

SPECIAL FAS NEWSLETTER

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

May 30, 1949

A-720

Major Controversy. The officers and advisors of the FAS are convinced that the present attack on the policies of the AEC is a matter of most serious concern for scientists, comparable in importance to the fight for the McMahon bill and confirmation of the AEC. The last Newsletter and supplement give the story of the beginning of the attack. The Executive Secretariat polled old and new Administrative Committee members, the FAS Advisory Panel, and the more active groups to be sure our policy was clear.

After first supporting Lilienthal's stand that fellowships in non-secret work should be awarded solely on the basis of scholarship, representatives of the National Research Council backed down under fire by the Joint Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee. With virtually no support from scientists or educators, Mr. Lilienthal was forced to retreat and the AEC announced that a loyalty oath and non-communist affidavit would be required of AEC fellows. The responsibility must fall on us but the public has been given the impression that Mr. Lilienthal was at fault. It is unlikely that the Joint Committee will be satisfied with the compromise; many members have already taken a stand for FBI investigations. Many Congressmen would extend these requirements to other federal scholarship programs.

Newspapers have carried the story of the missing U-235 which in the opinion of our specialists is a minor incident with no implications for national security.

On May 23rd, Senator Hickenlooper demanded Lilienthal's resignation, charging "incredible mismanagement". He was joined by Senators Wherry, McCarran, and others. Senator Vandenberg voiced grave doubts. On May 26th, President Truman came to the defense expressing "entire confidence" in Mr. Lilienthal.

Lilienthal has demanded full and open hearings but the committee has not agreed on what kind of a hearing or how much can be made public. The temptation will be to confine the investigation to the fellowship program, the lost U-235, and similar subsidiary but highly charged issues.

Emergency Meeting of FAS Administrative Committee was held in New York on May 29th to consider the present crisis and plan FAS strategy. There was unanimous agreement on the gravity of the situation and the need for continued spirited action by the Federation, its chapters, and members-at-large. The opinion was that the fellowship issue remains most important; that the misunderstanding about the isotope program should also be stressed. About the "missing" uranium, the attitude was that the charge was trivial and absurd. The committee discussed at length the implications of the present furor on the maintenance of civilian control, and concluded that the Cain bill for military domination of the Atomic Energy program need not be taken seriously at this time.

The committee's stand on some of the issues was made public in a press release on May 31st. Excerpts follow: "Not one of the present attacks on the management of the AEC is well founded. This does not mean that we oppose a Congressional inquiry; on the contrary, we welcome such an investigation provided it is a full investigation, openly conducted.... Accusations of mismanagement based on the loss of some uranium are wildly exaggerated.... No competent scientist would suggest that (radio-isotopes) have any connection with the manufacture of atomic weapons. To place an embargo on the tools and materials of research, is unworthy of the dignity of a great nation. We believe that oaths, affidavits, or clearance investigations (for non-secret fellows) are unnecessary and potentially dangerous to scientific progress."

Action Needed Now! There is still need to get scientists' opinion to the proper places in Washington. Otherwise some principles held generally by scientists may be lost by default. The key person to write to remains Senator McMahon. Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy Senator O'Mahoney, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee should also be advised how scientists feel on these issues. Also Senator Arthur Vandenberg, key Republican figure, and Congressman Durham, vice-chairman of the Joint Committee. It is also useful to indicate to Lilienthal and Truman that they have our support. Lilienthal, especially, was hampered by lack of backing in the early stages of the fellowship issue, although very many scientists, including the members of the FAS Administrative Committee, later decided to support his original stand. Letters to the editor can give our appraisal of daily issues. Commentators and columnists will appreciate comments and information. Every member of the FAS is strongly urged to write and get others to write. The following addresses are all Washington 25, D.C.

