrets to wilfully communicate them or attempt to transmit them to unauthorized persons, or to fail to transmit them to an authorized person on demand.

(2) penalize for the first time persons having unauthorized possession of restricted data, who fail to surrender it to authorized officials, whether they are requested to do so or not.

(3) extend penalties to employees who know security material entrusted to them has been illegally removed, lost, stolen, or destroyed and fail to report it promptly to a superior officer.

(4) double the penalty for conspiracy to commit the forbidden acts to make the conspiracy as grave as the crime itself. The penalty in each case would be \$10,000 or ten years.

**FAS Meetings.** The first meeting of the new FAS Council (now being elected) will be in Washington on April 29 and 30. The first session will start at 8 p.m. Saturday evening, and the second on Sunday morning. The meetings will be held at 1719 N Street, N.W. Federation members who may be in the city for the physics meetings are welcome to be observers.

**Membership Opportunities** in the FAS are available to those who are interested in having a considered and tempered "voice" in national and international affairs on issues where the opinions of scientists are relevant. In addition, FAS members receive this occasional Newsletter and are entitled to a special subscription rate to the sympathetically edited Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. The Federation has members throughout the country; and chapters in a dozen scientific centers. The membership covers all fields of science and engineering. At least two-thirds of the members are active professionals.

Application may be made on the coupon printed below. Correspondence with chapters may be sent in care of the Washington office.

#### MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

Name \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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.

Chapters at: Berkeley, Brookhaven, Chicago, Ithaca, Los Alamos, Madison, New York, Oak Ridge, Princeton, Rochester, Schenectady, and Washington. Informal branches in other communities.

Military Men on AEC Proposed. The Tydings-Kilday bill recently introduced in the Congress would make the appointment of one military man to the Atomic Energy Commission mandatory and a second optional. The President immediately expressed his strong disapproval of this proposal, saying that he thought the question was settled by the 79th Congress which set up the AEC and provided for civilian control. Sen. Tydings said in introducing the legislation that it was originally assumed the commission's duties would be primarily civilian, but "now, however, a large proportion of the work has been military. I feel at least one member with the armed services' viewpoint should be on the commission." The Washington Post commented editorially that this viewpoint "already is adequately represented in the military liaison committee, which has the power of appeal to the President in case of disagreement. ... If military officers were to be included on the top commission itself, military influence would be stronger than under the discarded May-Johnson bill." No hearings have been scheduled for the bill (S. 3198 and H.R. 7601).

Appointments to AEC. The new member of the Atomic Energy Commission appointed by President Truman to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of David E. Lilienthal is Thomas E. Murray, a New York industrialist, engineer, and financier. Commissioner Sumner Pike will continue as acting chairman at least until April 15. Then Lewis L. Strauss leaves the Commission, and the President will have another appointment to make. Dr. Arthur H. Compton has announced that he would not accept the AEC chairmanship. The President, it is said, is trying to persuade Gordon Gray, who recently resigned as Secretary of the Army to become president of the University of North Carolina, to take over the chairmanship.

Scientists' Committee on Loyalty Problems, an FAS committee headed by Lyman Spitzer of Princeton, has published a report of its first year's work (1949) in Science, March 3, 1950. The report discusses SCLP's work in obtaining for individuals the full protection of existing regulations, without judging the merits of any case. It further details the present procedures in the various government agencies and lists the specific reforms SCLP has urged. The SCLP's secretary is A. S. Wightman, 14 Battle Road, Princeton, New Jersey.

British Scientists, members of the British Atomic Scientists Association, in their March 23rd news bulletin, condemned hydrogen bombs as instruments of war. While recognizing that the U.S. had no alternative other than to try to make the H-bomb, the Association said editorially that both Russia and the U.S. must make concessions for common agreement. "Each side should decide what are its minimum requirements for security and, while standing firm on these, should be prepared to make concessions on all other points in return for similar concessions from the other side. The positions maintained at present by both sides are so far apart that, if these are to be regarded as final offers, the outlook is black indeed."

