

F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

Published by the
FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS
1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.
M. Stanley Livingston, Chairman

----- to inform and stimulate
discussion among scientists. Not to
be attributed as official FAS policy
unless specifically so indicated.

No. 54 - 5

May 24, 1954

ARMY - McCARTHY HEARINGS AND MONMOUTH

SECURITY IN NON-SECRET RESEARCH

Since June 1952, the US Public Health Service has revoked or denied support to something under 30 scientists on "political" grounds. The research programs, according to the N. Y. Herald-Tribune (April 29), were not secret or classified. All of the grants involved had been approved in the usual manner by the Study Sections or National Advisory Councils as to scientific merit of the research and the personnel. Normally the Surgeon General of the PHS follows the recommendations of these advisory bodies. In the approximately 30 cases involved, however, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare followed a policy made public by Department Secretary Cveta Culp Hobby in a statement issued April 28:

"We do not require security or loyalty investigations in connection with the award of research grants. When, however, information of a substantial nature reflecting on the loyalty of an individual is brought to our attention, it becomes our duty to give it more serious consideration. In those instances where it is established to the satisfaction of this Department that the individual has engaged or is engaging in subversive activities or that there is serious question of his loyalty to the United States, it is the practice of the Department to deny support." (Emphasis ours)

POLITICAL CRITERIA ? Rumors that "political" criteria were being applied in the awarding of grants had been "circulating among scientists for months," according to Earl Ubell of the Herald-Tribune, and "prompted the American Society of Biological Chemists to call on the National Academy of Sciences for an investigation of the practice of using 'political' criteria in the granting of awards."

In a resolution adopted unanimously April 15, the Society held that, "when research is open and unclassified, the imposition of political or other extraneous requirements on the investigator, as a condition for awarding a research grant, threatens the freedom of science and the principles on which the American social order is based." At its May 1 meeting, the Council of the FAS passed a resolution concurring in the views of the Society and urging appropriate action.

POLICY QUESTIONED The PHS research grant program is responsible for the financial support of a large fraction of research in medical sciences. The system of review of grant applications by extra-governmental advisory bodies, such as the National Advisory Councils, has been widely approved and has functioned admirably. Moreover, as noted in Mrs. Hobby's statement of Apr. 20: "The Department is aware of the importance to society of free scientific research-inquiry and seeks to avoid any undue interference in the affairs of scientists engaged in open or unclassified research supported by Federal funds." The exception being made to this policy of non-interference in cases of questionable loyalty has prompted Detlev Bronk, president of the National Academy of Sciences, to ask for clarification. According to the Herald-Tribune the Department replied to Bronk, outlining its practice in such cases, but the texts of the letters have not been released.

One of the first major items to come under detailed investigation at the Army-McCarthy hearings was McCarthy's performance at Ft. Monmouth. Acting Committee counsel Jenkins, in his questions to Secretary Stevens, appeared to be assuming that, "as a result of the Senator's efforts . . . at least 33 civilian employees at Ft. Monmouth were either fired or suspended because of their communistic leanings or background." This evaluation contrasts sharply with Stevens' report to the Subcommittee:

STEVENS' TESTIMONY "With respect to the 19 employees who were suspended during the month of October, the Army already had derogatory information in every case sufficient to be the basis for suspension. Insofar as the results of committee interrogations of these 19 individuals have been made available to the Army, no significant item of derogatory information was developed by the committee which was not already known to and being acted upon by the Army. In one additional case, the committee did develop certain derogatory information of a minor nature which was not known to the Army at that time. The suspension which occurred in that single case was based upon information already available in Army files, upon a further investigation conducted by the FBI, and upon statements made by that employe before the committee in executive session."

An AP dispatch quoted in the Christian Science Monitor of Apr. 24 reported that Attorneys Katchen and Green, representing 23 of the suspended Signal Corps workers, sent telegrams to Jenkins, saying they were surprised at the manner in which he presented the Ft. Monmouth background in that he commended Sen. McCarthy and gave him credit for the suspensions "when none of the evidence seems to bear that out."

N. Y. TIMES CRITICAL Disturbed by the tendency on Jenkins' part to "over-rate" McCarthy's accomplishments, the N. Y. Times editorialized (May 5): "If we understood him correctly, what Mr. Jenkins suggested on Monday was that any person suspended as a security risk was automatically -- if temporarily -- branded as a subversive. He went on to make the equally surprising comment that Sen. McCarthy had been 'vindicated' in so far as the Monmouth hearings were concerned, if his efforts had 'resulted in the suspension of one or more bad security risks.'" The editorial emphasized that "Not one of the 35 cases of suspension since last August has yet resulted in discharge; not one, so far as we know, involved espionage or disloyalty; not one involved a 'Fifth Amendment' case."