Senator Brien McMahon, Senate Office Building
 Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Senate Office Building
 Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Senate Office Building
 Representative Carl T. Durham, House Office Building
 Mr. David E. Lilienthal, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 1901 Constitution Avenue
 President Harry S. Truman, The White House

Public Action by FAS and Chapters, May 21-30. The work of many FAS groups has been most encouraging. Press coverage has been given to statements by Cornell, Rochester, Oak Ridge, and California. New York arranged a press conference on May 28 which resulted in front page stories in the N.Y. Times and Herald-Tribune. At least seven chapters have had meetings to organize letter-writing campaigns. As an indication of the effect of this work, one may quote the Washington Evening Star of May 30th, which said, "In fact, some members of Congress report that the telegrams they are getting read much like those received when the AEC law was before Congress and there was a hot fight over military vs. military control."

The Washington office has sent out five different memos since the last Newsletter on May 21 and has sent out about 50 wires during the past ten days. On May 29, R. Bush participated in a syndicated radio broadcast with Representative Chet Holifield. An FAS press release is being issued today.

National Science Foundation. A new bill, H.R. 4846, was introduced into the house by Rep. Priest. This contains certain modifications of the previous bill, H.R. 12, based upon the hearings held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. According to the new bill, the Foundation will consist of a National Science Board and a Director (language suggested by the Bureau of the Budget and endorsed by the FAS); no special commissions are specifically mentioned; there is a provision that the annual report contain information on the disposition of all patents and patent rights; Congress rather than the Foundation will determine the portion of the appropriations spent on fellowships. The period over which the monies may be spent will be provided in each Appropriation Act. The wording with respect to security regulations, research in the field of atomic energy, and international participation in the activities of the Foundation remains unchanged. It is anticipated that at least three weeks will lapse before H.R. 4846 will be reported to the House.

The Administrative Committee fears that there will be determined efforts to require oaths and affidavits, perhaps even investigations in the fellowship program of the NSF. This must be effectively opposed. The importance of the NSF is emphasized by the attack on the AEC fellowship program. The propriety of the AEC's supporting a general fellowship program, even as an interim measure, should be considered by us all.

Financing-Membership. The work of the Federation in this emergency costs money for travel, phone and telegraph, and special mailings. The Secretariat and volunteers have given unstintingly of their time. Higinbotham (former vice-chairman) and R. Bush (Princeton) came to Washington especially to help out. Members and members-at-large are urged to make contributions so that we can continue our activities. We will fill requests for additional copies of Newsletters, etc. from members, potential members, et:

F.A.S. NEWSLETTER

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS
1749 L Street, N.W. Washington 6, D.C.

May 21, 1949

A-711

Loyalty Investigation for Students? The recent charge by certain members of Congress that two of the recipients of AEC fellowships are Communists, has raised the question of whether loyalty checks should be made on all applicants for government sponsored fellowships to do unclassified research. The fellows are selected and the program is administered by the National Research Council. According to Senator Hickenlooper, the AEC had agreed to investigate all applicants for fellowships but had dropped the project last fall after covering only one fifth of the applicants. In a statement issued May 12, the AEC stated that it had carefully considered the implications of investigation and clearance of fellows working on non-secret projects and that such procedures raised issues of the utmost gravity. From its study of this point, the Commission concluded that the application of investigational processes to study and research in non-secret fields would grossly menace freedom of inquiry and education. In a strongly worded editorial, the Washington Post points out that if members of Congress become so jumpy about freedom of inquiry that they are willing to impose political surveillance upon it, the country will have travelled a long way toward the thought regimentation it abhors.

AEC Chairman Lilienthal in a statement on May 16 to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, said: "There is no question of national security at issue here. The sole issue is how best to operate a fellowship program....It is our judgment, based upon the conviction and experience of the best qualified people in the country, that the Nation will get the most return from its investment by adhering to the tried and true procedure for the development of scientific talent". He pointed out that the fellowship program is "overwhelmingly concerned with non-secret areas of research in the fields of biology and medicine and in the physical sciences. These are, of course, fields in which there is graduate work being done by private institutions and in which there is no security interest to prevent the traditional openness and free exchange of science."