Federation of American Scientists  
1749 L Street, N.W.  
Washington 6, D.C.  
A - 795

Who Can Travel? Public attention was called in the press on March 22 to the refusal by the State Department of a passport to a scientist invited to perform cosmic ray experiments in India. Dr. Bernard Peters of the University of Rochester was to have repeated some of his experiments at an equatorial site under an unclassified program sponsored by the Office of Naval Research.

The passport was denied, according to the State Department, because Dr. Peters' proposed trip was deemed "contrary to the best interests of the United States." Science Service reports that the university officials are determined to abandon the project rather than send another physicist in Peters' place. Dr. Alan Valentine, President of the University of Rochester, strongly supported Peters, finding nothing in a personal investigation "at high Government levels" which "should impair our confidence in Dr. Peters as a scientist, a professor, or an American citizen. He continues a member of the university faculty in full good standing."

When his application was turned down, Peters wrote the Secretary of State, "I have been completely unsuccessful in learning the nature of the charges which in the opinion of the Government justified the treatment which I have been accorded. Both my own efforts in this direction and those undertaken by the Administration of this university have been entirely fruitless."

Continued Dr. Valentine, "The atmosphere and procedures in these matters in Washington are at present peculiar. But we note that a man's reputation and career have been greatly threatened and perhaps even ruined without his being given an opportunity to hear the grounds for such action, to identify and face his accusers, and to offer his defense. It was my impression that our Government protected its citizens against such practice. In this case the citizen appears to need protection from his own Government. Consequently we do not regard this case as closed..."

Other instances are known where passports of scientists have been withheld or delayed. There is no straightforward way to ascertain the practical criteria for these actions or to respond to charges. Peters, in a pure-science project, has less opportunity to be heard than a suspected person in secret work.

H-Bomb in the Russian Press. In the last two months, the Soviet election campaign -- rather than the H-bomb -- has been the principal news in the Moscow newspapers, according to Harrison E. Salisbury, N.Y. Times correspondent in a dispatch dated Mar. 18. The discussions in the American press on the question of the hydrogen bomb were practically ignored. Salisbury notes only a few instances of press comment on atomic subjects. Molotov, in a pre-election speech on March 10, attacked the H-bomb as a propaganda device of American warmongers. On Mar. 13, Izvestia published a cartoon, captioned "Boo," showing Secretary Acheson in a rickety structure of "American imperialism" blowing up a jester's balloon labelled "H-bomb." In the background was a symbolic scene of busy construction, standing for the USSR. What few dispatches there were from the U.S., Salisbury noted, included comments by various speakers on the need for direct negotiations between the USSR and the U.S. on atomic and other subjects.

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.

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS  
March 1, 1950

1749 L Street, Washington 6, D. C.  
A - 775

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION -- HOW FAR CAN WE COMPROMISE ?

**Atomic Control Developments.** International talks on atomic energy control were suspended on January 19 when the Russian delegates walked out on the UNAEC in protest against the presence of a Chinese Nationalist delegate. Russian action, duplicating their current strategy in all UN agencies in which they participate, was denounced by Assistant Secretary of State Hickerson as blocking plans for world control. Russia's Malik retorted that the U.S. was to blame for refusing to bar the Chinese Nationalist delegate. In view of the long UNAEC stalemate, few could get excited over the issue of who was immediately responsible for the current breakdown in negotiations.

Deprived of the official forum, both sides continued the propaganda battle to convince their own citizens and the world that their own good intentions were being frustrated by the machinations of the other. Said President Truman: "We firmly believe that all nations would gain by...an international agreement. We shall continue to work honestly and whole-heartedly toward that end. But we must remember that the outcome is not ours alone to determine. The actions of men in other countries will help the ultimate decision."

