

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

Volume 19, No. 5

May, 1966

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

## FAS Again Urges Halt of North Vietnam Bombing

Washington, April 27, 1966—The Federal of American Scientists today again urged the United States to halt the North Viet Nam bombings.

Citing the damaging effects on East-West relations, FAS said of continued bombing:

"It appears to many other nations to be outright aggression, and thus makes the ultimate resolution of the conflict more, not less, difficult; it blocks at a crucial moment our attempts at negotiation to stop the dangerous proliferation of nuclear weapons; it leads to increasing Soviet involvement in the war; and finally, it carries a very real risk of further escalation."

The statement was issued at the 20th anniversary meeting of FAS.

### *Full Text of Statement*

A year ago the FAS Council warned that expansion of the war in Viet Nam ran counter to the vital goals of reducing world tensions and stopping the nuclear arms race. In January of this year we opposed the resumption of bombing of North Viet Nam. We wish now to reaffirm these views and to endorse the comment by George Kennan in testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Not only are great and potentially more important questions of world affairs not receiving, as a consequence of our involvement in Viet Nam, the attention they should be receiving, but in some instances assets we already enjoy, and, hopefully, possibilities we should be developing, are being sacrificed to this unpromising involvement in a remote and secondary theater."

The chances for achieving further improvement in East-West relations and for establishing measures for international settlement of local conflicts by peaceful means are jeopardized by the large-scale, active involvement of the United States in what was initially a local conflict.

We believe that the bombing of North Viet Nam should be discontinued. It appears to many other nations to be outright aggression, and thus makes the ultimate resolution of the conflict more, not less, difficult; it blocks at a crucial moment our attempts at negotiation to stop the dangerous proliferation of nuclear weapons; it leads to increasing Soviet involvement in the war; and finally, it carries a very real risk of further escalation.

## FAA AND PILOTS DISPUTE SAFETY AND STATISTICS

When the Federal Aviation Agency, by agreement with the International Civil Aviation Organization, narrowed the air corridors above 29,000 feet to 90 miles (from 120) the American trans-Atlantic pilots protested that the old limit was none too safe. The pilots have questioned the statistical methods and sampling accuracy of the FAA study that preceded the change, and some have refused to fly above 29,000 feet altogether until their own reports are considered. The pilots contend that 7 per cent of 2000 flights in their survey deviated more than 45 miles from course. The FAA survey indicated that 3 per cent deviated more than 40 miles.

(N.Y. Times, 1 May 1966)

## McNamara Supported on Anti-Missile Funding

*The following statement was released by FAS for publication on May 8.*

Recently, Secretary of Defense McNamara told the Senate Armed Services Committee that, in his opinion, the construction of an anti-ballistic missile system would not "add measurably to our safety" and, therefore, that he would not now request funds for its deployment. The Federation of American Scientists supports this long-standing Defense Department policy. It sees no reason sufficiently urgent to justify tens of billions of dollars for an immensely complicated system which will remain of dubious efficiency, and require continuing expenditures, in a continuing race between offensive and defensive technology.

FAS recognizes also that a decision this extraordinary—the largest single military procurement decision in the history of man—would lead to others. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree that a ballistic missile defense system must be accompanied by a full fallout shelter program. And efforts to achieve a "balanced damage-limiting program" will encourage procurement of anti-bomber and anti-submarine systems. These expenditures, truly enormous over extended periods, would be the hallmark of a frightened, not a great, society.

And our fear would find its echo in Soviet planning. We have spent more than several billions already to neutralize, with developments in our offensive weapons, whatever Soviet defensive systems might someday be deployed. Were we to deploy a missile defense, we could expect the Soviet Union, in due course, to respond no less strongly with offensive weapons of its own. And in turn, efforts to improve Soviet offensive weapons will threaten our own, as well as induce us to still further defensive efforts. There is no way out in this direction because there is no defense against nuclear war except to avoid one. Attempts to secure such a defensive will, by fits and starts, lead only to further spirals of expenditures.

Neither the technical implications of a decision to deploy nor the political ones, internal or external, are likely in any important way to further our domestic progress or our aspirations for control of the arms race abroad. Instead, such a decision will, if it does anything, be disruptive and divisive in its impact upon us and upon those relations with the Soviets from which eventual control of arms can spring. Finally, other nations consider our progress toward arms limitations relevant to their decision to acquire nuclear weapons; thus a new round of arms race will make the achievement of a non-proliferation treaty more difficult.