Dr. A. N. Richards, President of the National Academy of Sciences, told the Joint Committee that FBI investigations would deter sensitive scientists from applying for fellowships. "It would soon become generally known that the information collected about an individual ... is not limited to provable facts, but of necessity includes hearsay." The AEC would be faced with the decision on "whether a leaning, an association, a tendency to be critical of some of the weaknesses of our form of government constitutes a basis for disqualification." Richards further said that even if a Communist were selected and discovered later, "his training will have added one more to the group of those capable of utilizing knowledge of nuclear energy," and "the country will have been the gainer by his training."

The FAS issued a statement on May 17th endorsing the policy of the AEC and NRC in not requiring loyalty investigations prior to granting fellowships for training in the basic sciences. "We stand to lose much more than we can possibly gain if we make it appear that conformism and orthodoxy are prerequisites to Federal support of basic scientific training," the FAS statement said. The Federation called this instance part of a pattern which threatened to pinch off one of the essential roots of our security -- the free progress of science. "Secrecy, loyalty investigations and security regulations have their proper role. But if they get out of hand, as they now threaten to, they will wreck the very security they should be designed to protect."

This issue is fluid as the Newsletter goes to press (May 17th). Whether it will affect confirmation of the new AEC appointees or the National Science Foundation bill remains to be seen.

"Science and the Climate of Opinion" was the subject of the general meeting of the FAS, held on Friday, April 29th, at the Cosmos Club in Washington, D.C. The capacity audience included many visiting scientists in Washington for the meetings of the American Physical Society. Featured speakers were Professor Richard H. Shryock of the University of Pennsylvania, authority on the history of science, and Dr. Samuel Goudsmit, well-known nuclear scientist, author, and lecturer. Dr. Arthur Roberts, chairman of the Federation, presided.

Dr. Shryock spoke on the influence exerted by society upon the development of science. He pointed out that the character of a society -- its institutions, its sense of values, etc. -- has a decided effect upon the prestige and financial support accorded scientists and their work. The cultural climate is an important factor in determining the caliber of men who will become scientists and the kinds of scientific activities which will be encouraged by that climate. He attributed the neglect of basic research and the heavy emphasis upon applied research and development in the U.S. to the emphasis by American business and industry upon the concept of utility, or practicality. This, coupled with the fact that business and industry also control great wealth, led to the rapid development of some sciences such as geology, and to the neglect of less practical theoretical research. Similarly, the mores of the United States today have their impact upon scientific activities in this country. An illustration is the serious effort of anti-vivisectionists to halt laboratory experimentation on animals. In Europe, there are no such interferences with the development of medical knowledge.

Dr. Goudsmit, speaking on the influence of the present day climate of opinion on the freedom of science, drew attention to a growing belief that science is evil and that its effects are more destructive than beneficial. In discussing the curtailment of scientific freedom, he pointed to the experience of Nazi Germany, where truth was sacrificed to the political theories of the Hitler regime, and to Soviet Russia, where indications are that scientific work is evaluated in terms of its agreement or disagreement with dialectical materialism. The most serious result of such curtailment is that the youth have no teachers who can train them in objective techniques of scientific investigation.

In the United States, Dr. Goudsmit warned, the potentialities exist for similar curtailment of science. Scientists must be on the alert to avoid conscious or subconscious bias induced by the interests which provide financial support of their work. They must be equally careful, however, that incompetent scientists do not, in the name of scientific freedom, wrongly instruct and guide the youth which looks to them for training.

The Bikini Report. The FAS in a press release on May 2nd recommended the immediate publication of the Bikini atom bomb test report. The Report of the President's Evaluation Committee on the Bikini tests has been cleared for publication by military security. President Truman, it is reported, is at present personally responsible for withholding publication. The FAS urges releasing the report since the information it contains will contribute to public understanding of the issues involved in the utilization and control of atomic energy.

Information on Bomb Stockpile. In opposition to the stand taken by President Truman, the FAS voiced its attitude in the following statement released May 2nd;

"Any attempt to muzzle public discussion is a real threat to the future of our country. The number of available atomic bombs in the U.S. is known to only a few top military and government officials. The President of the United States has asserted at a recent news conference that the atomic bomb stockpile is not a matter for public discussion. Clearly this information has great importance in evaluating our military defense program and foreign policy. While admitting that publication of this information might be of some benefit to other countries, we must, nevertheless, weigh this against the break with our traditional policy of informing the public on matters of national welfare. Should the Congress and the public be told the number of atomic bombs in our stockpile? The Federation of American Scientists supports the proposal which Senator Brian McMahon made in an address before the Economic Club of Detroit on January 3rd (reprinted in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, March 1949), that this important question should receive full public discussion."