Said Frederick H. Osborn, recently resigned deputy U.S. representative on the UNAEC, "We have been forced to believe, by every action of the Soviet representatives, that they are under instructions to give outward appearance of cooperation, but under circumstances actually to cooperate." "We had better accept this lesson we have learned in four frustrated years. We had

(Continued on Page 2, Column 1)

**Proposed Legislation on Security Procedures.** The mechanism for security clearance of employees of 9 federal departments and agencies is detailed in a bill introduced by Sen. Tydings Feb. 23. A similar bill (text not yet available) was introduced in the House Feb. 27. The Senate bill (S. 3104) provides for summary suspension without pay of an employee deemed a security risk; but before the employee may be dismissed (without appeal from the decision of the agency head), he is given (1) a written statement of charges stated as specifically as security provisions permit, (2) a reasonable opportunity (30 days) to answer the charges and submit affidavits, (3) a hearing upon his request, and (4) a review by the agency head before an adverse decision is made final. If reinstated, the employee is entitled to compensation for the period of his suspension; if not reinstated, his employment opportunities in other government agencies are not necessarily revoked.

Several agencies have had for some years the authority of summary removal of employees. For the departments of the Army and Navy, this authority extends back to 1942. The State Dept has been given this authority annually in its appropriation bill and for the AEC it derives from the McMahon Act, although in both cases no procedures are outlined. It must be said that the procedures given in the Tydings bill appear upon preliminary study to be as fair as or fairer than those established administratively under the present laws. Technically they would apply only to "permanent" employees; the bill is less specific with regard to "temporary" workers.

A point of great significance is that the Tydings bill would increase the number of agencies given the authority of summary suspension. In addition to the AEC, State, Army, and Navy, there would be added the Departments of Defense and Air Force, both established since the 1942 legislation. Also the bill covers employees of the Coast Guard, the National Security Resources Board, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The Tydings bill would make permanent the State

(Continued on Page 4, Column 2)

National Science Foundation legislation passed the House on March 1, 1950, after 3 days of debate. The stubborn opposition which developed was overcome only after it had succeeded in forcing through a number of amendments, several seriously undermining scientists' hopes for the Foundation. The two chief amendments put in by the House are a limitation on appropriations to 15 million dollars per annum, and a drastic provision which requires an FBI investigation of each employee and fellow to establish whether or not he is a past or present member of a subversive organization on the Attorney General's list. The latter amendment reads as follows:

"No person shall be employed by the Foundation and no scholarship shall be awarded to any person by the Foundation unless and until the FBI shall have investigated such person and reported to the Foundation that such person is loyal to the U.S., believes in our system of government, and is not and has not been at any time a member of any organization declared subversive by the Attorney General or any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of the government of the United States by force and violence."

Another amendment requires FBI investigation of all foreign nationals, associated in any way with the Foundation. This was offered and accepted as insurance against a Fuchs incident under the Foundation.

Opposition to the legislation, spearheaded by Rep. Wadsworth of New York, centered on 3 fears: straining the U.S. treasury; Government control of American life and particularly of science; and Communism. These fears were skillfully played upon by creating a picture of the proposed Foundation almost unrecognizable to supporters of the legislation. Wadsworth saw the Foundation as "the master of scientific research in the U.S., because it will hold in its hand that very tempting bait, money, money." Rep. Hale of Maine saw it as "one more straw in the gradual socialization of our national structure." Rep. Rankin bellowed that power was being placed in the hands of "a gang of professors, many of whom you will find are affiliated with Communist-front organizations." Fear of financial burden, fear of government control, fear of subversion -- all honest fears felt by many people -- were all inappropriately but adroitly turned against the Foundation. The culminating stroke by Rep. Smith of Virginia was to capitalize on the fear of Communism by forcing into the bill his amendment for FBI investigation which strikes at the heart of scientific support of the legislation. There seems little doubt, considering that the amendment goes far beyond anything previously enacted for a Federal agency, that its intent is more to kill the bill than to protect security.

H.R. 4846, as it emerged from the House, has been so altered that many scientists undoubtedly will want to reconsider the support they have long given to the legislation. Severely limited as to appropriations, the Foundation has been hedged about with other restrictions. Some were in the original bill, others were added or implied during the debate on the House floor, including: The Foundation may not support research in the broad field of atomic energy without consent of the AEC. It is expected to exert a correlative influence on Federal research, but it may not interfere in the operation of existing Federal research programs. It may operate no laboratories or pilot plants of its own. It may not evaluate research by private individuals and organizations.