"... We trust that this country has not yet been so permeated by McCarthyism, and we hope it never will be, that a person is to be considered guilty until he is proved innocent. ...the
(Continued on Page 3, Column 1)

THIS ISSUE OF THE NEWSLETTER is being sent to a number of non-members who have been invited to join the Federation. A report on some current FAS activities appears on page 3. It is hoped that this, and the Newsletter itself, will further indicate why they should be interested in the Federation -- and why the Federation needs them. Members are urged to call this issue to the attention of their colleagues and remind them of the importance of supporting FAS.

FAS TESTIFIES ON REVISION OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT

The proposed bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (HR 8862/S 3323) was the subject of testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy starting May 10. FAS views were presented May 17 by William A. Higinbotham, Executive Committee member and former Executive Secretary. He commended the basic objectives of the bill, to permit private participation in atomic power development and to permit increased exchange of information with other countries, but expressed strong criticism of some of its provisions. Stressing our awareness that an atomic arms race can achieve security for no one, he suggested that experience gained in control of domestic atomic energy might later be useful in international control.

With reference to the patent provisions, he quoted to the Committee from policy formulated by the FAS Council (Nov. '53) expressing concern that "the transition (allowing patents in the power field) should be made in a manner which will not grant special privilege or tend to create monopolies in the field."

HIGH FENCE, LOW FENCE Nearly half of Higinbotham's statement dealt with information and security. The present practice was described as automatic classification "at birth" of every new piece of information, with later declassification piece by piece. Instead of this, he asked that the AEC be allowed to map out unclassified areas in the field of atomic power. "The proposed amendment appears to carry us in the wrong direction," he said. "We now need not more secrecy, spreading more widely, but secrecy more realistically and effectively administered in the narrow areas which specifically require it. ...it is better to have a high fence around a small area than a low fence around a large area."

Noting that "the proposed amendment would permit exchange with other nations of information in the field of atomic power and information relevant to mutual defense," the statement agreed these provisions would be in the best interests of the country, but noted that some of the restrictive provisions seemed rather extreme. It emphasized the value of the proposed exchange of reactor information and advocated additional change in the law to permit sale of power reactors abroad.

Two sections of the new bill, relating to security procedures, were felt to be excellent. One section provides for the automatic declassification of any document after 3 years, unless positive action is taken to extend such classification. The other provision instructs the AEC to establish standards on the extent of investigations of personnel, based on the kind of work they are to do and the location where they will work. Present legislation treats all "restricted data" as if it were of the same importance, and requires full investigation of persons having access to "restricted data," although their contact may be only superficial.

\$2500 FINE Jerome Luntz, editor of *Nucleonics*, was seconded by the FAS representative in objecting strongly to a provision of the amendment imposing a fine of \$2500 for even-intentional disclosure of "restricted data" by a government employee and the same penalty for any other person who transmits information which he has reason to believe is "restricted data." Luntz said this provision would leave the press "at sea" about what it could publish, and would primarily "create an atmosphere of intimidation and harassment."

Higinbotham called the Committee's attention to certain changes in Chapter 3 of the Act, designating the chairman as "principal officer of the commission." Stressing the difficult problems for which the Commission is responsible, he strongly urged the continuation of the present concept wherein all five members of the Commission "bring to bear their combined experience and judgment" on policy matters. They should continue to delegate "responsibility for the detailed operation to the General Manager and his staff." (The new bill substitutes "administrative" for the existing wording, "administrative and executive," in describing the functions of the General Manager.)

The provision of the bill that "no action shall be brought in any court... if the Commission finds that such action would necessarily involve the disclosure of restricted data, and the National Security Council concurs in the finding," was questioned. Higinbotham called for "adequate provision for review [of deci-

sions of the Commission]... independent of the Commission and free from other pressures. ... The citizen's right to use the courts must not be compromised except for most compelling reasons."

Additional testimony from a number of other groups and individuals was also given at these hearings for voluntary non-government witnesses, which ended May 19. Various government agencies have also been invited to testify, but this has now been postponed until early June.

ANOTHER PROPOSAL Almost unnoticed by the press is HR 8701, a bill introduced by Rep. Feighan (D, O.) on April 2, to authorize exchange of information with foreign nations on "the effects of the employment and use of atomic weapons." Rep. Feighan's position is that more communication with our allies is urgent and should not be delayed by the public/private power controversy sure to arise from HR 8862 (the Committee amendment) which lumps the two matters together.

