

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

No. 54 - 9

November 15, 1954

SECURITY PROGRAM MADE ELECTION ISSUE

The Congressional elections -- the campaign and the outcome -- indicate that the Administration's security program has become and will continue to be a major national issue. Although the pre-election oratory concerned government employees generally and not specifically scientists, the shift of control in Congress and its possible consequences in terms of new legislation or new investigations are of concern to all scientists and engineers who directly or indirectly are affected by the program.

On Oct. 11, Civil Service Commission Chairman Philip Young issued the latest Administration figures on "security" firings for the 13-month period ending July 1, 1954. The Commission reported a total of 6,926 dismissals of which 1,743 were for reasons of subversion. This pronouncement by Young followed by one day a report by the American Assembly dealing with the character, prestige, and problems of federal service. (The report is available from the Press Office of Columbia Univ. and is described in the Oct. 19 FAS Newsletter.) Among other things, this non-partisan group founded by President Eisenhower when he headed Columbia University noted that "above all, the loyalty-security program must be taken out of partisan politics."

HOT ISSUE From then on, the security program became a hot issue. Republican electioneering implied that those dismissed were hangers-on from the Truman Administration, and credited the Eisenhower Administration with fulfilling its campaign pledge to "clean up the mess" in government. Democrats countered by proclaiming that whereas the government's official definition of subversion impugned those "whose files contained information indicating, in varying degrees, subversive activities, subversive associations, or membership in subversive organizations," not one of the 1743 cases had been tested in court thus far.

According to Jerry Klutz in his column, "The Federal Diary" (Washington Post, Nov. 4), "the President's Federal employe security program is headed for a going-over on Capitol Hill. Democrats will team up with Republicans to investigate the program and to attempt to draw a clear line of distinction between disloyalty and security firings." The Alsops predict more specifically in their Nov. 12 column that in the coming 84th Congress, "the Civil Service Committee under Sen. Olin Johnson of South Carolina is expected to undertake a full dress review of the whole Government security program. The purpose, of course, will be to prove that Republican claims of having found the Government crawling with subversives are phony."

Related to this is an editorial in the Nov. 12 Washington Post on Secretary Dulles' firing Oct. 29 of Foreign Service officer John Paton Davies for "indiscretion." The Post maintains: "The Davies case is symbolic of what is happening all over the Government. ... The Administration, instead of viewing the security figures with alarm, has been exploiting them for political purposes." The Post revives a previous suggestion that "a commission of distinguished and disinterested citizens be appointed to review the security situation and recommend a program that will better protect both the real interests of the Government and the reputation of the individual."

TRANSFER ACTIVITIES? Another pertinent development expected in the new Congress was foreshadowed in the announcement Nov. 3 by Rep. Walter (D, Pa.), in line to chair the House Un-American Activities Committee, that he will ask the House in January to abolish that controversial committee

CONDON -- '48, '52, '54

A new chapter has been added to the trials of E. U. Condon, veteran target of the super-security-minded. On Oct. 19, the Navy confirmed that Condon had been given full clearance last July following a complete hearing before the Eastern Industrial Review Board. Two days later, however, Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas announced that the clearance had been suspended pending a new complete reconsideration of the case. The "re-review" will be conducted by another 3-man panel of the Eastern Industrial Review Board.

It was in 1948 that the first highly publicized attack on Condon was initiated by J. Parnell Thomas. To that attack, and the ones that continued under the aegis of the House Un-American Activities Committee (of which Thomas was then chairman), Condon was given no opportunity to reply -- in that year, or for several years thereafter. But in the fall of 1952 a subcommittee of the House Committee finally held a hearing. The hearing took place in Chicago where Rep. Vail, former member of the Committee and successor to Thomas as chief Condon-critic, was fighting hard in an election which he subsequently lost.

REVERSAL A COINCIDENCE? On Oct. 19, prodding newspapermen brought to light the fact of Condon's clearance last July. What happened between October 19 and October 21 to reverse this decision was not officially explained. According to the N. Y. Times (Oct. 22), Navy Secretary Thomas told reporters that it was coincidental that the Review Board action had come to his desk for consideration at the time it was being noted in the press. But coincidentally, too, Vice President Nixon announced in a Butte, Montana campaign speech that he had personally intervened to reverse the Condon clearance. To the Times of October 24, this suggested that "politics had something to do with the suspension."