**Provision for military research.** Perhaps even more important than these restrictions is the clear intent of Congress, as expressed in the debate, that the Foundation shall engage in classified military research. Enabling provisions are contained

(Continued on Page 2, Column 2)

Atomic Control Developments (cont. from Page 1).

better stop making the unrealistic demands that we compromise and negotiate with men who do not understand the meaning of these words."

Russian reaction was summarized by Harrison E. Salisbury in a dispatch to the N.Y. Times dated Feb. 13. He reports authoritative Soviet periodicals as reaffirming Stalin's statement of May, 1948, that "peaceful settlements of disagreements between the USSR and the U.S. are not only possible but are also absolutely essential in the interests of general peace." Peaceful co-existence of capitalism and communism is referred to as the basic principle of Soviet foreign policy. An article in Soviet State and Law, a scholarly journal, is said to have emphasized that there is no Soviet objection in principle to an agreement for international control in the atomic field, though not on the basis of the Baruch plan. The article protested that the Soviet Union does not insist upon absolute sovereignty and absolute equality of states. Stress is laid on Soviet requests for outlawing all weapons of mass destruction, including the atomic bomb and bacteriological warfare. Russians believe, Salisbury said, "that discussion for the benefit of all concerned would have to be predicated on the assumption of slow and careful serious negotiations not only of accepted proposals but also of those they rejected."

Caught in the middle of acrimonious and apparently fruitless debate, and readily accessible to American news-hawks, Trygvie Lie, UN Secretary-General, remarked in desperation that he was in favor of great power negotiations "all the time and on all levels -- the top level, the middle level, and the lower levels -- inside the United Nations and outside the United Nations." Mr. Lie was giving his wish every possible chance, but as of the moment it has not come true. International negotiation on atomic control, long moribund, seems now to be very, very dead.

Senator McMahon has again made specific suggestions for a new approach to atomic peace. Speaking in the Senate on March 1, he called for a conference of Atlantic Pact nations to "formulate a concrete peace program," which should be presented to Russia through the UN at a meeting of the UN General Assembly, if possible, in Moscow. McMahon emphasized that control of atomic energy is a matter for all nations to consider, not just the possessors of atomic bombs. He said that a review of the existing plan pending in the UN may be necessary, but that he would retain features providing for safeguards in the way of inspection.

British Scientists on H-Bomb. A new attempt to avert atomic warfare and achieve effective control of atomic energy was urged by 11 members of the Atomic Sciences Committee of the British Association of Scientific Workers. The group included Dr. Rudolph Peierls and Sir George Paget Thomson. Their statement, released February 21, follows:

"The recent decision of the U.S.A. to develop the hydrogen bomb shows that an atomic arms race is in progress and emphasizes the dangerous direction in which humanity is moving. We believe that if a disastrous atomic war is to be avoided the utmost attempts must be made now to eliminate atomic warfare, either by a new effort to solve the problem of effective control of atomic energy or by a new contribution of the wider problem of international relations.

"Any solution must be acceptable to all nations, though all nations would have to be prepared to sacrifice some of their national interests for a realistic hope for continued peace."

A New Twist to the Hydrogen Bomb. In a University of Chicago Round Table Conference broadcast over NBC last weekend, the conferees -- Hans Bethe, Leo Szilard, Harrison Brown, and Frederick Seitz -- introduced a new concept in the use of the H-bomb. Since the deuterium-on-deuterium reaction produces approximately 1 free neutron for every 4 deuterons, it was pointed out that this neutron could be absorbed in some substance such as cobalt to produce a radioactive element which could be released into the atmosphere. Dr. Szilard estimated that 50 tons of neutrons absorbed in this manner would produce enough radioactivity in an element of 5-year half-life to kill everybody on earth. Approximately 500 tons of reacting deuterium would be enough to cause this, according to Dr. Szilard's calculations. Thus a single explosion of 500 tons anywhere on earth would put an end to all of the higher forms of life on the planet. Other topics discussed were dispersion of cities and flash fire effects of the bomb.