Peace or Pestilence by Theodor Rosebury, Whittlesey House, 218 pp., \$2.75; to be published May 27, 1949.

It appears that biological warfare is at last going to have a public airing. Following hard on the heels of the Forrestal statement (see FAS Newsletter, A-702) is this book on BW by the former chief of the Air-Borne Infection project at the U.S. Biological Warfare Headquarters at Camp Detrick, Maryland. And being circulated at the moment to member associations and informed scientists for comment, is a draft report of an FAS Study Group on BW. Taken together, the three treatments make possible an evaluation of the scope and dimensions of the technical problem of BW.

Of the three, Rosebury's statement attributes the greatest menace to BW. Where the Forrestal statement was clearly aimed to counteract "sensational" stories about "the potency and state of development of biological warfare", Rosebury's book opens with a simulated radio flash announcing a mysterious epidemic in St. Louis which has taken 4000 lives in five days, and which has been attributed on the floor of Congress to a Russian germ warfare attack. And where the draft report of the FAS Study Group finds severe limitations on BW imposed by technical problems and public health defenses, Rosebury asserts that the technical difficulties are "not beyond the ken of human genius", and that "we need not doubt that BW is capable of taking its place beside the atomic bomb and other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction."

Rosebury's central theme runs as follows. BW agents of high potency can be mass-produced; hence, a "bomb" can be relatively easily and cheaply fabricated. Air-borne infection with a number of such agents has been demonstrated in small scale laboratory experiments in cloud chambers. Although never successfully used in practice, "human genius" can be expected to bridge the gap. Hence BW is a potential method of mass destruction, a versatile technique adaptable to many strategic military purposes. Its nature is such as to preclude international control, since the manufacture of BW agents requires no extensive installations or unusual procedures.

"There seem to be no adequate defenses against it". Therefore, it is "peace or pestilence" -- eliminate war or decimate humanity. The experience with atomic energy has demonstrated that, in the present atmosphere of fear and distrust, schemes for control of weapons of mass destruction, no matter how excellent technically, are naive politically. Therefore, this easy path must be eschewed for the more difficult, but more realistic path, of political agreement between the U.S. and the USSR.

On the political side, the argument will again center on which comes first, control or political understanding. Rosebury is certainly on strong ground when he argues that "the U.S. plan for international control (of atomic energy) was a work of technical genius" but failed of enactment "because the world is obviously not ready for it". But others may wonder whether the world (i.e. the U.S. and the USSR) is ready for the political understanding Rosebury pleads for but makes no effort to blueprint.

There appears little to be gained from continuing the debate over whether control or political understanding must come first. The important fact is that so far we have neither. Clearly there will be no perfect solutions in the near future. Should we not think seriously of partial ones? Maybe it's time to roll out the cracker barrel and see how much control we can get by how much and which political understandings.

Must We Hide? by R. E. Lapp, Addison-Wesley Press, 182 pp., \$3.00.

The flood of books written to provide laymen with information on why an atom works, appears to be gradually giving way to books describing the bomb's past and potential effectiveness. This is sad, but probably all too realistic a reflection of scientists' decreasing faith in atomic energy control. If control should never eventualize, it will certainly be important to have a citizenry well informed on the characteristics of atomic warfare, and Dr. Lapp's book should provide valuable assistance in that line.

Written on a far more elementary level than Blackett, Must We Hide? makes no attempt to deal with political aspects, past or future. The book is almost entirely concerned with the military effectiveness of atomic bombs, the nature of suitable targets, problems of bomb delivery, and possible defense measures. Two of the major "scare aspects" -- radioactive warfare and bomb planting by saboteurs -- are discussed but considered relatively ineffective.