OPPENHEIMER CASE WEIGHED

The special 3-man board investigating the Oppenheimer case recessed on May 6, after hearing testimony for most of 4 1/2 weeks, according to the *N. Y. Times*. No mention was made of a date for the submitting of the board's report. The report, when it is completed, will go from Gordon Gray, chairman, to the AEC general manager, Maj. Gen. K. D. Nichols.

FINAL DECISION Whose should be the final authority in deciding on this case appears to be in question, according to James Reston (*N. Y. Times*, May 16). "Will the recommendations be decided by the general manager... on his own authority? Or will it be decided by the 5-man commission by majority vote? And if the commission is to decide, when will it be asked to do so--before June 30, when Dr. Oppenheimer's contract with the AEC ends and Commissioner Zuckert leaves, or later in the year, after one or two new members have been appointed?" Earlier in his column, Reston had mentioned that Zuckert's term is up on July 30 and "in accordance with the practice of this administration he is being replaced by a Republican;" also, that there were reports that in "something of a revolt against the domination of Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, ... at least three of the five Commissioners were planning to resign," though Reston considered these reports exaggerated.

MORE PRESS REACTION The *May Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* contains an editorial plus a documentary account of the case and individual reactions of 14 prominent scientists. In his May 3 column, Roscoe Drummond, chief of the *N. Y. Herald-Tribune's* Washington bureau, raised serious question as to the wisdom of the new investigation of Oppenheimer. He emphasized that, aside from Oppenheimer's opposition to H-bomb development, no new information was contained in the charges. In his opposition to the H-bomb he was one of 9 members of the atomic advisory council unanimously opposed to the undertaking at that time. On all the other charges he had been previously cleared. Drummond asks, "...has the Government by any chance become the prisoner of its own security system and got itself so boxed in by its own inflexible rules that it can't retain the services of Dr. Oppenheimer even if it wants to? ... The essence of all of these honest and anxious questions is that we can't afford a security system which makes the system, rather than security, the end."

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD. The following 8 appointments to the 24-man National Science Foundation Board were announced by President Eisenhower on May 18:

Donald H. McLaughlin, President, Homestake Mining Co. (reappointed); Geo. W. Merck, chairman of the board, Merck & Co. (reappointed); Jos. C. Morris, head, Physics Dept. and vice president of Tulane U. (reappointed); Wm. V. Houston, physicist, president of Rice Institute; Jas. B. Macelwane, director, Dept. of Geophysics, St. Louis U.; Douglas Whitaker, prof. of biology, U. Cal. at Berkeley; Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of U. of Notre Dame; and Roger Adams, head of Chem. Dept., U. of Illinois.

TESTIMONY ON MONMOUTH (Cont. from Page 1).

act of suspension does not make him guilty of anything. . . . Mr. Stevens swore that if Mr. McCarthy had 'stayed out of the picture' the Army would ultimately have accomplished the same results. . . . Sen. McCarthy undoubtedly has the right of investigation; but he did not have, and he does not have, the right to embark on public fishing expeditions of the type he indulged in at Monmouth. He and the Senate that has supported him and the Administration that until recently has refused to fight him have a heavy responsibility for the wreckage that has been strewn around in the wake of his destructive activities."

SCLS UPHELD The text of Stevens' report confirmed the essential conclusions of the recent survey of the Ft. Monmouth situation conducted by FAS' Scientists' Committee on Loyalty and Security, whose report released Apr. 25 was summarized in our Apr. issue. (Copies at 50¢ from SCLS, 2153 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.)

Commenting on the SCLS report, the Los Angeles Daily News of Apr. 27 editorializes: "The extremely serious nature of their findings led the committee of scientists to propose that President Eisenhower appoint a scientific and administrative committee to study the entire problem, including the security program itself and the background of the Army security personnel. Certainly the President has a clear obligation to follow this advice because the competence of his own officials has been questioned."

INVESTIGATION OF FOUNDATIONS

A new investigation of American educational and philanthropic foundations was launched in hearings begun on May 10 before a special House committee headed by Rep. B. Carroll Reece (R, Tenn.). Norman Dodd, the committee's director of research, presented his report outlining the investigative approach of the group. The report stated that on evidence gathered to date, some foundation funds have been "used to finance ideas and practices incompatible with the fundamental concepts of our Constitution."