Drew Pearson, in his column of Oct. 29, was less cautious. His inside story of the clearance flip-flop, "one of the most amazing in Washington," related it to thwarted high Republican campaign strategy in the New York gubernatorial election. He said it was designed to embarrass Democratic candidate Harriman, who headed the Commerce Dept. and defended Condon when the latter was Director of the National Bureau of Standards. In this version, the Vice-President and the US Attorney General teamed up to reverse, in 24 hours, a security clearance given by the Regional Board after a full year of consideration.

Commented veteran Condon: "I have been fully cleared for secret data four times by four different boards... I will be pleased to be cleared a fifth time, confident that one more honest, objective review of my record can only lead to this result."

and transfer its functions to the Judiciary Committee "where they should have been all along." Walter is second ranking Democratic member of the Judiciary Committee; Rep. Celler (N. Y.) is first. "I think that if the transfer is made and a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee is established to handle the investigation work of the Un-American Activities Committee, there will not be so much abuse of power in the future," Walter said. Another change of interest as the Democrats take over the 84th Congress will be the chairmanship of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, where Sen. Clinton Anderson (N.M.) and Rep. Melvin Price (Ill.) are the ranking Democratic members.

WEST PROPOSES PEACEFUL ATOM, DISARMAMENT STEPS

NEW U.S. ATOM PROPOSAL

In a press conference Nov. 3, President Eisenhower announced revived negotiations with Russia on atomic energy. He said, "I hope that this will start a new phase in the US-USSR negotiations which will be more fruitful than the first phase, during which the Soviets showed a lack of interest in cooperating with the US to further international cooperation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy." He also emphasized that "we are determined to get on with this international project whether or not the Soviets participate." Immediately after the President's announcement, Secretary Dulles Soviet Ambassador Zoroubin a reply to Moscow's note of Sept. 22 requesting renewed negotiations on the proposed international atomic energy agency.

7-POWER RESOLUTION

Further developments came on Nov. 5 in an address by Ambassador Lodge before the UN General Assembly. He proposed the following four steps already outlined in Secretary Dulles' UN speech of Sept. 23 (see NL 54-8): "1. The creation of an international [atomic] agency . . . , 2. The calling of an international scientific conference . . . , 3. The opening early next year in the US of [an international] reactor training school . . . , 4. An invitation to a substantial number of medical and surgical experts from abroad to participate in the work of our cancer hospitals . . ."

On Nov. 6 a resolution based on the address was submitted to the General Assembly's Political Committee after temporary withdrawal to make sure that the details of the resolution would not permit Communist China to participate in the proposed international scientific conference. The resolution carried the backing of Australia, Belgium, Britain, Canada, France and South Africa.

POOL NOW CLEARING-HOUSE

As anticipated in the last Newsletter, the resolution calls for the proposed international agency to be a specialized agency related to, but not a direct part of, the UN. One change has been made in President Eisenhower's A-pool proposal of Dec. 8, 1953. The present proposal calls for the international agency to serve as a clearing-house in the direct transfer of nuclear materials from one nation to another, rather than to maintain a supply of such materials for distribution itself as was originally proposed. One reason for this modification is that changes made in the Atomic Energy Act last summer now permit the US to provide nuclear materials to individual countries under bilateral agreements, but it would be necessary to ask Congress for additional authorization to supply such materials to the atomic agency itself.

In proclaiming Russia's willingness to continue negotiations, Russia's Vishinsky maintained in a speech before the UN on Nov. 8 that it was a distortion of Russia's position to claim that she had a negative attitude toward atomic pool negotiations. Lodge's reaction to this was: "... he can prove me wrong by supporting the resolution." Russia and India were invited on Nov. 9 to help arrange the international scientific conference.

On Nov. 12, Vishinsky dampened optimism by stipulating that the suggested international atomic agency should be inside the UN and subject to the Security Council.

CORRIGENDUM. The story "Russia Offers Disarmament Plan" in the last Newsletter (54-8, October 19) described the USSR plan as calling for "a 50% reduction in conventional armaments and appropriations for them in the first 6 months to 1 year" and "the reduction of the remaining 50% . . . in the second 6 months to 1 year." The 50% should have referred to what is called in the plan "agreed norms." The exact wording as reported in the October 1 New York Times is: "States [should] reduce within 6 months (or one year) their armaments, armed forces and appropriations in their state budgets for military purposes by 50% of agreed norms" and this initial reduction should be followed by a further reduction "within 6 months (or one year) . . . by the remaining 50% of the agreed norms." Thus the plan calls for reduction by unspecified "agreed norms" rather than for total disarmament, as might have been inferred from the Newsletter story.