In general, Lapp's opinion of the value of atomic bombs in modern war checks fairly well with that of Blackett. The principle of defense by dispersion is strongly supported in the book. This is undoubtedly valid, but the achievement of such defense appears at present to run counter to most of the economic and psychological forces acting on our competitive businessmen and workers. It would be nice to have dispersion, but the prospects are not very hopeful.

- - M. L. Ernst

Other New Books. During the past war there were extensive studies made by the Armed Services of the psychology of social relations. The Research Branch of the War Department's Information and Education division conducted one of the largest social-science studies ever made in its survey of the attitudes of the U.S. soldiers. This will be published in four volumes by the Princeton University Press under the title, "Studies in Social Psychology in World War II". Examples of their findings are given in the May 1949 issue of Scientific American.

Perhaps of greater interest to FAS members is Alexander Leighton's new book, "Human Relations in a Changing World" (Dutton, 220 pp., \$4.50). This book describes the techniques used for studying the morale of Japanese soldiers and civilians through the analysis of the information content of letters, periodicals, radio broadcasts, etc., and points out that similar methods could well be applied to the study of today's problems of foreign relations, labor relations, and race relations.

Dr. Leighton was associated with the Department of Interior during the immediate post-war years and gave generously of his time to the briefing of the members of the Social Science Committee of the Washington Association of Scientists. During the sessions of this Committee he impressed the members deeply with his knowledge of human relations in the light of the findings of social anthropology.

In a different vein is the book by Merle Colby, "The Big Secret" (Viking, 375 pp., \$3.00). Mr. Colby in his novel concerns himself with the doings of a young atomic scientist who comes to Washington to inform congressmen, politicians, military commanders, and administrators of the dangers of governmental interference with the freedom of publication of research findings. (Any resemblance to past or present FAS members is purely co-incidental). The novel is replete with Hollywood characterizations and love interest. It looks like a natural for a typical grade B movie.

Wetenschap en Samenleving (Science and Society), the new Dutch monthly, is an amalgamation of Maatschappij en Wetenschap (Society and Science), house organ of the Dutch Association of Scientific Workers, and Atoom, a journal dedicated to dissemination of information on nuclear energy. The new journal is now the Dutch counterpart of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. The first issue is good reading for any who still doubt the profound international repercussions of the loyalty investigations in the U.S. The second (February) issue contains an article by the chairman of the Association, Dr. M. G. J. Minnaert, Utrecht, on how to give a lecture on atomic energy to non-professionals. An introduction on the principles of nuclear physics is followed by examples of peaceful applications and the use of nuclear physics in war. The last part reads in translation: "Our lecture ends with an urgent plea for the possibility and necessity of international agreement....Not only must the possession of atomic bombs be prevented, but especially the possession of U-235 must be prevented or at least fully controlled. This is possible because production of the dangerous material is possible only in large installations, which must operate for years for this purpose only. Very important here is agreement in the UN as well as between the U.S. and Russia on the two fundamental points: atomic war must be forbidden by international agreement; and full international control is therefore necessary.... In the given international conditions a physical-technical-economical problem presents itself, which has not been answered....Here is a beautiful duty for small countries, including Holland. Apparently the big powers cannot agree. The small countries must insist on continuation of negotiations, on further technical discussions, on personal pre-discussions on a small scale (Einstein proposal). They must insist now on partial control measures, in preparation for final control. A solution will be found because it must be found...."