"CHARGES IN REPORT Specifically, it was charged that grants made by the foundations, largely the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations, have been used in: "Directing education in the US toward an international viewpoint and discrediting the traditions to which it had been dedicated; training individuals and servicing agencies to render advice to the Executive branch of the Federal Government; decreasing the dependency of education upon the resources of the local community and freeing it from many of the natural safeguards inherent in the American tradition; changing both school and college curricula to the point where they sometimes denied the principles underlying the American way of life; financing experiments designed to determine the most effective means by which education could be pressed into service of a political nature."

Foundations are accused of having played a "significant role" in providing " . . . this country with what is tantamount to a national system of education under the tight control of organizations and persons little known to the American public."

Rep. Wayne L. Hays (D, O.), committee member, criticized Mr. Dodd's report on several grounds, including the fact that it was based on conclusions reached even before research was begun. He seeks fuller explanation of allegations that the Foundations have failed to support "pro-American activities." He asked for a definition and said "if you mean they have not contributed research that led them to the thinking of McKinley, Ulysses S. Grant and Cohn and Schine, I am not for that in any case." He also suggested an investigation of "Facts Forum," a tax-free foundation financed by wealthy Texas McCarthy supporter, H. L. Hunt.

FORD FOUNDATION The Ford Foundation, largest and newest of the tax-free foundations, is singled out for special consideration. In replying to the charge that American-education was centrally controlled, Clarence Faust, president of the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation, stated that the "wide diversity of theories and practices" exhibited by American education and the "constant controversies" concerning its methods and purposes have been its "most striking characteristics" and a "source of its vitality and of the hopes of improving it."

FAS ACTIVITIES INCREASING

A particularly vigorous meeting of the FAS Council was held April 28 and May 1, with a total of 47 delegates and observers in attendance at the sessions. Discussion of all topics of concern to FAS led to policy formulation on several, with the Executive Committee empowered to act when and as appropriate.

CHAPTERS & BRANCHES A high level of membership activity was reported. Outstanding was the Stanford group's meetings and action in the Oppenheimer case and on the Gubser visa resolutions. The Los Alamos Branch sponsored a meeting which drew 1200 persons to see the H-test film and discuss civil defense. Fairly regular luncheons have been held by Chicago, Greater Boston, Madison, New Haven, and Mohawk groups.

WASHINGTON OPEN MEETING The now traditional open meeting sponsored by the Washington Chapter during the spring physics meetings was again an overwhelming success. On April 29 a large crowd, half of the audience standing, heard a panel discussion on "Scientific Responsibility and the National Security." Ernest Pollard discussed the SCLS Monmouth report; S. A. Goudsmit expressed optimism about the eventual outcome of the Oppenheimer case; Joseph Volpe, former AEC General Counsel, urged scientists to show more concern about abuses in the security clearance system; Alfred Friendly, journalist, pleaded for more drama in scientists' comments on current affairs so as to attract the attention of the public more forcibly.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FAS' new chairman, M. Stanley Livingston of MIT, becomes head of the 1954-55 Executive Committee. The other statutory members are Ernest Pollard, Yale, vice-chairman, and David L. Hill, Vanderbilt, past chairman. The remainder, elected by the Council, are Lewi Tonks (Schenectady), secretary, A. S. Wightman (Princeton), treasurer, W. A. Higinbotham (Brookhaven) and John Toll (U. Maryland).

FAS NOTES The Council completed action on amendments to the Constitution and By-laws to provide for greater continuity in FAS operations: council delegates will serve 2-year terms, and the 2 most recent past chairmen are automatically on the Council. * * * Marvin Fox of Brookhaven heads the new FAS Committee on the A-Pool Plan. * * * FAS membership continues to grow; the need was never greater, for the issues facing FAS are fundamental and require simultaneous activity on several fronts, which outstrips reasonable demands on the volunteers who manage the Washington Office and coordinate FAS affairs. The Executive Committee and Washington Chapter so far have found no replacements for key Washington volunteers and are looking for reasonable prospects of increasing the present \$8,000 budget. Still further membership growth is considered the only reasonable solution. Members and prospective members please take note. Use the coupon below.