DISARMAMENT SUBCOMMITTEE REVIVED

Action in the UN has revived formal attempts to reach international agreement on effective and acceptable principles and procedures for world disarmament. On Nov. 4 the General Assembly adopted unanimously a resolution approved by its Political and Security Committee that the US, USSR, Britain, France, and Canada initiate new secret talks aimed at agreement on disarmament and prohibition of nuclear weapons. The resolution was supported in the Political and Security Committee by all of the above nations, and came after the Committee had heard several weeks of general debate on disarmament. Procedurally, the talks would be undertaken as the work of a subcommittee to be set up by the UN Disarmament Commission and consisting of representatives of these five nations. In effect, the action amounts to a revival of the similar subcommittee that met in London last summer.

BACKGROUND The general debate in the Political and Security Committee started October 11. Under consideration were the proposals recently made by the USSR (see NL 54-8) and the British-French proposals which came out of the Disarmament Commission's 5-nation subcommittee discussions in London last summer. The Russians had rejected the latter when they were first made although they are considered to be substantially the basis for the Russian's own recent proposals. Debate lasted two weeks and the "Big-5" resolution sent to the General Assembly, originally introduced by Canada, represented some concessions by both sides.

TWO PROPOSALS

On the same day, the Political and Security Committee acted on two other proposals. One by India dating from last April called for a standstill agreement on the production of nuclear and other arms, pending conclusion of a disarmament convention (see NL 54-4, Apr. 26). India's V. K. Krishna Menon has complained that their proposal has been neglected. The Political and Security Committee sent it to the Disarmament Commission which in turn referred it to the revived 5-power subcommittee. This action amounts to a shelving.

A second proposal, by Australia and the Philippines, was that the Secretariat draw up a paper showing the points of East-West agreement and disagreement on disarmament. This the committee also referred to the Disarmament Commission, an effective negative action since it was intended that the Secretariat prepare the paper now. Sir Percy Spencer of Australia argued that the small countries had a right to know and it was time they were told how matters stood. Russia's Vishinsky fought the proposal on the basis that the USSR would not be satisfied to have anyone else state her position. Jules Moch of France also objected to the proposal.

OPTIMISM TEMPERED

Although the unanimous action of Nov. 4 in the General Assembly was a rarity -- the first on disarmament matters since 1946 -- any optimism generated by it was cautiously guarded. Typical reactions reported in the N. Y. Times of Nov. 5 are as follows: E. N. Van Kleffens, Assembly president, considered the vote "an important step forward" but cautioned, "our organization can hardly be said to have made real progress in the field of disarmament." Canadian Minister of National Health and Welfare Paul Martin, who submitted the original resolution, considered that the gap between the positions of the principal atomic powers had narrowed in the past year, but that it still remains "wide and deep." Britain's Sir Pearson Dixon emphasized the general agreement on disarmament and prohibition of nuclear weapons was by no means "just around the corner." James J. Wadsworth of the US said that "a long and rocky road" lay ahead.

However, the ample evidence that the air is clearer for productive discussions includes President Eisenhower's interpretation of the USSR attitude in the recent B-29 plane incident as more conciliatory than in similar earlier cases and his Nov. 8 statement: "The possibility of peace is more promising than at any time in recent years."

RIEHLMAN HEARINGS RELEASED

The transcript of the complete hearings on "Organization and Administration of the Military Research and Development Programs," by the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, was released October 18. Under the chairmanship of Rep. R. Walter Riehlman (R, N.Y.), the Subcommittee heard testimony last June from Defense Dept. officials, scientists and scientific administrators and solicited further views by letter. Its report was released last July 28 (see NL 54-7, Aug. 16). According to Neal Stanford (Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 19), "the testimony... confirms... that the security program was hurting scientific research, that the military people were more or less ignoring the natural scientists in national security talks, that the US was losing its lead over the Soviet Union in weapons research and development."