Other articles in the monthly deal in general with topics similar in form and approach to those in the Bulletin. Wetenschap en Samenleving is published by von Holkema and Warendorf, Keizersgracht 333, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Economic and Social Consequences of Atomic War. The controversy regarding the effectiveness of the atomic bomb engendered by Blackett's book and the analysis made in Lapp's book on minimizing the damage wrought in a strategic bombing campaign utilizing the A-Bomb, raise a very serious question concerning the capacity of our economic system to recover from the effects of another war. None of the discussions of Blackett's book appears to be much concerned over this point. Blackett claims that A-Bombs dropped by the hundreds over Russia could not by themselves defeat the Russians. Lapp believes that the U.S. could survive a major assault by A-Bombs through taking certain passive defense measures. Even assuming that one or the other opponent succeeded in forcing the surrender of an enemy after extensive destruction of his capital goods and sources of economic strength -- what next? We found that both victors and vanquished verged on the brink of economic chaos after this last war. Only the enormous productive capacity of the undamaged economic machine of the U.S. enabled us to survive this crisis. What if another war touched us more closely? And although victorious, we had to try to restore normal conditions among both our allies and the populations of the defeated countries, with enemy productive capacity reduced to zero and ours seriously crippled? Can we feed the world again if food crops have been affected by the war? These are questions which need to be answered before we can speak authoritatively on the value of A-Bombs and strategic bombing in warfare.

New Appointments to the AEC. President Truman recently announced two new appointments to fill the vacancies created in the Atomic Energy Commission by the resignation of Dr. Robert F. Bacher and Mr. W. W. Waymack. On May 10, Professor Henry deWolfe Smyth, chairman of the Physics Department of Princeton University, was nominated to succeed Bacher, who expressed a desire to return to his previous academic career, and Mr. Gordon Dean, a former law partner of Senator Brian McMahon, was nominated to succeed Waymack, who resigned last December to return to private life.

The Strand-Spitzer Case, retitled to give proper emphasis, was summarized in the March 7th Newsletter. A statement by the FAS Council, made public May 2nd, follows:

"The Federation of American Scientists is concerned about implications for scientific freedom involved in the charges made by Dr. A. L. Strand, President of Oregon State College, in justifying his decision not to renew the contract of Dr. Ralph Spitzer, Associate Professor of Chemistry. The basic charge made against Spitzer is that he is a follower of the Communist party line. Statements received by the Federation from Spitzer and Strand show that the only evidence presented publicly in support of the charge against Spitzer is a letter written by him to a technical journal. From this Strand concludes that Spitzer 'quotes the charlatan Lysenko in preference to what he must know to be the truth.... Any scientist who has such poor power of discrimination so as to choose to support Lysenko's Michurin genetics against all the weight of evidence against it is not much of a scientist, or, a priori, has lost the freedom that an instructor and investigator should possess.' Spitzer pointed out that in his letter he did not 'support or accept Lysenko's theories'.

"Without passing judgment on the validity of any biological theory, the Federation nevertheless is concerned about the issue of orthodoxy in scientific thought which appears to be raised in the charges of the Oregon State College President. No scientific theory is 'right' or 'wrong' just because it is espoused by a particular national group or government. The validity of scientific theories ought to be determined, now and in the future, just as it has in the past -- by experimental methods. It is deplorable that Lysenko's theory has been made a matter of national policy of the USSR; it would be equally deplorable to make any theory, in any field of science, a matter of national doctrine. There is no surer way to stifle science.

"Present scientific knowledge does not entitle anyone to be dogmatic about the nature of hereditary processes. Genetic theory is undergoing continuous modification under the impact of new facts gathered both in the United States and abroad. This process is hindered when decree is substituted for the time-tested method of experiment and scientific discussion -- whether this is done by exponents of the Lysenko school, or by the President of Oregon State College. In the long run, the principle of free scientific thought and opinion will prove more important than the fate of any individual theory."

COMMUNICATION -- The FAS and World Government.

Up to the time of the Baruch proposals to the UNAEC, the FAS policy on "foreign policy" was clear and challenging. The Baruch proposal itself, though perhaps not the tone of its presentation, embodied a departure from traditional statecraft of the sort advocated by the FAS as demanded by the urgency of the atomic situation. Since then, the disappointing, though perhaps expected, Soviet reception of this proposal has left little hope of a departure from the usual Soviet methods of statecraft in the atomic field, and the clear crusade of the FAS has deteriorated into a less forceful appeal for patience. Because we know the alternative to be so grim, we have clung to the hope, though it is fainter than at first, that some change of attitude might develop, more favorable to the possibility of effective international control of atomic energy, in spite of the unfavorable political climate of the "cold war". Some of our members have felt this unrealistic of late, but we have agreed on no more forceful stand on the international problem.

