

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

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

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

No. 56 - 5

May 28, 1956

## SOVIETS FREE NUCLEAR DATA

Impressive reports of Soviet peacetime nuclear research have come from several quarters as the Russians apparently pursue a policy of stepped-up declassification. In an address to some 300 British scientists at the Harwell atomic research center on Apr. 25, Prof. Igor Kurchatov gave a detailed disclosure of Russian progress in controlling thermonuclear reactions. The leading Russian authority on atomic energy told of experiments in which temperatures near 1,000,000° C. have been reached for very short periods -- by passing large currents through gasses like deuterium with strong magnetic fields keeping the ions away from the walls of the container.

British scientists reportedly were impressed by Kurchatov's "lack of hesitation in replying to technical questions." Additional reports of Soviet experiments will be published in scientific journals, according to an article by Kurchatov in Pravda on May 10.

### SOVIET RESEARCH IMPRESSIVE

In the N. Y. Times of May 22, Jack Raymond reported the impression of several US scientists at the Moscow conference on high energy physics (May 14-20), that the Soviet Union began an extensive program of pure research and peacetime development about two years ago. Many of the Soviet delegates to the conference seemed to have been transferred from the military program at about that time. It appeared too that Bruno Pontecorvo, who defected from the West in 1950 and who appeared at the conference on May 16, had never worked in military projects. The Russians are spending large sums of money not only for accelerators but also for associated equipment, and Western scientists were agreed that the Soviet laboratories compare favorably with those in the US, both in quality and quantity.

In a press conference May 23, the American scientists -- the first group of US specialists in this field to visit Russia for an international conference -- issued a statement which said in part: "A source of particular gratification to us has been the observation of a strong interest in pure science on the part of so many Soviet physicists."

### EFFECT OF SECRECY

The disparity between the Soviet release and our own secrecy in the field of controlled thermonuclear reactions was emphasized by outgoing FAS chairman Donald J. Hughes, testifying as an individual before the House Subcommittee on Government Information on Apr. 27. Hughes felt that the H-power 'scoop' and other recent developments, such as the removal of science attaches from our embassies, might be interpreted to mean the Soviets were now realizing -- perhaps more clearly than the US -- the advantage of free flow of scientific information. Hughes, along with other eminent scientists, had previously urged that the US should liberalize its policies on exchange of scientific information.

## A-POWER "CRASH" PROGRAM DEBATED

The progress to date and prospects for speeding further development of atomic power in this country are the subject of an 'agonizing reappraisal' in current hearings by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The charge has been raised (see NL 56-3), by AEC Commissioner Murray and Sen. Gore (D, Tenn.) among others, that in spite of provisions in the 1954 Atomic Energy Act designed to encourage entry of private industry into the A-power field, very little progress has actually been made.

At the time Sen. Gore made his critical comments in the Senate Apr. 26, only one large-scale power plant had passed the drawing board stage in the US. The Shippingport, Pa. 60,000 kw reactor, which is largely government-financed, is expected to be in operation by the fall of 1957. Since then, the AEC has issued permits to Consolidated Edison Co. of N.Y. and to Commonwealth Edison Co. of Chicago, to build 2 nuclear power reactors which will produce a total of 320,000 kw upon completion in 1960. The leading competitors in the international race to develop A-power are Russia, which has had a small 5,000 kw plant operating since May, 1954, and has plans for a 100,000 kw plant, and England, which will have a 60,000 kw plant operating this October and has plans for a total of 13 plants in the next 10 years, to produce from 1.5 to 2 million kw of electrical power.

### "CRASH" PROGRAM

The Joint Committee hearings have apparently disclosed a deep schism within the Administration as to where we stand on A-power vis a vis the Russians. According to the Washington Post (May 24), Central Intelligence Agency representatives informed the Committee that their intelligence reports "put Russia's atomic power program definitely ahead of this country's." The very next day, AEC Chairman Strauss testified there was no need for a "crash" program, and declared, "We are prone to overestimate the Russians." Sen. Gore replied that the Soviet program "dwarfs the very best anticipated under our present program." While the US hopes to have almost 700,000 kw of A-power by 1960, only in the case of the Shippingport plant has ground been broken.

A crash development program financed by the government is the solution proposed in bills by Sen. Gore (S. 2725) and Rep. Holifield (H.R. 10805). They direct the AEC "to construct 6 nuclear power facilities" to demonstrate their practical value for industrial and commercial purposes. The 6 reactors are each to be of a different design, to provide comparative data on their technological and economic feasibility.