NEVER CONSULTED BY JCS

Revealing testimony was given by MIT president J. R. Killian and wartime OSRD head Vannevar Bush. In answering a question concerning what use the Joint Chiefs of Staff make of the scientific information and viewpoints of others which is furnished by them, Bush replied: "... straight from the shoulder. I have held important posts in the field of research and development for 15 years and I have never been called by the JCS for my personal evaluation of such... scientific or technical matters, to my recollection, on their initiative... and what applies to me perhaps applies also to scientists generally." To the same question, Killian made a similar reply and added: "I think there has been a tendency to feel that civilians and research people or staff people should not come in above a certain level."

With regard to the plausibility of a new civilian agency similar to the wartime OSRD, Bush said in part: "Such an office developing weapons could not possibly operate without the closest interrelationship with the military... During the war... it was possible to cut corners and... the OSRD... reported directly to the President of the US and had his vigorous support... Today we do not even have good, cordial interrelationships between the scientists and the military within the Dept. of Defense."

Killian and Bush agreed with a recommendation submitted by the Rockefeller Comm'n on Reorganization of the Defense Dept. which "advocated the setting up of a committee of senior military men... and civilian scientists who would be at the level of the JCS but not part of the JCS, who would advise the Secretary of Defense and the President as well as the Nat. Security Council."

SECURITY WEDGE

Although the security problem constituted only one aspect of the hearings' subject matter, it received substantial play in the press. Vannevar Bush testified that "the way in which our security system is working at the present time is driving a wedge between the military and scientific people of the country, and is doing great harm." Another witness, John Von Neumann, told the Subcommittee: "We must either convince the public that it is not a matter involving a man's honor and good citizenship whether he is or is not a security risk, in which case one can continue to handle it informally and administratively, or else we have to admit that it is a capital matter, in which case one has to develop judicial methods and deal with it." Killian testified, in this connection: "The feeling that the present security procedures can be handled and administered in a manner to damage creative activity, and if they are, the feeling that the giving of an unbiased and objective judgment can be, under certain conditions, dangerous to the giver because this unbiased judgment does not accord with somebody's policy, all of these things add up to a great discouragement..."

Bush's testimony was tempered somewhat by his later comments, according to an AP dispatch (Washington Post, Oct. 20): "Things have improved quite a bit since June... We're getting over our hysteria, and I feel a little more encouraged." He still maintained, however, that "the security itself is bad [sic]... It's absurd the way it works."

"In line with the Subcommittee recommendations," Chem. & Eng. News reported Aug. 30, "is Army's recent establishment of its Army Scientific Advisory Panel with permanent board status. Such status will give the panel broader advisory powers than it has had so far in Army R & D programs," said C & EN, noting that Killian would head the board.

SECOND SCIENTIST APPOINTED TO AEC

The tradition for a scientist serving on the Atomic Energy Commission, which was continued with the appointment of chemist Willard F. Libby on Sept. 30, was reinforced on October 23 when the President announced that mathematician John Von Neumann had been chosen to fill the vacancy created by the expiration of Commissioner Zuckert's term last June. A further vacancy on the AEC is in prospect, as Commissioner Campbell on Nov. 9 was appointed Comptroller General of the US. All of these appointments are subject to Senate confirmation.

Libby, formerly at the Institute for Nuclear Studies at the Univ. of Chicago and well known for his "carbon-dating" work, succeeds to the post originally occupied by Robert F. Bacher and then by Henry D. Smyth, both physicists. Smyth, long rumored ready to quit although his term had almost two years to run, resigned to become chairman of the Board of Scientific and Engineering Research at Princeton. His was the dissenting vote in the AEC's decision on Oppenheimer's clearance. Von Neumann, named to a full 5-year term, was on the staff of Oppenheimer's Institute for Advanced Study, and like Libby had been a member of the AEC's General Advisory Committee.

No names of possible successors to Campbell on the AEC have been mentioned. Campbell, an accountant, was appointed in July, 1953 from the business office of Columbia Univ. He has been a staunch supporter of Strauss in the matters of strengthening the Commission chairmanship and of the Dixon-Yates contract. The General Accounting Office, of which he would become head, has been critical of the method proposed for awarding this contract. His AEC appointment was due to end in June, 1955.

OTHER CHANGES

Three new appointments, expiring in 1960, to the General Advisory Committee of the AEC were also announced Oct. 23. They are: Warran Charles Johnson, Chemistry Dept. chairman at the Univ. of Chicago; Edwin M. McMillan, physics professor at the Univ. of California; Jesse W. Beams, physics professor at the University of Virginia.