National Science Foundation (cont. from Page 1).

in Section 3(a)3, where the Foundation is instructed, "with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense;" and in Section 14(k) specifying that the Foundation's Executive Committee, "with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property (having military significance) in connection with scientific research under this Act." Moreover, Section 11(c) gives authority to support "scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense" by contracts or other arrangements with individuals or organizations in foreign countries, including government agencies of foreign countries.

These provisions, which the FAS has opposed in the past as likely to lead the Foundation away from its fundamental concentration on unclassified basic research, assumed new significance in the floor debate. First, they gave weight to the opposition's claim that security provisions such as FBI investigation were essential in the legislation. Second, it became clear that they were inserted to meet specific and immediate requirements of the military. Thus, Congressman Hinshaw, replying to questions about the purposes of these provisions, and the reason why they were not limited to basic research, spoke as follows:

"The National Military Establishment for its own purposes might like to have a bit of research that was not exactly basic, so to speak, done outside of its own agencies in order, perhaps, to obtain a greater degree of a certain kind of security. There are reasons why the National Military Establishment, for its own purposes, might like to have the Foundation do certain other research." And continuing, "The National Military Establishment makes contracts with universities and with private establishments. Whenever it makes a contract with a university, those engaged under that contract are well aware that it is a matter of national security. But they may wish to originate or make a contribution toward certain research endeavors, the favorable results of which might well contribute to a solution needed in the interest of better defense. It is quite possible that a part or the whole of such research might not come exactly under the definition of basic research." At a later point in the debate, Rep. Priest, floor manager for the bill, referred to this point again in language which suggested even more clearly that the National Military Establishment had in mind using the Foundation as a blind to conduct certain types of research which it wanted done, but with which it did not wish to be identified for its own reasons.

What Next? The situation we now face on National Science Foundation is not a happy one. We are offered legislation which preserves the concept of a Federal agency devoted to support of scientific education and research, with responsibility to think in terms of a broad national science policy. But the Foundation is severely limited by budgetary and other restrictions -- so severely as to raise serious doubts that it can make a significant contribution to the national science effort. In addition, the Foundation is open to distortion by military interest. Under H.R. 4846 as amended, we have not realized the hope of freeing basic research from security limitations by segregating such research in an exclusive agency. Finally, the bill contains provisions profoundly repugnant to the traditions and aspiration of scientists.

What are we to do? The general strategy agreed to by representatives of all interested organizations here in Washington, is to focus pressure on the Senate-House conference committee. The job of this Committee is to reconcile the numerous differences between S. 247 as passed by the Senate, and H.R. 4846, as passed by the House. The principal ones are the House provisions for FBI investigation and for limitation of Foundation appropriations, although there are other significant differences as well. Concerning the FBI investigation clauses, it is agreed that if they are not deleted in conference, scientists should urge defeat of the bill. About the other significant differences, the strongest possible case is to be made for the more favorable alternative. To this end the Washington office will publicize the names of the conferees as soon as available, and will attempt to distribute a detailed comparison of Senate and House versions in the very near future.

There is reason to expect favorable action by the Senate House conference committee. If the action proves unsatisfactory, particularly with reference to FBI investigation, recommendations will be made to Senators and Representatives, and if necessary to the President, that enactment of the legislation be deferred until a sounder version can be obtained.

Senator Vandenberg Leaves Joint Committee. Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, Republican supporter of the bi-partisan foreign policy of the 80th Congress, has resigned from the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee for reasons of ill health. Senator Vandenberg underwent a serious operation last fall from which he has not fully recovered, and in order to conserve his energies, he has decided to limit his activities to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He has been replaced on the Joint Committee by Senator Bricker of Ohio. Senator Vandenberg has been one of the most active and well-informed members of the Joint Committee and his loss will be keenly felt.