At the Apr. 23 hearing, Strauss said this legislation would have the US "building obsolescent plants with scarce talents," and urged that our A-power leadership should be "based on sound scientific progress and technological development. On the following day, former AEC Commissioner Smyth cautioned Congress not to order the AEC "to build  
(Continued on Page 3, Column 2)



## SECURITY CRITERIA MODIFIED

The decision handed down by the Federal Court of Appeals last fall in the Parker vs. Lester case, involving the right of the individual to "face his accuser," has been followed now by basic revisions in security clearance procedures. The majority opinion in this case, dealing with the use of secret witnesses by the US Coast Guard, asked rhetorically: "Is this system of secret informers, whisperers, and talebearers of such vital importance to the public welfare that it must be preserved at the cost of denying to the citizen even a modicum of the protection traditionally associated with due process?" Possibly in answer to this question, Government authorities have recently revamped legal ground rules for the evaluation of "security risks." Changes made by the AEC, the Army, and the Coast Guard place more emphasis on the "common-sense" aspect of clearance questions.

**6 MAJOR CHANGES** In a release on May 11, the FAS Executive Committee commended the new Atomic Energy Commission regulations, which took effect May 10, as "an encouraging and important step toward a fairer and more realistic security program." The Committee emphasized that the extent to which the changes will ensure fairer processing will depend on action-level interpretations. It urged other government agencies to "follow the lead of the AEC," and encouraged the "Commission to maintain a continuing review of its security policies."

Some of the major differences from the 1950 AEC procedures, noted in the FAS release, include: (1) the use of informal interviews to resolve security questions before formal proceedings are initiated; (2) provision for counsel to ensure presentation of all relevant information; (3) the private hearing of witnesses whose public appearance might violate security, and provision that, if a witness cannot testify, this fact and the reasons for it must be taken into account by the Board; (4) rewording of clearance criteria to permit boards to make a more realistic evaluation of past associations; (5) provision for a reconsideration of clearability, after an adverse decision, in the face of new evidence; (6) assurance that, once cleared, an individual will not have to face reopening of his case unless substantial new derogatory evidence is introduced or if there is a significant increase in the "sensitivity" of the classified information involved.

**ARMY** The new Army regulations provide that "activities and associations" are not in themselves sufficient bases for a finding of "security risk." It must be shown that the soldier has been "influenced by, or is sympathetic to, subversive aims and ideologies" (*N. Y. Times*, May 14). This should at least rule out the "guilt-by-kinship" type of case that has recently caused so much furor. A critical analysis of Army clearance procedures, prepared by Rowland Watts and sent to Army Secretary Brucker by ACLU Executive Director Patrick M. Malin and Norman Thomas, representing the Workers Defense League, stated that "substantial improvements" have been made but that there are still "flaws which result in gross injustices" to draftees.

The report emphasized that, "as long as the Army continues to assert a right to investigate the beliefs and civilian activities of men under its jurisdiction by reason of the Selective Service law, it will continue to constitute a threat to political and social freedom." It was pointed out that the Army still takes into consideration pre-induction civilian activities before deciding whether a soldier should be allowed to complete his 2-year service. Similarly, post-service civilian activities during a man's 6-year status in the inactive reserve are still scrutinized in spite of the fact that he is not subject to recall to active duty without specific act of Congress.

**COAST GUARD** On Apr. 25, the Coast Guard revised its security regulations for merchant seamen. About confrontation, the new rules say: "Every effort should be made to produce material witnesses to testify" and to "be confronted and cross-examined" by the seaman. If the seaman may be handicapped by non-confrontation, "the hearing board shall take the fact into consideration." Lawyers for Parker, who started the case, have asked for an injunction against the revised port security program. Government attorneys, in answer, are expected to contend that the revisions comply with the court decision, although some

(Continued on Page 4, Column 2)

## DISARMAMENT: Nyets and Nibbles

On May 4, after a 7-week session, the latest effort of the UN Disarmament Subcommittee to find agreement ended unsuccessfully. The visit of the Soviet leaders to London, expected to further disarmament, actually widened the disagreement. Communist Party leader Khrushchev publicly described Eisenhower's "Open Sky" proposal as "a phantasy" and, on April 24, he rejected the US proposal for small-scale trial of inspection procedures, thus setting the tone for continuing Russian refusal to consider any inspection system acceptable to the West.