Another AEC personnel item to make the news was the resignation, reported Nov. 3, of David S. Teeple as special assistant to Chairman Strauss. Teeple has been a highly controversial figure since his role as an aide to Sen. Hickenlooper (R, Ia.) during the Senator's 1949 investigation into charges of "incredible mismanagement" in the AEC. His appointment last year had been strongly objected to by Murray, Smyth and Zuckert, press reports stated.

• • • • •

Former AEC Chairman DAVID E. LILIENTHAL, in a letter to the Washington Post of Nov. 11, deplors the current tendency of newspapers and the public to label AEC Commissioners politically, thereby imputing to the AEC a bipartisan character rather than the non-partisan character he says was originally intended. "It was to be nonpolitical, not bipolitical," Lillienthal points out.

* * * * *

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.

EUROPEAN LAB BECOMES REALITY

The Council of the European Nuclear Research Center (CERN) held its first general meeting in Geneva on Oct. 7 and 8. Felix Bloch, Swiss-born Nobel Prize-winner and former head of Stanford University's Institute of Physics, was installed as Director-General; E. Amaldi (Rome) and C. J. Bakker (Amsterdam) were appointed deputy directors. On the Scientific Policy Committee are Heisenberg (chairman), Alfven, Bernadini, Blackett, Bohr, Cockroft, Leprince-Ringuet, and Scherrer.

The organization was established in 1952 by agreement of Belgium, Denmark, France, West Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and Yugoslavia, under the sponsorship of UNESCO.

NON-MILITARY, NON-SECRET One purpose of CERN is to provide European physicists with high-energy nuclear research equipment which no single European country has, in the past, been able to afford. The main laboratory in Geneva will house one 600 Mev synchrocyclotron and one 25 Bev "strong focusing" proton synchrotron. Research will be non-military and non-secret.

Speaking to the National Industrial Conference Board in New York on Oct. 13, Niels Bohr expressed the hope that benefits other than increase in knowledge might result from this enterprise. "Surely," he said, "there is hardly anything so much as common search for truth which is able to create international understanding and make everybody aware of our common position."

Further comments on "THE HYDROGEN BOMB," by Shepley and Blair (see NL 54-8), have come to our attention. Edward Teller, one of the book's "heroes," said (Sante Fe New Mexican, Sept. 26) that he did not have "a shred of responsibility for any part" of the book and that the authors "did not have any corroborative evidence from me." Enrico Fermi asserted in his press conference Oct. 4 (Newsweek, Oct. 18): "Perhaps as much as 95% of the H-bomb development took place at Los Alamos... The fear of scientists during these times is that young people may be discouraged from entering science and government research, although we needn't worry about the people at Los Alamos. They are stable guys." Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, wartime Manhattan Project chief, said (ibid.): "I can't see how that book can possibly help the US. Most of the men attacked in this book worked on the Manhattan Project and did a splendid job. When the book's authors try to take a team that's been successful and criticize members of that team, they're making a terrible mistake."

Time magazine, employer of the authors, defended their accuracy (Nov. 8 issue). According to Time's interpretation, "it is possible to believe everything in the book without finding disloyalty in Robert Oppenheimer or any other man who appears in it."

F A S NEWSLETTER

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

54 - 9

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS LOW, WELL USED

The UN Technical Assistance Program, to which in 1954 a record number of 73 nations have pledged \$25.3 million, faces a 1955 crisis. Last summer Congress appropriated just under \$10 million to cover US commitments for 1954 only. These commitments now amount to only 57% of the total, or 22% if the recipients' contributions are included. But Congress also directed that future US pledges not be made in advance of appropriation. Since Congress failed to act on the President's request for funds for the first half of 1955, the UN group is severely limited in its planning both for new and continuing projects. Unusually early action in the coming Congress is the main hope for minimizing the disruption to the successful international programs in underdeveloped nations.

Meanwhile, the US's own and larger technical assistance program is undergoing a change of emphasis. In Aug. 1953, it was transferred from the State Dept. to the Foreign Operations Administration. Some experts feel that by this change it has lost its independence and become linked with political and military objectives. For example, a recent House Foreign Affairs Committee report says: "Such sums as we can grant... must go to those who are standing on our side even at the expense of aid to those who are neutral." The program has also been criticized on the grounds that it has tended to shift from "technical" assistance to a supply or commodity program.