A Charter for Scientists. The concern scientists feel about their relations with the society that supports them has found expression in the proposals made many months ago for adoption of a charter for scientists. The proposals are perhaps even more worthy of discussion and reflection now, after the give-and-take in the atomic arms race since last September. The gist of the idea is to get on paper for all to see the responsibilities and obligations which scientists willingly assume -- and also the conditions and safeguards which they require from society in order to fulfill them.

Bart J. Bok made an effective plea for such a charter in the August-September (1949) issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Dr. Bok, recently succeeded by Dr. Maurice B. Visscher as Chairman of the National Research Council committee on UNESCO, sees the charter as a logical extension of the recent U.N. Declaration on Human Rights. The charter which he is sponsoring, and which he emphasizes is open to discussion and modification, is as follows:

"In consideration of the prominent place which science holds at present in society, and of the rapid transformation of the world through the application of science, and in consideration further of the fact that scientists can obtain and use information not readily available to others, the scientific worker has certain obligations toward society over and above the ordinary duties of citizenship. It is therefore the duty of every scientist:

- a) to maintain a spirit of honesty, integrity and cooperation;
- b) to examine searchingly the meaning and purposes of the work that he or she is performing, and when in the employ of others, to inquire into these purposes and to evaluate the moral issues that may be involved;
- c) to promote the development of science in the ways most beneficial to all mankind and to exert his or her influence as far as possible to prevent its misuse;
- d) to assist in the education of the people and of governments in the aims, methods, and spirit of scientific research and to keep them abreast of scientific progress;
- e) to promote international collaboration in science, to work for the preservation of world peace, and to contribute toward a spirit of world citizenship;
- f) to emphasize and develop the human values associated with science and technology.

"In order to be able to fulfill these obligations, scientists must claim certain rights, the principal ones of which are:

- g) the right to participate freely in all activities permitted to the average citizen;
- h) the right to obtain general information about the purposes for which assigned projects are being done;
- i) the right to publish the results of his or her researches, as well as full freedom to discuss work in progress with other scientists, except where these privileges may have to be restricted for socially or ethically justifiable reasons."

A more detailed and elaborate charter has been proposed by the World Federation of Scientific Workers. Too long to be reproduced here, its provisions fall under seven headings: (1) Responsibilities of scientific workers, (2) Status of scientific workers, (3) Opportunities to become a scientific worker, (4) Facilities for employment, (5) Conditions of work for scientists, (6) Organization of scientific work, (7) Special needs for science in undeveloped countries.

The full text of this charter appears in the first issue of Science and Mankind (January, 1949), the journal of the World Federation of Scientific Workers, available in this country from Dr. H. Grundfest, 630 West 168th Street, New York 32, N.Y. The subscription price is \$2.00 per year.

The FAS has not as yet commented on these suggestions and is not affiliated with the WFSW. Comments by members will be forwarded to Bok, Visscher, WFSW, or the FAS Council, as requested.

Changes Within the AEC. With the departure of David Lilienthal on February 15 from the Atomic Energy Commission, Sumner Pike was named from among the commissioners as temporary chairman. Just previously, Mr. Lewis L. Strauss announced his intention of leaving his AEC position April 15 to take a much needed rest. The former Wall Street financier was commissioned in the Navy in 1941 and rose to a rank of Rear Admiral before leaving that service after the war. He has been associated with the Atomic Energy Commission since its inception. Mr. Strauss was a champion for stricter security within the AEC last year, and had been in favor of FBI investigation of all AEC fellowship applicants. Both of these policies had been opposed by the FAS on the grounds that they did not contribute in any way to the security of the country and were an impediment to scientific research.

The terms of the remaining commissioners -- Pike, Gordon Dean, and Henry D. Smyth -- expire on June 30. Later this spring, the President must make nominations, which have to be confirmed by the Senate, for all five posts. The scheme of staggered terms of office, outlined in the McMahon Act of 1946, will apply to the five new AEC commissioners.