Soviet leaders, on the other hand, blamed the failure upon dogged US insistence on controls, rather than real arms reduction, and chided the West for reneging on its own disarmament proposals as soon as the USSR had adopted them. The negotiations have in fact disclosed important basic policy shifts by both East and West, probably brought on by the advent of atomic parity. The world is confronted with the curious spectacle of Russia, so long insistent on nuclear disarmament first, now pushing for reduction in conventional arms with only a grudging look at nuclear control, whereas the US, previously insisting mainly on limitation of conventional armaments, is now being challenged by the Soviets to match its reductions in military manpower.

### GLIMMER OF HOPE

While there is some feeling that Harold E. Stassen, the President's Special Assistant on Disarmament, has been too optimistic about the UN Subcommittee's achievements, there does appear to be one 'glimmer of hope.' Rather detailed agreement was reached on a possible plan of ground inspection of strong-points, and the Soviets have also shown some interest in atomic stockpile ceilings. They have acceded to Western insistence that inspection be set up before arms reduction begins and that the objects of control and inspection be cited specifically. Concessions were also made by the West, the most important being an offer to include foreign bases in any inspection plan. There would seem, therefore, to be some possibility of further progress if the US reassesses its policy, as promised by Stassen on May 6, and if Russia does likewise.

### DISARMAMENT OR 'NEW LOOK'

The unilateral Soviet cut of 1.2 million in its armed forces and mothballing of 375 surface vessels, announced with fanfare on May 14, is regarded by many Western observers as a pseudo-disarmament measure. The *Christian Science Monitor*, for example, considers it merely symptomatic of a shift of military emphasis from massive ground forces to 'new look' weapons such as submarines, jet bombers and nuclear weapons.

In any event, the US has been put in a difficult propaganda position. On the one hand, we run the risk of being considered warmongers, because NATO and other commitments prevent us from matching the Soviet cut, and on the other there is real danger to "the North Atlantic and other free world security pacts" through premature disarmament by allies who take the Russian move at face value. As the *N. Y. Times* remarked editorially on May 16, "the Soviets would [thus] attain by 'disarmament' what they have been unable to attain by force of arms."

### FACELESS INFORMERS OKAYED by PASSPORT BILL

A bill has been introduced by Rep. Walter (D. Pa.) that would restore the right of the State Department to deny passports on the basis of confidential information. Although the bill (H.R. 9991) provides for appeal before a special review officer, it states that "formal rules of evidence shall not apply." It also calls for criminal penalties for officials who knowingly issue passports to supporters of the Communist movement.

State Department endorsement of the bill was voiced by Scott McLeod, head of State's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, in hearings May 10. He objected, however, that the bill had no provisions covering withdrawals and revocations of passports, and that it bound the hand of the Secretary of State too much by removing his discretionary powers, and by imposing criminal penalties on officials involved in passport issuance to Communists. The American Civil Liberties Union and various bar groups will give their views at further hearings by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration on May 28.

## 5th AMENDMENT COURT DECISIONS

In recent weeks the US Supreme Court has handed down two important decisions bearing on the Fifth Amendment. The first sustained, by a 7-2 vote, the Immunity Act of 1954, under which a witness may be forced to testify in matters touching on national security. The second, by 5-4, found the summary firing of an employee, on the basis of his invoking the Fifth Amendment, to be a violation of due process.

**ULLMAN CASE** William Ludwig Ullman, in the first case, refused to testify before a Federal grand jury about Communist associations. Although promised immunity under the new law, he claimed protection of the Fifth Amendment, partly on the grounds that the Federal government could not prevent prosecutions by the states. The court majority ruled that Ullman would not incriminate himself, and that the immunity extended to both federal and state prosecution. Justices Douglas and Black dissented, claiming that the Fifth Amendment "was designed to protect the accused against infamy as well as prosecution."

**SLOCHOWER CASE** The use of the Fifth Amendment was upheld in the second case, that of Prof. Harry Slochower, fired by the New York City Board of Education immediately after he refused to testify before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The Board held that dismissal was automatic under a City Charter section requiring city employees to answer official questions about their official duties. The Supreme Court ruled that, when the Fifth Amendment is validly invoked, it is not a "conclusive presumption of guilt." Slochower's dismissal, without notice or hearing, was therefore a violation of due process of law. The decision does not affect previous decisions permitting dismissal of teachers found to be subversive (e.g., the New York State Feinberg law).

**WATKINS CASE** Previous Newsletters (56-2 and -3) have mentioned the case of John T. Watkins, who refused to answer questions of the House Un-American Activities Committee concerning ex-Communist associates, although he testified about himself and those he believed still to be Communists. A 3-judge panel of the US Court of Appeals reversed Watkins' conviction of contempt of Congress, on the grounds that the questions had not been shown to be pertinent. Now the full bench of the Court of Appeals has reversed the decision of the 3-judge panel, asserting that "Congress has power of exposure if the exposure is incident to the exercise of a legislative function." Watkins' lawyers will ask the Supreme Court to reverse the reversal of the reversal.