The principal *raison d'être* of the FAS has shifted to its activities concerning domestic issues, which are related to the international problem mainly in the way they may preserve or improve the possibility of implementing international agreement in the atomic field, if agreement should ever be reached. The less challenging nature of this indirect approach to the international problem may be partly responsible for the ebbing strength of some of the local associations of the FAS.

Our part in politics as scientists was much more clear in that first year of the life of the Federation when we had, as the result of our special experience, a message that was new. By now the torch of truth which we carried has been glimpsed by many, forgotten or perverted by most of these. But from among the many who saw it, certain groups have been formed of sensitive citizens who could not forget and who could, within the various groups, agree on what should be done about the situation. Perhaps the most vigorous of these groups is the United World Federalists, and in advocating the formation of an adequate federal world government (if possible by means of the rapid evolution of the UN) it insists on the point of view that progress toward this end should be made with the Soviet Union and its satellites if possible, without them if necessary, but always with the possibility that they may be attracted by the advantages of membership to join later, if they do not agree to at first. Among programs advocating direct international action, this point of view seems to make the program of the United World Federalists probably the one most nearly compatible with the majority view of the FAS. In a sense, they carry our torch, and it is right that they do so. They are many, and we scientists are few. They draw strength from our original message concerning the danger of atomic attack. The question arises whether we should let our contribution to their cause end with that message, and with the numerically small help that some of our members may give by joining them individually.

Though we are few, and do not even include a majority of American scientists in our ranks we have prestige out of proportion to our numbers, and it would seem proper that we should consider the desirability of lending this prestige to the support of the most likely program aimed at attaining a realistic international organization with powers sufficient to meet the atomic emergency. This could be done with or without actually naming the group whose program we wish most directly to support. To some of us, it would seem most effective both to endorse the program of the United World Federalists and to revitalize our own program by including their aims in our aims. To others it might seem more discreet and less profligate of what little prestige we may have to give more active support to the general idea of world federation, embracing as much of the world as possible, without being more specific than that about the details.

We have said the time is short -- just how short we have never pretended to know. The clock on the cover of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists has been set late, but has remained stationary since it was set. The spectacle of the FAS content with patience on the international scene has made some doubt our sincerity in our original message concerning the urgency of the situation. While it cannot be denied that there may be some faint hope in patience, outright endorsement of, and participation in, the more hopeful and quite active program of the United World Federalists would seem to be more in keeping with the creeping of the clock toward twelve.

- - David R. Inglis, Baltimore

National Science Foundation. Hearings on NSF legislation before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have been completed. The final day of the hearings (April 26) brought a full-fledged attack on the entire Foundation concept by the National Patent Council. NPC sees the Foundation as an attack by "subversive influences" on free enterprise by undermining the American patent system. Communications received by Congressmen indicate that NPC has convinced some small manufacturers and businessmen that their right to profit from discovery and invention is in jeopardy. Parenthetically, FAS is listed by NPC as one of the "subversive influences" operating in this field.

The House Committee is holding closed sessions on the legislation, which it hopes to bring to the House floor in the near future. Two obstacles to passage this session remain. First, as a comparatively minor bill with little political glamor, NSF must compete for a place on the calendar with such politically "hot" legislation as labor relations, housing, etc. The recent set-to on Taft-Hartley slowed NSF at least a week. Second, NPS, which probably influenced the Committee very little, may be more of a threat on the floor where many Congressmen will know little about the legislation and may heed their mail. Communications favoring NSF will be urgent at that time. The situation is being closely watched here and at the appropriate time, when the bill comes out of committee or when it appears to be unduly delayed in doing so, action from the "grass roots" will be called for. Watch for a possible special Newsletter in the not too distant future.

FAS Poll Results. The results of the poll distributed in the March 7th Newsletter are:

1. Do you think there should be public discussion on the advisability of releasing information on the atomic bomb stockpile?