COLLEGE PROGRAM One of the more encouraging aspects of the US program involves contracts with some 40 US colleges and universities to carry on technical assistance in 26 foreign lands. These already account for about \$15 million of the \$10 million budget and 15% of the 1800 technical people serving overseas. A doubling by the middle of next year is in prospect. This extensive program has grown out of a pilot project in which Oklahoma A & M since 1952 has worked with Ethiopia to establish that nation's first agricultural and mechanical arts college. FOA serves as a sort of middleman while a program is worked up by the two schools involved. The American school agrees to send a university team from its faculty to remain in residence and to provide specialists for shorter periods. The foreign school or nation puts up much of the local currency cost, including overseas travel and living allowances.

Along these lines, the Univ. of Maryland is assisting in the economic and social development of British Guiana. Georgetown is helping five Yugoslav universities and also Turkey to establish and conduct English language institutes. Some of the other US schools involved abroad are: Minnesota (South Korea), Pennsylvania and Colorado A & M (Pakistan), Michigan State (Brazil), Harvard (Peru), Nebraska (Turkey), three Utah colleges (Iran), Arkansas (Panama), Washington Univ. (Thailand), Wyoming (Afghanistan), Tuskegee (Indonesia).

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

Postmaster: If addressee has moved and new address is known, please forward and advise of new address on Form 3547. If new address unknown, return to sender. Postage for these services guaranteed.

ROALD A SCHRACK
2827 - 15TH ST. N.W.
WASHINGTON 9, D.C.

Not for Release

1749 L St., N.W., Washington 6, D.C., Nov. 15, 1954

MEMBERSHIP DISCUSSION: A CHAPTER ACTS on DISPERSAL

The Committee on Dispersion of the Mohawk Association of Scientists and Engineers (FAS chapter in the Schenectady-Troy area) has had a number of experiences in its first year of existence which might be of interest to other FAS members. The following report was prepared by a member of the committee:

ORIGIN

The committee had its origin at a weekly luncheon meeting of the Mohawk Chapter in November, 1953. The meeting was devoted to discussing the October 1953 issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists which reported on the East River Study on the vulnerability of the US to atomic attack. East River's conclusion, that a manageable civil defense was not possible without some previous reduction of the vulnerability of our large cities, attracted attention. If this was the case, should not civil defense begin with a program for reducing vulnerability? No one at the meeting could recall having seen public discussion of the problem outside the Bulletin.

The MASE Committee on Dispersion was formed shortly thereafter. Its first action was to obtain further information. The East River report is not easy to get; a local librarian finally located a copy at Brookhaven, and we borrowed the pertinent sections for 2 weeks. We found, somewhat to our surprise, that there actually was a modest federal dispersion program and we were able to get informative literature from the US Department of Commerce.

DISPERSION BEGINS AT HOME

The federal program calls for local groups, composition unspecified, to make dispersion surveys to determine if local areas are target areas, as defined by certain arbitrary rules, and to file the results of these surveys with the Commerce Dept. Since one criterion of a target area is at least 16,000 workers in heavy industry inside a circle less than four miles in diameter, and since the figures as reported in the newspapers for employment in the General Electric Works alone in Schenectady were over 30,000, it was clear that Schenectady should be classed as a target area. However, no survey had been made. The committee therefore decided to make the survey its first item of business. We felt this would be educational for us as well as providing a definite starting place, which is essential in this kind of volunteer undertaking.

At this point, the committee consisted of R. S. Rochlin (Chairman), G. E. Henry, A. E. Newkirk, and B. H. Zimm. C. D. Doyle, M. D. Fiske, and V. C. Wilson joined subsequently. When it became desirable to include members from Troy and Albany as well as Schenectady, F. T. Worrell and C. L. Andrews agreed to represent the respective areas.

SURVEY MADE Following instructions in the Federal Dispersion Guidebook obtained from the Commerce Dept., Newkirk prepared a map showing the existing target zone. We then attempted to get the local government and Chamber of Commerce officials to join us in forming a committee to send the map and supporting material to the Commerce Dept. as our local Dispersion Survey. Henry arranged a very amicable luncheon meeting in May with mayors, city engineers and civil defense directors from Albany, Troy and Schenectady and their respective counties. However, when we attempted to get their signatures on the document, the natural conservatism of most of these politically wise individuals became apparent. One city manager agreed to sign but only if the whole matter was to be kept secret. (This showed remarkable trust in our discretion!)