### HUGHES: FREE TECHNICAL DATA EXPORTS

On Apr. 27, retiring Chairman Hughes testified for FAS before the House Government Information Subcommittee, headed by Rep. Moss (D, Cal.), opposing Commerce Dept. regulations which require labeling the wrappers of all scientific and technical information sent abroad with the symbol "GTDS" (General Technical Data Scientific) or "GTDP" (... Published), and the words "Export License Not Required." Said Hughes, "the national Council of the FAS, at its meeting Apr. 25, called for elimination of the general licenses GTDS and GTDP, as presently included in the Export Control of Technical Data regulations; this can be done by administrative action. ... The FAS Council further urges that the Export Control Act of 1949 be specifically amended to exclude from export control all unclassified scientific and educational technical data." Hughes pointed out that such control does not further any of the stated purposes of the Act (conserving scarce materials; supporting US foreign policy; protecting national security).

Because "most scientists do not know of the existence of the export control of technical data," Hughes observed, they are "unwittingly violating these regulations [and] are thus subject to \$10,000 fine and 1 year imprisonment. ... We urge the Congress and the Dept. of Commerce to give immediate attention to lifting these controls which can have no beneficial effects." (Complete testimony available on request from FAS Washington Office)

**A-POWER CRASH PROGRAM DEBATED (Cont. from Page 1).** power plants of particular numbers or types or in particular locations." Sen. Morse testified in support of the Gore-Holifield bills, while NAM spokesman W. E. Kelley and GE's F. K. McCune felt the government should leave the program's development to industry.

One of the main deterrents preventing industry from going ahead with large power reactors is the spectre of the vast damages that could result should such a reactor, placed in a heavily populated area, get out of control. Insurance companies have indicated a willingness to form a pool to insure companies operating reactors for liabilities up to \$65 million, which is roughly the cost of a reactor of the 100,000 kw size. It is estimated, however, that damages resulting if such a reactor should "run away" could easily be 10 times that amount. Two bills defining the extent of the government's responsibility in this situation were the subject of Joint Committee hearings during the week of May 14. A proposal by Rep. Price (D, Ill.) would indemnify a reactor operator for all damages that private insurance firms failed to meet. Another, by Rep. Cole (R, N.Y.), would limit a reactor operator's liability to twice his capital investment in the plant, the government absorbing the rest.

**NEW MONOPOLY?** A second problem which private industry is trying to get Congress to resolve raises very important questions of utility vs. monopoly status for the budding nuclear power industry. Because of the large financial investments and the great variety of technological and engineering skills necessary for the construction of A-power plants, combines of industrial firms and public utilities have been formed to plan and carry out such projects. Under the Public Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935, such combines become subject to the scrutiny and regulation of the Securities and Exchange Commission. However, many of the industrial manufacturing firms object to this and are seeking relief through the Potter-Pastore bill (S. 2643) which would exempt such combines from the provisions of the Holding Company Act.

The SEC is dubious about such permanent and automatic exemption of the A-power industry from the provisions of the act, but is willing to make allowances at least for the research and development phases of the atomic energy program. Federal Power Commission Chairman J. K. Kuykendall has testified in favor of full exemption on the basis that the joint utility ownership of atomic facilities thus allowed would mean larger and more economical plants than could be afforded by one company alone.

Two other changes which various industrial spokesmen have called for to facilitate private development of atomic power are: (1) allowing firms to write off against taxes money spent in research and development on atomic reactors, and (2) revision of the patent sections of the 1954 Atomic Energy Act to remove the compulsory licensing provisions contained therein. No congressional action has yet been taken on either of these proposals.

\* \* \* \* \*

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

## H-Testing -- Proceed with Caution

The H-bomb blast which shook the islands around Bikini on the morning of May 21 was only the second largest the islands had felt, but it certainly was the most cautiously prepared. Repeatedly postponed, awaiting exactly the right wind patterns, the test was surrounded by elaborate measures to avoid recurrence of the unfortunate tragedy of 1954 when a Japanese fishing vessel was exposed to radioactive fallout. Involved in the preparations were not only all conceivable physical safeguards, but psychological precautions in the form of a long informational build-up at home and abroad on the 'why's and 'wherefore's of H-bomb testing.