These arguments bear repeating because the Senate, by voice vote, has recently done what three years ago it declined to do on a roll-call vote—to try to force about \$200 million dollars on the Defense Department for the purchase of missile defense hardware.

It may be that the Senate was responding to the prospect of Soviet deployment, just as the Soviet Union may react unfortunately to the Senate vote. It would be unfortunate indeed if either country were panicked into decisions of this type by equivocal evidence of the other's progress or inten-

(Continued on page 4)

## CROP DESTRUCTION

*The letter reprinted below appeared in Science on April 15, 1966.*

I am addressing myself in this letter to the practical and the ethical implications of our destruction of rice crops and grain stores, by chemicals and by fire, in South Vietnam. I am *not* addressing myself to the problem of the morality of using chemical agents in wartime, as did our colleagues in their letter in the issue of 21 January, page 309. Nor am I addressing myself to the problem of the general morality of the Vietnam operations, except to say that I think we can all agree that obviously for many Americans the emotions are not as simple as those aroused in previous wars by the unprovoked attack on Pearl Harbor, the gas-ovens of Auschwitz, or the clear-cut violation of the United Nations Korean mandate. With the ends thus debatable—or at least debated—the means become particularly important in their practical consequences as well as in their morality.

In wartime, the ethics of means always pose difficult problems. Having spent five years of war as a forward artillery observer and as commander of artillery units, I know all too well that my contribution to the demise of the Wehrmacht was accompanied by the demolition of houses, churches, and works of art and by the killing and wounding of children, women, and civilian men in Africa, Italy, France, and Germany. Still, while knowledge that this was so forced me—and all Allied officers in similar positions—to extreme care so as to minimize such casualties, some such casualties were in the last analysis unavoidable if we were to conduct successful operation and eliminate the Nazi nightmare.

The situation seems to me entirely different when we consider the crop and stores destruction program in South Vietnam. The aim of the program is to starve the Viet Cong by destroying those fields that provide the rice for their rest—and field—rations. This aim is, in essence, similar to that which every food blockade (such as the one imposed against the Central Powers in World War I) has attempted. As a nutritionist who has seen famines on three continents, one of them Asia, and as a historian of public health with an interest in famines, I can say flatly that there has never been a famine or a food shortage—whether created by lack of water (droughts, often followed by dust storms and loss of seeds, being the most frequent), by plant disease (such as fungous blights), by large-scale natural disturbances affecting both crops and farmers (such as floods and earthquakes), by disruption of farming operations due to wars and civil disorders, or by blockade or other war measures directly aimed at the food supply—which has not first and overwhelmingly affected the small children.

In fact, it is very clear that death from starvation occurs first of all in young children and in the elderly, with adults and adolescents surviving better (pregnant women often abort; lactating mothers cease to have milk and the babies

die). Children under five, who in many parts of the world—including Vietnam—are often on the verge of kwashiorkor (a protein-deficiency syndrome which often hits children after weaning and until they are old enough to eat "adult" food) and of marasmus (a combination of deficiency of calories and of protein), are the most vulnerable. In addition, a general consequence of famine is a state of social disruption (including panic). People who are starving at home tend to leave, if they can, and march toward the area where it is rumored that food is available. This increases the prevailing chaos. Families are separated and children are lost—and in all likelihood die. Adolescents are particularly threatened by tuberculosis; however, finding themselves on their own, they often band together in foraging gangs, which avoid starvation but create additional disruption. The prolonged and successful practice of banditry makes it difficult to rehabilitate members of these gangs.

I have already said that adults, and particularly adult men, survive usually much better than the rest of the population. Bands of armed men do not starve and—particularly if not indigenous to the population and therefore unhampered by direct family ties with their victims—find themselves entirely justified in seizing what little food is available so as to be able to continue to fight. Destruction of food thus never seems to hamper enemy military operations but always victimizes large numbers of children. During World War I, the blockade had no effect on the nutrition and fighting performance of the German and Austrian armies, but—for the first time since the 18th century—starvation, vitamin-A deficiency, and protein deficiency destroyed the health, the sight, and even the lives of thousands of children in Western Europe.

We obviously do not want to take war measures that are primarily, if not exclusively, directed at children, the elderly, and pregnant and lactating women. To state it in other words, my point is not that innocent bystanders will be hurt by such measures, but that only bystanders will be hurt. Our primary aim—to disable the Viet Cong—will not be achieved, and our proclaimed secondary aim—to win over the civilian population—is made a hollow mockery.