The reasons for the reluctance of our mayors to sign became clear in the discussion. Both the local unions and the

Chambers of Commerce are trying to bring new industry into the area. There have been political statements to the effect that the incumbent administrations are not doing their best to help. On the other hand, there has been no public discussion of the dangers of living in an industrial concentration in an atomic age. The headline placed over a news article in the Schenectady Union-Star about the filing of our survey was interesting: "New Defense Plants Here Won't Solve Job Ills."

Unwilling to swear secrecy, we went ahead on our own and filed the survey with the Commerce Dept. in Washington on June 22, 1954. On Sept. 17 Victor Roterus, Chief, Area Development Division, Office of Technical Services, Commerce Dept., wrote acknowledging and praising our survey: "We have made a check of this material and wish to commend the group for the technical excellence of both its survey and the presentation of the survey results." He then pointed out that it would be desirable to have the local effort and survey be made by a broad cross-section of the community, including business men. He indicated that we might now get some cooperation from the local Chambers of Commerce in preparing and resubmitting a survey report. Our Committee, though skeptical, will explore this possibility.

LETTERS-TO-THE-EDITOR We had a chance to argue our point in print. The Schenectady Gazette, a morning daily with 41,000 circulation, ran an editorial stating essentially that they did not understand what dispersion was all about. After all, the editor said, was not a factory as easy to bomb in one place as another? We went and talked with him at some length, and were able to explain that atomic bombs would not be aimed at one factory but at groups of factories, if not at a city as a whole. He gave us space on the editorial page to present our views. This was done in a signed article by Zimm.

Since this was during the period when we were carrying on negotiations with the local officials about the survey, we felt obliged not to discuss the Schenectady target area specifically in the article. The latter omission no doubt diminished its impact on the public; at any rate there was little reaction one way or the other.

Doyle, who was not then a member of the committee, and so was under no inhibitory influence, had written a much stronger letter on the subject to the competing Union-Star, which, after delaying about a week, printed it just after the article in the Gazette had appeared. There was also no reaction to this letter.

The lack of understanding of things that seemed perfectly plain to us was nearly universal among the contacts we made. A city engineer stated categorically that his city, though in a target zone, would never be bombed. This attitude was also present in the business world. We had informal discussions with two General Electric staff executives. Despite the fact that one had held a responsible position in civil defense during World War II and the other was associated with advanced planning in defense product production, dispersion was clearly a new idea to each of them and one which neither found easy to accept.

BOTH A LOCAL AND A NATIONAL PROBLEM

The committee, while continuing local efforts as vigorously as possible, has now come to the conclusion that dispersion is not being pushed enough on the national scale. The initiative must come from somewhere, but at present the federal government appears to be afraid of the local interests and the local interests appear to be ignorant of the problem and afraid of each other. We think that the only way to break this deadlock is to get more publicity and discussion on a national scale. Our committee has therefore decided to try to interest the FAS as a whole in this undertaking.

As a first step, we have drawn up a summary of conclusions, which we hope might serve as a basis for discussion and

eventual agreement. This appears below. Comments and correspondence will be welcomed, and should be addressed to Dr. R. S. Rochlin, R.D. 2, Sacandaga Rd., Schenectady 2, N.Y.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The H-bomb has dramatized the dangerous situation in which this country has been placed ever since the first atomic weapon was exploded in 1945. That event made it possible to conceive of the destruction of all of our major cities in a few hours' time by bombing. The conception of 1945 is the reality of 1954. The bombs and the bombers that could accomplish this destruction are actually in existence and in the hands of foreign powers. Meanwhile even improved defensive devices promise only a partial and temporary defense, which in our present state of extreme vulnerability is no defense at all.

These gloomy facts should be obvious to every one. However, the general public, lacking leadership in this matter from its elected leaders, has either ignored the facts or adopted an attitude of fatalism and done nothing.

Actually there is a clear and effective answer to this

danger. This is to adopt a thorough and fast-moving dispersion of industry and population away from the great metropolitan concentrations that form the present too-attractive targets. Dispersion would not be a complete break with present conditions but would rather be an acceleration of trends already in existence for other reasons. Such a program, even partly carried out, would force a bombing attack on the US to be a protracted plant-by-plant affair against which anti-aircraft defense would be effective, rather than the devastating area raids now possible.

One of the most attractive features of dispersion is that it is purely defensive; it reduces the threat of war without itself threatening war. We are now spending many billions on armed forces but hardly a cent on the one measure that most effectively gives protection against atomic attack.