The preliminary communique reported that there was no increase in radiation in the Marshall Islands and "relatively little" fallout on Bikini Atoll. The approximately 10-megaton monster was exploded about 2 miles above Namu, a tiny test island in the mid-Pacific, and formed a fireball about 3 miles in diameter. Details of the effects at ground level have not been released.

**HEALTH HAZARD** Debate continues on the question whether -- even given all prudent precautions -- atomic weapons testing may not constitute a long-term, cumulative health hazard. The AEC maintains that, at present levels of testing, it does not. In a technical address to the Amer. Philosophical Society on Apr. 20, AEC Commissioner Libby analyzed data on the potential hazard of radio-strontium fallout -- of particular importance because strontium concentrates in bony tissues where radioactivity may induce tumors. Libby concluded that "at the present level of weapons testing, the present and potential contribution of Sr<sup>90</sup> to the world ecology is not a significant factor."

In an interview reported in the Washington Post on May 22, Ralph Lapp, physicist and lecturer, challenged the official AEC position, accusing the agency of "sugar-coating the bitter facts of fallout" and of "double-talk" with regard to long-term hazards. Lapp maintained that continued tests pose a real danger of world-wide increase of cancer. Agreeing that tests so far have not raised atmospheric radio-strontium to hazardous levels, he asserted that public discussion of the question is essential since continued experiments, through their cumulative effect, pose an irreversible danger. A British atomic blast off Australia on May 17, the third in that area, emphasized that "present levels" of testing are rising fast, and that Commissioner Libby's data may soon need revision.

**TEST RESISTANCE** Although testing goes on apace, resistance to continuing tests of atomic weapons is clearly growing. It has been carefully nurtured by the Russians and long has been featured in official statements from Soviet bloc countries. India also has repeatedly sought to limit or prohibit further tests, and Japanese politicians have walked a tight-rope between popular apprehension and official support of

SECURITY CRITERIA MODIFIED (Cont. from Page 2). security experts doubt that the court will agree.

**FACE YOUR ACCUSER ?** This crucial point remains ambiguous, despite the revision of regulations. The AEC rules, for instance, state that if confrontation is not possible, the hearing Board may request the AEC to arrange "for such witnesses to testify privately and be subject to thorough questioning by the Board." Everything hinges, then, on the "common sense" application of the rules by each Board. Some steps remain to be taken to back up President Eisenhower's statement that, "In this country, if someone dislikes you or accuses you, he must come up in front. He cannot assassinate you, or your character, from behind without suffering the penalty an outraged citizenry will impose."

**LEHMAN vs. BROWNELL** Sen. Herbert Lehman (D, N.Y.), speaking in Washington on May 6, attacked Attorney General Brownell for "passing the buck" to Congress in regard to suspensions without pay of Government employees, pending hearings on security charges (see NL 56-4). According to Lehman, Brownell "does not need . . . authority from Congress" to permit accused employees to remain at work; "the Administration has all the power it needs to institute, by executive order, this necessary reform." In order to give the Administration the Congressional reassurance it seems to want, however, Sen. Frank Carlson (R, Kan.) introduced a bill (S. 3810) on May 9, stating "that nothing [in the present legislation] shall be deemed to require the suspension of any civilian officer or employee prior to hearing or termination." The 1950 Act on which the present Federal security program is based authorizes agency heads, in their "absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interest of national security," to suspend Federal employees without pay.

US policies. In England, the opposition Labor party has pressured the Conservative government to take steps toward test-limitation, though Labor itself is divided on the issue.

On Apr. 21, Adlai Stevenson became the first major political figure in the US to call for H-test limitation. "As a layman, I question the sense in multiplying and enlarging weapons of a destructive power already made incomprehensible," Stevenson told the Amer. Society of Newspaper Editors. He urged that we ask other nations to follow our lead toward test limitation as a step toward "effective reduction and control of armaments."

Neither President Eisenhower nor Stevenson's Democratic opponent, Estes Kefauver, agreed. The President defended further tests, saying that they are aimed not at a bigger bomb for "mass destruction," but at a more compact bomb for military uses. In the Democratic nominees' debate in Miami on May 21, Sen. Kefauver said that the US should not give up the tests without simultaneous parallel action by the Soviets.

## F A S NEWSLETTER

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

56 - 5

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

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

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.

**Council Meets in Washington**

The FAS Council held its largest meeting in recent years in Washington, D.C. on April 25 and 28. The two evening sessions, at the American Psychological Association's national headquarters, were attended by 29 delegates and alternates, 11 members of the old and new Executive Committees, and 16 observers. The Council formulated policy in several areas, and issued two press releases from these meetings.