New R.D.B. Head. The President has recently announced the appointment of Mr. William Webster as chairman of the Research and Development Board, of the Department of Defense. This is an important government post, since the board coordinates the research and development programs of the separate military services and certifies the spending of some 500 million dollars annually for this purpose. The two previous occupants of this position have been Dr. Vannevar Bush and Dr. Karl T. Compton, research scientists with administrative experience. Mr. Webster on the other hand is not a scientist, but has had extensive administrative experience in the technical field. He was formerly chairman of the Military Liaison Committee of the AEC and most recently vice-president of the New England Electric System. The President was at first disposed to nominate another distinguished scientist for the post, but following the refusal of all eligible candidates and faced with increasing criticism of the methods of operation of the Board, he selected a qualified administrator instead. The appointment is generally regarded as a good one by both scientists and government officials.

A Reminder about Membership. Affiliation with the FAS is open to all natural scientists, mathematicians, and engineers, whatever their field. Membership opportunities are also available to any other persons holding a bachelor's degree or equivalent as long as this category does not (and it doesn't) exceed one-third of the total membership. New members may join directly through the Washington office or through one of the FAS chapters. The only difference between national and chapter members is that the latter participate in local activities -- serve on committees, attend chapter meetings, actively further the local program -- while national members are not notified of chapter activities. There are both national and chapter representatives on the policy-making FAS Council. All members receive the Newsletter. All members, when their names and dues are received at the national office, are sent a "Privilege Card," entitling them to a special subscription rate of \$3.50 to the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. All members help support FAS activity in Washington.

Why not pass this Newsletter to a non-member colleague and ask him to use the coupon?

#### MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

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  
 Chapters at: Brookhaven, Chicago, Ithaca, Los Alamos, Madison, New York, Oak Ridge, Princeton, Rochester, Schenectady, and Washington. Informal branches in other communities.

\* Regular members with more than \$2500 annual income pay \$5.

Nominations for FAS Chairman, 1950-51, have been communicated by the Elections Committee, headed by Lester Guttman of the Chicago chapter. According to By-Law 13, nominees may be added to the list by petition of 10 or more members who have first ascertained the willingness of the candidate to serve if elected. Such additional nominations must be sent to the Washington office by March 20. The election will be held in April. The Vice-Chairman, being the candidate receiving the second highest number of votes, will also be selected from these nominees. The nominees proposed by the Elections Committee are:

W. A. Higinbotham, associate head, electronics division, Brookhaven National Laboratory since 1948; A.B. Williams, 1932; M.I.T. Radiation Lab; Manhattan project; Executive Secretary, FAS, 1946-47; vice-chairman, 1948-49; chairman, Brookhaven chapter, 1949-50; associate chairman, Scientists Committee on Loyalty Problems.

Hugh C. Wolfe, Professor of Physics and Chairman of Department, Cooper Union, since 1949; Ph.D. Michigan, 1929; Professor of Physics, City College of N.Y., 1942-49; Chairman, New York chapter of FAS, 1948-50; Administrative Committee, FAS, 1948-50; chairman, 1949-50.

Nominations for Council Representatives of Members-at-Large, proposed by the Elections Committee, are listed below. Seven persons are to be chosen in the election in April.

Michael H. Baker, Minneapolis, Minn.; chemical engineer; Pratt Institute, Univ. of Maryland, Virginia Poly. Inst.; charter member of FAS Chicago chapter.

Lloyd H. Donnell, Chicago, Ill.; Research Professor of Mechanics, Illinois Inst. of Tech. since 1938; B.M.E. Michigan, 1915; Ph.D. ibid, 1930; Secretary, Chicago Association of Scientists and Engineers, 1947-49.

Bernard T. Feld, Cambridge, Mass.; Professor of Physics, M.I.T.; Ph.D. Columbia, 1945; Manhattan project; active in FAS chapters at Los Alamos, Chicago, Cambridge (sometime chairman); volunteer, Washington office, 1946.