It is the task of the Federation of American Scientists to lead in educating and forming public opinion in fields within its competence. In this critical field of urban dispersion, leadership is now lacking. Undertaking an active role in stimulating public discussion toward an effective national dispersion is a timely and proper activity for the Federation of American Scientists.

UN CHARTER -- REVIEW and REVISION

In recent years, UN Charter Revision has been discussed at several FAS meetings. The time for action, if it is to be taken, is now approaching. The FAS membership and the Council should consider whether Charter Revision is a proper field of action for FAS, and whether FAS as an organization should testify before the Senate Subcommittee.

According to provisions in the present UN Charter, a proposal for calling a conference to review the Charter automatically goes on the agenda of the UN General Assembly in 1955. This conference will be held at a place and date to be fixed by a 2/3rds vote of the General Assembly and by a vote of any 7 members of the Security Council. That is to say, the calling of a conference is not subject to a veto. The conference presumably will not be held until 1956. Any revision of the Charter recommended by a 2/3rds vote of the conference shall take effect when ratified by 2/3rds of the members of the UN, including all the permanent members of the Security Council. A revision, in other words, will be subject to an effective though not final veto, as long as the revision is not ratified by any permanent member.

PUBLIC HEARINGS A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, established to consider proposals to amend or revise the UN Charter, has been holding hearings in different parts of the country over a period of several months. Sen. Wiley (R, Wis.), chairman of both the full committee and this subcommittee, has suggested that all persons and organizations interested in revision of the UN Charter should offer testimony. Early in 1954, the subcommittee heard testimony from Secretary Dulles and UN Ambassador Lodge. Copies of hearings to date (7 volumes) and staff studies are available from the Subcommittee on Review of the UN Charter, Capitol Bldg., Washington 25, D.C.

Other source materials include: (1) "Questions and Answers on UN Charter Review," June 1954 (Public Services Div., Dept. of State, Washington 25, D.C.); (2) "The Future of the UN: Issues of Charter Revision," Nov. 1954 issue of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 3937 Chestnut St., Philadelphia 4, Pa.; (3) "Peace through Disarmament and Charter Revision: Detailed Proposals for Revision of the UN Charter," by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn (preliminary print by the authors, Dublin, N.H.; no price listed).

U.S. POSITION The subcommittee hearings may play a large part in determining what proposals the State Department will offer for Charter Review. Dulles, in his testimony to the subcommittee, said "We are now approaching a time when in all probability there will be a review of the Charter with a view to its possible amendment. Article 109 (3) of the Charter provides that a proposal to call such a conference shall

be placed on the agenda... of the General Assembly... of 1955, and present indications are that a review conference will be held. The US has already indicated that it expects to favor the holding of a review conference." Clearly, from his remarks, Dulles is sympathetic to the idea of improving the Charter. But he is aware of the political realities and will probably not propose any amendment which hasn't had the prior indications of Senate backing. Thus these hearings may be the most critical moment for public action for UN Charter amendment.

ISSUES Among the issues up for consideration, as outlined in the State Department pamphlet mentioned above, are:

1. **Collective Security** -- What changes in the Charter might help to achieve peace with justice and freedom compatible with human dignity? Should greater responsibility be given to the General Assembly? Do regional organizations, such as NATO, forward basic Charter objectives?
2. **The Veto** -- Should the veto power be taken away with respect to questions involving pacific settlement of disputes and the admission of new members, such as recommended in the Vandenberg resolution?
3. **Disarmament** -- Should consideration be given to creating a special organ of the UN on a par with the Economic and Social Council for dealing expressly and constantly with the problem of disarmament?
4. **Special Agencies** -- Are present Charter provisions sufficiently explicit for carrying out desirable modifications of FAO, WHO, and UNESCO?
5. **International Law** -- Are the Charter provisions on international law adequate and is progress being impeded by a basic divergence as to the nature of law itself?

Any suggestions offered by FAS should, of course, be concerned with those aspects in which FAS has special interest.

Plans for **FAS MEETINGS IN CHICAGO** the end of November are underway. The FAS Council is scheduled to meet Saturday PM, November 27, following sessions of the American Physical Society at the University of Chicago's Institute for Nuclear Studies. The FAS Chicago Chapter is planning to sponsor an Open Meeting Friday PM, Nov. 26, program and speakers to be announced. Look for further announcements at the FAS literature table near the APS registration desk.