**EXECUTIVE & ELECTIONS COMMITTEES NAMED** In addition to Chairman Charles C. Price, Vice-chairman Martin Deutsch, and retiring Chairman Donald J. Hughes -- who shared the rostrum at this meeting -- 4 members were elected to the new Executive Committee: Edward L. Brady (physical chemist, Knolls Atomic Power Lab.), John T. Edsall (biochemist, Harvard), Mortimer M. Elkind (biophysicist, Nat. Inst. of Health), and Harry Palevsky (physicist, Brookhaven Nat. Lab.). The Executive committee, meeting on Apr. 29, selected Palevsky and Elkind, respectively, as the national Secretary and Treasurer of FAS.

An Elections Committee for 1956-57 was also selected by the Council, to include: David H. Frisch (physics, MIT) as chairman, Christian B. Anfinsen, Jr. (biochem., Nat. Inst. of Health), and Charles D. Coryell (chem., MIT; retiring Elections Comm. chairman and ex officio member of the new committee).

**NOTE:** A slate of nominees will be compiled by this committee for annual elections to take place in the spring of 1957. Members should send to the Washington Office their suggestions, with a description of the individual's qualifications, for the offices of chairman, vice-chairman and Council delegates-at-large.

**LOYALTY POLICY IN NON-SECRET RESEARCH** Staunch Council backing was given to the report of the National Academy of Sciences committee on "Loyalty in Relation to Government Support of Unclassified Research" (see NL 56-4). Recognizing, in a press statement Apr. 28, that "some Government agencies have already conformed in part with the policies expressed in the...report," the Council urged that the Academy recommendations "be fully incorporated into the practices of all Government agencies...supporting unclassified research," and that the agencies concerned "should include these points in regulations and procedures affecting grants and contracts for that research." Chairman Price subsequently transmitted the Council statement to White House Assistant Sherman Adams, Academy President Bronk, and top officials in all Government agencies concerned.

With respect to Federal security policies in general, the Council urged the Executive Committee to make every effort to compile and present to the new 12-man Commission on Government Security, headed by attorney Loyd Wright, a consistent FAS policy position on these matters. FAS members are in contact with the staff of the new Commission, which has already requested Passport Committee Chairman Geoffrey Chew to submit an expression of Committee views.

**AAUP SUPPORTED** A statement of principles on academic freedom, approved by the Amer. Assoc. of University Professors at its annual meeting Apr. 6-7 (see NL 56-4), was commended and endorsed "in general" by the FAS Council at this meeting. The new policy statement is available on request from the FAS Washington Office. AAUP General Secretary Ralph F. Fuchs acknowledged a letter from Chairman Price, informing him of the Council action, by saying his organization "will be deeply grateful" and that "this kind of support is what we have been hoping

for. I am confident that, if the academic profession and members of the various scientific, social, and liberal arts disciplines will consider the issues carefully, we shall succeed in obtaining a strengthened stand on the part of the educational and intellectual world."

**TESTS-BAN PROPOSAL AS "PRELIMINARY STEP"** A proposal that the FAS Council support "a worldwide agreement banning further tests of nuclear weapons" -- as "a preliminary step in the disarmament program" -- was debated intensively at this meeting and finally approved for later presentation. In addition, the Council approved a recommendation for "a ban on the testing of long-range missiles," if monitoring of the firing of such missiles can be shown to be feasible. Before any action is taken on the tests-ban proposal, the Executive Committee must re-formulate it in the light of the Council discussion.

There appeared to be general agreement that cessation of tests, as a step toward disarmament, would do much to lessen world tension, and that this should be our major argument in promoting such a program. The Executive Committee may have an opportunity to present the proposal, as part of a general statement of FAS disarmament policy, before a Congressional committee in the near future. The Council further expressed its support for "arrangements in the Federal Government for more attention to be paid to long-range disarmament problems."

**ANDERSON IDEAS COMMENDED** Other steps supported by the Council -- "to displace the...tensions which have grown up in recent years" -- were the constructive suggestions in Sen. Anderson's speech to an international nuclear conference in Rochester Apr. 6 (see NL 56-4). Anderson's proposals for world laboratories to develop new areas of technology, an honorary "world passport," and increased ease of travel and communication were cited by the Council in a press statement Apr. 29 "as consistent with the broad objective of furthering world peace, by removing artificial barriers which tend to intensify the natural suspicion and mistrust of all men for that which is foreign and unknown. ... The heads of government in this and other countries would do well to emulate [the] exceptional leadership" displayed by Sen. Anderson, the Council stated.