<u>Yes</u>	86%	<u>No</u>	11%	<u>Undecided</u>	3%
------------	-----	-----------	-----	------------------	----
2. Do you think the U.S. should:

a) say nothing about the subject?	13	62	25
b) treat the subject in general terms (e.g. probable standing relative to other countries)?	39	27	34
c) describe its potential in terms of previous explosions (Hiroshima, Bikini)?	54	24	22
d) announce the number of bombs on hand?	28	41	31
e) announce the production rate of atomic weapons?	28	41	31

In summary, an overwhelming majority (86%) of those who replied are opposed to the muzzling of discussion of the question, and a sizeable majority (62%) opposed to complete secrecy of information. With regard to the nature of information that should be released, the replies indicate considerable indecision, with a plurality for some kind of information but not for the number of bombs or the production rate.

Members! There are many American scientists who consider themselves allied with the FAS but have let their membership lapse or are content to remain on the "free" list. All natural scientists are eligible to become members-at-large and others interested may join as associate members-at-large. The FAS needs paying as well as vocal support. The coupon below is for the conscience-stricken.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP - AT - LARGE IN F.A.S.

Name _____	Highest Degree	Institution	Major Field
Mailing Address _____	Received		
	_____ Present Position		
Are you an American citizen? _____	_____		

Annual dues are: Member....\$5.00, Supporting Member....\$10.00, Patron....\$25.00
(Please make checks payable to Federation of American Scientists)

There are local associations of the FAS in the following communities: Baltimore, Brookhaven, Cambridge, Chicago, Ithaca, Los Alamos, Schenectady, Berkeley, New York, Oak Ridge, Pittsburgh, Princeton, Rochester, Madison, and Washington, D.C.

Atomic Education Activities of the FAS. Several local chapters of the FAS maintain active and useful educational programs on the implications of the Atomic Age. On a national scale, however, the National Committee on Atomic Information ceased a year ago because of lack of funds, and the Association of Scientists for Atomic Education, except in New York City, has been moribund for many months. The FAS has attempted to service the numerous inquiries which still come to these organizations as well as those addressed to the Federation itself. Many come from schools and clubs, which are sent the available reprints and referred to other sources of information.

The Office of Information of the Atomic Energy Commission has some literature available (including reprints of recent articles) and co-sponsors exhibitions and educational forums of a semi-official nature; it is the most active agency serving this important field. Commendable as their work is, however, there should be a non-official source of information on atomic implications by a well-informed scientists' organization. The FAS plans to continue to respond to the requests for information. The educational material distributed is being revised and brought up-to-date. The FAS Council has authorized use of funds from sources other than membership dues for purchase of new reprints for educational purposes. Typical pamphlets and reprints supplied by the FAS office at a nominal cost include One World or None (book), Discussion Outline on Atomic Energy, 12 Points on Atomic Energy, How the Atomic Energy Act Works, Acheson-Lilienthal Report, Struggle for World Control, Atomic Challenge, and a composite of articles from the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

FAS Officers and Administrative Committee for 1949-50. Elected to the FAS Administrative Committee by the Council at its Washington meeting were: Gerhart Friedlander (Brookhaven), Clifford Grobstein (Washington), M. Stanley Livingston (Cambridge), Philip Morrison (Cornell), Arthur Roberts (member-at-large, Iowa City), R. Rollefson (Wisconsin), and Hugh C. Wolfe (New York).

The Council designated as Chairman, Dr. Wolfe, who is Associate Professor of Physics at the College of the City of New York, one of the original members of the Ass'n of New York Scientists, and currently its chairman. Named Vice-Chairman was Dr. Grobstein, biologist at the National Cancer Institute, and chairman of the National Science Foundation study committee of the Washington Ass'n of Scientists. Dr. Friedlander, chemist at Brookhaven Nat'l Laboratory, and active successively in the Los Alamos, Mohawk, and Brookhaven chapters of the FAS, was elected Sec'y-Treasurer.

The Administrative Committee, which carries out the general policies laid down by the Council, will meet in Cambridge on June 18 or 19, after the meetings of the American Physical Society. The next Council meeting is to be in November of this year.

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

Sec. 562 P.L. & R.

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.