Jules Halpern, Philadelphia, Pa.; Assoc. Professor of Physics, Univ. of Pa.; Ph.D. Carnegie Tech, 1937; Radiation Lab., M.I.T.; active in FAS groups at Cambridge and Philadelphia (officer and executive committee).

David Hawkins, Boulder, Colo.; Assoc. Professor of Philosophy, Univ. of Colo.; Ph.D. Calif, 1940; field: history and philosophy of science; Manhattan project; active in FAS groups at Los Alamos and Washington; executive board, Rocky Mountain Council on Nuclear Energy; FAS Admin. Comm, 1946-47, 1948-49.

Lindsay Helmholtz, St. Louis, Mo.; Assoc. Professor of Chemistry, Washington Univ.; Ph.D. Johns Hopkins U, 1933; Manhattan project; active FAS groups at Los Alamos and Northern California.

Joseph M. Keller, Ames, Iowa; Assoc. Professor of Physics, Iowa State College; Ph.D. California, 1940; Manhattan project.

Victor A. Lewinson, New York, N.Y.; Ph.D. candidate, physical chemistry, Columbia; Manhattan project; executive

committee and newsletter editor, New York chapter of FAS.

Robert Loevinger, New York, N.Y.; Physicist, Mt. Sinai Hospital; Ph.D. California, 1947; Manhattan project; field: medical physics; former member, N. Calif. chapter of FAS.

Walter C. Michels, Philadelphia, Pa.; Professor of Physics and head of Department, Bryn Mawr College; Ph.D. Cal. Tech, 1930; USN during war; president, Association of Philadelphia Scientists, 1946-47.

Robert L. Platzman, Lafayette, Ind.; Assoc. Professor of Physics, Purdue Univ.; Ph.D. physical chemistry, Chicago, 1942; Radiation Lab., M.I.T.; Manhattan project; 2½ years abroad, chiefly at Inst. of Niels Bohr, Copenhagen; observer for FAS at International Assembly of World Federation of Scientific Workers, Prague, 1948.

J. I. Routh, Iowa City, Iowa; Assoc. Professor of Biochemistry, State Univ. of Iowa; Ph.D. Michigan, 1937; President, FAS chapter in Eastern Iowa, 1946-49; active lecturer on atomic energy.

Leonard I. Schiff, Stanford, Calif.; Professor of Physics and Exec. Head of Dep't, Stanford Univ.; Ph.D. M.I.T, 1937; Los Alamos, 1946-47; FAS Administrative Committee, 1947-48.

Additional nominations may be made until March 20th by petition of five or more such members, having first obtained consent of the candidate to serve if elected. This election of Council representatives does not concern members affiliated with chapters, their representatives having been chosen in chapter elections.

#### Security Procedures (cont. from page 1).

Department's authority which now must be renewed annually. Like the present laws, it refers only to civilian employees.

The trend to extend security (as distinguished from loyalty) requirements farther from the primary military agencies is further evidenced in a report by a columnist in the Washington Post, February 20-21, and confirmed by unofficial sources, that proposals are under consideration to give the authority of summary suspension also to the Department of Commerce. The major component agencies in this department are the Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Nat'l Bureau of Standards, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Patent Office, Weather Bureau, and Civil Aeronautics Administration. For such an agency to have this authority in the name of security would seem a circumvention of the safeguards of the Civil Service system. The few classified projects in the department are sponsored by the armed services or the AEC and are thus covered by the security precautions authorized by law for the sponsoring agencies. All employees of the Department of Commerce must be cleared under the President's Loyalty Program, as must all federal employees. Requiring tests of reliability for all employees of a civilian agency not normally considered primary to the national defense would appear hard to justify. The Tydings bill does not include the Department of Commerce, but does have an elastic clause permitting the President to extend its applicability to other agencies.

Federation of American Scientists  
1749 L Street, N.W.  
Washington 6, D. C.  
A - 775

Sec. 34.66, P. L. & R.

U. S. POSTAGE

PAID

WASHINGTON, D. C.

PERMIT NO. 9124

Dr. Robert Simha  
6505 Sligo Parkway  
Green Meadows, Md.

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.