Copies of Anderson's speech are available from the FAS Washington Office; members may wish to transmit these with personal covering letters to influential Government officials.

**TO COOPERATE ON INTERNATIONAL CONTROL STUDIES** In his article on "International Cooperation of Atomic Scientists" (*Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, February, 1956), editor Rabinowitch describes efforts begun at a London conference last summer to bring world scientific opinion to bear on the dangers of atomic warfare and the scientific possibilities of its avoidance by international control. Chicago chapter delegates presented to this Council meeting a proposal that FAS, as the appropriate socio-scientific organization in the US, cooperate with the British Atomic Scientists Association and other groups in a continuing study of these basic problems.

The Council authorized the Executive Committee to lend FAS assistance and sponsorship to whatever extent is deemed advisable. As an initial step, the circulation of a list of questions formulated after the London discussions (see Feb. *Bulletin*) and a compilation of US scientific opinion, was urged. If this effort, also being carried out in other countries, brings a substantial response, then working papers might be prepared which

**WASHINGTON POST As Research Aid Scientist Group Hails Loyalty Plan**

Monday, April 30, 1956.

The Council of the Federation of American Scientists held its annual spring meeting here Saturday and praised the National Academy of Sciences for its report to the White House on "loyalty in relation to Government support of unclassified research."

The report, released April 4, affirmed the principle that questions about a scientist's loyalty should not bar him from Government grants for unclassified research.

The Council noted that "some agencies already have conformed in part" with Academy-recommended policies, and said "... we believe full adoption will substantially improve the effectiveness of the Government's research program."

The Council also praised Sen. Clinton P. Anderson (D-N. M.) for his proposal on April 6 before the Rochester Conference on High Energy Nuclear Physics for exploration of "new areas of technology to be developed on a joint basis with other countries in world laboratories." The Senator's proposal was called a "major contribution."

New FAS chairman, elected at the meeting, is Charles C. Price, chairman of the department of chemistry at the University of Pennsylvania and former department head at Notre Dame. Mortimer M. Elkind, biophysicist in the radiation branch of the National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, was named treasurer.



could justify holding a representative international meeting under joint sponsorship.

#### REACTOR SHIPMENTS & THERMONUCLEAR SECRECY

The Council gave its support to the general conclusions of a report by the FAS Atoms-for-Peace committee (headed by H. J. C. Kouts, Brookhaven chapter). The report recognized the "obstacles to quick and direct action" in fulfilling the promises of our bilateral agreements with some 28 nations, and the even slower progress of the International Atomic Energy Agency. It advanced a scheme for expediting reactor shipments (of a uniform, general-purpose research type) to those nations eager to receive nuclear training and equipment. The committee was authorized to bring their proposal to the attention of US authorities, but was reminded by the Council that we should not jeopardize the possibility of having the utmost US atomic cooperation channelled through the UN.

Reaffirming a position adopted in February and included in the printed record of hearings by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee (on the "Development, Growth and State of the Atomic Energy Industry," Feb.-Mar., 1956), the Council approved at this meeting a further expression of FAS policy: "Thermonuclear power developments need the maximum scientific effort, and eventually engineering effort. It is primarily a non-weapons development, is creative, and no scientist of standing has stated that it has military significance. FAS should support all efforts to reduce security in this field, and in all other non-military fields."

#### SCIENCE OFFICE AND ATTACHES

The Council urged the Exec. Committee to "give a high priority to promoting the reactivation and expansion of the science adviser program in the State Dept., or to alternate measures, along the lines originally recommended in the Berkner report ('Science & Foreign Relations') of 1950." Members who know of useful functions served by the Office of the Science Adviser and the attache program could assist by writing Secretary Dulles (copy to FAS) or by sending your ideas to the FAS Washington Office.

#### MEMBERSHIP DRIVE PLANS PROGRESS

The Membership Committee (headed by R. L. Kyhl, Mohawk chapter) is drawing up a new invitation form to solicit FAS members, and has investigated terms for having envelopes addressographed by various technical societies and publications. It is hoped to send out several thousand invitations in the next few months. Suggestions of prospective members (name, title, address) should be sent to the FAS Washington Office.

The Washington Office reported to the April meeting that, as of Apr. 15, FAS had 1727 members-at-large in good standing and 132 chapter members paid thus far in '56 (416 had paid by the end of '55). The national treasury showed a cash balance of some \$3800, with monthly expenditures averaging \$1100. In the first quarter of '56, 32% of the budgeted income (\$14,200) had been realized, whereas only 23% had been spent.