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

- MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION -- Dues: Regular - \$5 (with income below \$2500 - \$3); Supporting - \$10; Patron - \$25. New membership and an introductory subscription to Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists - \$7.50 (with income below \$2500 - \$5.50).
- SUBSCRIPTION to INFORMATION BULLETINS -- \$10 to individuals; \$25 for Societies, etc. (including Newsletter)
- NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIPTION -- \$2 to non-members (all members receive the Newsletter)

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

Check enclosed Send bill
MAIL TO: FAS, 1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

DISARMAMENT & A-POOL PROPOSAL

Though the 10th year of the political atom began so auspiciously with President Eisenhower's UN speech, it seems to have bogged down in familiar political jockeying. Spurred on by the Korean armistice, the Atom Pool proposal, the Big Four talks, the obsolescence of the Baruch plan, and especially by the H-bomb tests, the UN Disarmament Commission, dormant since June 1952, stirred long enough in mid-April to appoint a subcommittee for mid-May secret talks in London. However, the severe and continuing Soviet pressure to add India, Red China and Czechoslovakia to the 5-nation committee (US, Britain, France, Canada and Russia) served notice that disarmament cannot be divorced from politics and foreshadowed the probable course of the London talks.

At the same time, it seems clear that the Atom Pool proposal received a major setback when Molotov informed Secretary Dulles at Geneva that the Soviets would not participate in the project without a prior ban on atomic weapons. This is equivalent to rejection of the plan, since, as pointed out in a Washington Post editorial (May 13), "there is little chance that this country and its allies will put their trust in anything so nebulous as an unenforceable prohibition on atomic weapons."

FAS DISCUSSES DISARMAMENT PROBLEM

The necessity for seeking ways to halt the armaments race was a topic of renewed concern at the spring FAS Council meeting, with the H-bomb tests in recent memory. The Council realized that any proposed steps of guaranteed arms limitation must be carefully devised, so as not to weaken any major power compared to another, thereby inviting aggression. Now that the Soviet Government has joined our leaders in recognizing that both sides would lose a war with modern weapons, it seemed more likely that agreement might be reached.

HIGH-LEVEL COMMISSION Admitting the extreme difficulty of devising a plan to meet the combined technical and political problems of bringing modern weapons under control, the Council agreed that a dependable answer can be provided only by a large-scale concerted study of the problem. Recalling the State Department Panel on Disarmament, of 1952, delegates stressed the importance of setting up a high-level commission on a full-time basis to explore all possibilities for agreement, before the rapidly mounting stockpiles and techniques make the problem more overwhelming still.

It was the consensus that such an imaginative approach should be initiated within our government and separately within other governments principally concerned, with the hope of finding an acceptable path to long-term peace. While vigorously seeking agreement, members felt that we must continue strong -- giving increasing attention to the economic needs of the free world.

F A S NEWSLETTER

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

54 - 5

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.

H-BOMB -- Hopes and Fears

On May 13, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department announced the conclusion of the 2-month 1954 Pacific test series of thermonuclear weapons, which the statement said were "essential to our national interest and have contributed materially to the security of the US and the free world." Defense Secretary Wilson finds the US in a "relatively secure" position now (according to appropriations testimony released Apr. 19), while admitting we are vulnerable (but not highly vulnerable) to a sudden atomic attack. A Gallup Poll recently reported (Apr. 25) that 57% of the persons in an adult cross-section of the US felt that there was a fair to good chance of their own community being attacked with hydrogen bombs, with 1 out of 20 giving serious thought to moving elsewhere.

JCEAD? In the interests of dealing in a reasonable manner with the practicalities of the H-bomb, Rep. Bolling (D, Mo.) submitted a resolution (H.Con.Res. 229) on May 3 calling for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Economics of Atomic Defense. The purpose of this committee would be "to bring before the Congress and the American people the best judgments of scientists, lay leaders, and congressional experts" on many serious problems raised by the possibility of H-warfare.

SENSELESS TEST OF STRENGTH Hard Russian position on possible H-warfare is evidenced in Malenkov's threat before the Supreme Soviet on April 26: "If, however, the aggressive circles, banking on the atomic weapons, should senselessly want to test the strength and might of the Soviet Union, the aggressor would without doubt be crushed by the same weapon and such adventure would inevitably lead to the ruin of the capitalist social system."

India suggested to the UN on April 12 that Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold be asked to issue periodic reports on the destructive powers of hydrogen and atomic bombs. India maintains that it is the "sacred duty" of the UN to demand from the atomic powers that full publicity be given to the "implications and results" of the weapons.

On April 20 the people of the Marshall Islands, through their Congress, submitted an "urgent plea" to the UN requesting that "all the experiments with lethal weapons within this area be immediately ceased" because many of the Marshallese have been stricken by radioactive material from "fall-out" and are "suffering in various degrees from 'lowering of the blood count,' burns, nausea, and the falling off of hair."

These expressions of concern give added point to Bertrand Russell's proposal for an international commission of scientists, perhaps under UNESCO, to explore in detail and to publicize the probable physical, biological, and psychological effects of all-out war.

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

Stanley C. Bunce
Box 68
Grafton, New York