JEAN MAYER

*School of Public Health,  
Harvard University,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts*

## FAS SPEAKERS

Council members, local officers, and other members qualified and willing to speak on FAS-related subjects are requested to inform the National Office of their personal or business travel plans, whenever possible. The Office will transmit this information to the branches, chapters, or individual FAS members concerned, in order to assist local FAS groups in arranging a meeting which might otherwise not be possible.

This plan is one way of boosting our memberships, especially in areas where FAS is presently not strong.

Members willing to accept such out of town speaking engagements when traveling are requested to provide the following information:

- a. Location and dates of travel
- b. Time or times at which available
- c. Subjects of possible talks
- d. Tentative or definite plans. If tentative, when are they expected to be definite?

Please send this information, as long as possible ahead of time, to: Mrs. Margie E. Fleischbein, FAS National Office, 2025 Eye Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20006.

### FAS NEWSLETTER

Published monthly except during July and August by the Federation of American Scientists, 2025 Eye St., N.W., Washington, D. C., 20006. Subscription price: \$2.00 per year.

Chairman.....Marvin Kalkstein

The FAS Newsletter is prepared in Washington.

Editor: Judith Eckerson.

The FAS, founded in 1946, is a national organization of scientists and engineers concerned with the impact of science on national and world affairs.

Sources of information (given at the end of articles in parentheses) are for further reference. Items reprinted directly from other publications are designated as such in an introductory paragraph.

## CIVIL DEFENSE BIBLIOGRAPHY

In response to the needs of a Boston study group, Milton Leitenberg prepared the following bibliography to be used in connection with the "Project Harbor" and civil defense discussions.

## BOOKS

1. *Civil Defense*, Congressional Hearings, House of Representatives, Committee on Government Operations, 1961 (551 pages).
2. *Civil Defense—Fallout Shelter Program* Congressional Hearings, House of Representatives, subcommittee of Armed Services Committee, 2 volumes (1,600 pages).
3. *No Place to Hide*, (Ed.) Seymour Melman, 1962 (Grove Press).
4. *Kill and Overkill*, Ralph Lapp, 1964.
5. *Nuclear Disaster*, Thomas Stonier, 1963.
6. *The Fallen Sky, Medical Consequences of Thermonuclear War*. Edited for Physicians for Social Responsibility (first appeared as a series of articles in the *New England Journal of Medicine*) 1963 (Hill & Wang).

## PERIODICALS, OFFPRINTS, PAMPHLETS

1. The Fallout Shelter—*Consumer Reports* Jan. 1962 (11 pages).
2. A National Shelter Program. A Report. Feb. 1962. N.Y. Scientists Information Dissemination Committee (27 pages).
3. The Shelter-Centered Society, A. I. Waskow, Jan. 1962 (18 pages).
4. Report of Jan. 1966 A.A.A.S. Symposium, *Science* 151 Jan. 7, 1966 (5 pages).
5. P.S.R. Report *New England Journal of Medicine* 266, #1174, pg. 1126-1155; May 31, 1962. P.S.R. Report *Boston Herald* May 31, 1962.
6. "Nuclear War & Civil Defense" in *Scientist & Citizen* a special series of eleven issues by the St. Louis Nuclear Information Committee.  
See especially:
  - a) Civil Defense—The Citizens Choice June-July 1964.
  - b) Practical Problems of C.D. Feb. 1964 (12 pages).
7. Three recent issues of *Scientist & Citizen* specifically on Project Harbor:
  - a) Project Harbor Report — review, May-June 1965 (41 pages).
  - b) Project Harbor Controversy, August 1965 (28 pages).
  - c) Defense in the Nuclear Age. Project Harbor, Feb.-March 1966 (37 pages).
8. The Effects of Nuclear War on the Pittsburgh Area (ed.) J. R. Townsend, 1962.
9. The Shelter Program, *Bull. Atomic Scientists* 17 #9 Nov. 1961 (2 pages).
10. More Important than Shelters, B. T. Feld, *Bull. Atomic Scientists* 18 #4, April 1962 (4 pages).
11. Deterrence & Shelters, J. D. Singer, *Bull. Atomic Scientists* 17 #8, Oct. 1961 (1 page).
12. Project Harbor: Washington Report, *Bioscience* Sept. 1965.
13. Shelters & Survival, *New Republic* Jan. 15, 1962 146, #3 (40 pages).
14. Community Shelters, *Nation* by Roger Hagan Feb. 24, 1962 194, #8 (7 pages).
15. The Family Fallout Shelter, Dept. of Defense, O.C.D., #MP-15 June 1959 (31 pages).
16. Case Against Civil Defense, S. Lens, *Progressive* Feb. 1962 (47 pages).
17. The Illusion of Civil Defense, Gerard Piel, Nov. 10, 1961 (23 pages).
18. The Cost of Survival, R. Steel *Commonweal* Oct. 13, 1961.
19. Civil Defense, Sen. Stephen Young, *Progressive*, 1960 (3 pages).
20. The Political Equivalent of War, Civil Defense; Gene Sharp, *International Conciliation* (Carnegie Endowment) #555 Nov. 1965 (67 pages).