#### COUNCIL SIZE & REPRESENTATION

The fluctuation in the size of the FAS policy-making Council -- as the membership grows or decreases -- received extensive discussion at this meeting. Council representation has been one delegate for approximately every 50 members. With FAS' recent spurt from 1000 to 2200 members, the Council has mushroomed from 25 to 45 members. Most delegates agreed that this led to inefficiency of operation. The larger the attendance at a meeting, the less the incentive for an individual delegate to contribute to the discussion, assume responsibility for group action, or participate in carrying out assignments. A minority view was also expressed, however, that one individual could adequately represent only a reasonable number of members and that, if the organization expands, so should its governing body. The majority held, though, that a Council of workable size outweighed this objection, and amended the FAS by-laws to make the representation one delegate to approximately every 75 members. It further instructed the Exec. Committee to "prepare and present to the next Council meeting an amendment to the By-laws which will fix the Council membership to a definite number."

#### IS THERE an FAS CHAPTER or BRANCH

##### in YOUR VICINITY ?

At the April Council meeting, the Los Angeles Branch of FAS was given Chapter status, thus making a total of 7 FAS chapters. Chapters have at least 25 members, and are entitled to Council representation through locally elected delegates. If you are an FAS member-at-large living in one of the following areas, and would like to be affiliated with the local chapter, please advise the FAS Washington Office by postcard and, so that you may receive notice of chapter functions, inform the local chapter treasurer:

BROOKHAVEN - Clarke Williams, Brookhaven National Lab., Upton, L.I., N.Y.  
 CHICAGO - Elliott Silverstein, Atomic Scientists of Chicago, 5734 S. University Ave., Chicago 37, Ill.  
 LOS ANGELES - James Emmett Garvey, 700 S. El Molino Ave., Pasadena 5, Calif.  
 LOS ALAMOS - Laurence A. Blatz, 2414 - 36th Street, Los Alamos, N.M.  
 SCHENECTADY-TROY - S. B. Dunham, Bldg. 5, Gen. Electric Co., Schenectady, N.Y.  
 STANFORD - Carl W. Olson, W. W. Hansen Laboratories, Stanford Univ., Stanford, Calif.  
 WASHINGTON - Frank L. Verwiebe, 1805 H Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

FAS BRANCHES are informal groups of 5 or more members-at-large, with a Corresponding Secretary who keeps in close touch with the FAS Washington Office. Some branches are fairly active, holding luncheon or evening meetings. Contact the branch secretary in your area, if you wish to be placed on the mailing list for Branch functions:

BERKELEY AREA - John O. Rasmussen, 24 Crescent Drive, Orinda, Calif.  
 GREATER BOSTON - Armand Siegel, 10 Kilburn Rd., Belmont, Mass.  
 HOUSTON - Herbert Kanner, 6721 Rowan Lane, Bellaire, Texas  
 IOWA CITY - Edward B. Nelson, Physics Dept., State Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa  
 MADISON - W. W. Beeman, Sterling Hall, U. of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisc.  
 NEW HAVEN - Earle C. Fowler, Sloane Physics Lab., Yale U., New Haven 11, Conn.  
 NEW YORK - Hugh C. Wolfe, Head, Physics Dept., Cooper Union, Cooper Square, New York 3, N.Y.  
 PHILADELPHIA - Donald G. Long, Dept. of Physics, Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pa.  
 PITTSBURGH - J. S. Youngner, Virus Research Lab., Univ. of Pittsburgh Medical School, Pittsburgh 13, Pa.  
 ROCHESTER - Alice S. Andrews, Dept. of Biochem., U. Rochester Med. Sch., 260 Crittenden Blvd., Rochester 20, N.Y.  
 ST. LOUIS - Norman Goldberg, Physics Dept., Washington Univ., St. Louis 5, Mo.  
 URBANA - Geoffrey F. Chew, Dept. of Physics, U. of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

#### BOSTON AREA LUNCHEONS

The Greater Boston Branch of FAS reports that it will continue its informal luncheon meetings "on roughly a 3-week schedule" at least until summer. Members in the Boston area should contact Armand Siegel (see above) for details.

#### LOS ALAMOS MEETINGS

The Los Alamos chapter recently sponsored a public lecture on Antarctic expeditions by Dr. Poulter, of the Stanford Research Institute. A forthcoming meeting will feature Robert McKinney, publisher of the Santa Fe New Mexican, who recently headed a panel appointed by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee to study the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.