## OF INTEREST . . .

The Department of Defense is paying a New York design company \$50,000 to standardize and beautify military insignia. One of their first changes was to soft-pedal the "big bomb" image of the Defense Atomic Support Agency. The DOD is about to replace an insignia featuring the mushroom cloud with one showing three golden arrows on a shield of blue. The shield will be surrounded by a circle of chain links, indicating a "chain reaction." (*N.Y. Times*, 26 April 1966)

The Atomic Energy Commission will select a site for a proposed 200 billion electron volt proton accelerator from among six locations recommended by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences. The locations which have been recommended are: Ann Arbor, Michigan; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Denver, Colorado; Madison, Wisconsin; Sierra Foothills, near Sacramento, California; and South Barrington, Illinois. (*News Report, NAS, March 1966*)

James A. Shannon, director of the National Institutes of Health, has warned that physicians must equip themselves to discourage men and women carrying genetic defects from having children. "By our humanitarian interference with the operation of natural selection," he said, "we are saving many lives but we are also to some extent degrading the health of the nation." He called genetic counseling a moral obligation and a social responsibility. (*The Evening Star, Washington, 25 April 1966*)

Drugs which were sent to Algeria by an American voluntary agency have been donated by the Algerian government to the Viet Cong. It was termed "a very effective contribution of the Algerian people to the struggle of our people against the American imperialists" by the Liberation Front's central committee. Along with 4 tons of drugs, the Algerians gave \$4,000. (*N.Y. Times*, 30 April 1966)

William C. Foster, chief of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has said that he hopes for a treaty to be signed in 1966 to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In spite of the Vietnamese war and the current disarray of the NATO alliance, he believes there are urgent pressures for a treaty this year. (*N.Y. Times*, 11 April 1966)

The Long Island Lighting Company plans to build a nuclear-powered electric generator in Shoreham, Long Island. The president of the company has offered the surrounding community the inducement of a public recreation area adjacent to the plant, and has pointed out that there will be no dust, soot, smoke, or barge deliveries of coal or oil to upset the resort atmosphere of the neighborhood. Construction of the plant is planned for 1969. (*N.Y. Times*, 14 April 1966)

The Canadian government is studying reports that some Canadian citizens have been questioned and threatened in Canada by American F.B.I. men who told them that they were liable to arrest for draft-dodging if they entered the U.S. The F.B.I. agents in question had ignored the policy of advising local police that they were visiting Canadian residents. (*Toronto Globe and Mail*, 23 April 1966)

The testing of an experimental oral contraceptive in 7000 women was halted in March after blood-clotting problems developed in heavily dosed laboratory animals. This information may renew the controversy about a possible relation between other oral contraceptives and blood clots, a relation that is neither proved nor disproved. On the basis of the same information, the authorities in Britain have allowed the new drug to remain on sale there, under the name Volidan. (*Washington Post*, 28 April 1966)

21. A Debate on the Question of Civil Defense. H. Kahn; E. Fromm; M. Maccoby, *Commentary* Jan. 1962 (26 pages).
22. Civil Defense, Arthur Waskow, Amer. Friends Serv. Comm. publication 1961 (17 pages).
23. The Shelter-Centered Society, A. I. Waskow, *Scientific American* May 1962 (5 pages).

## FRANCE RATIFIES OECD (PARIS) NUCLEAR LIABILITY CONVENTION

France has ratified the OECD (Paris) Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy. The Paris Convention, the first in the world governing liability in the case of a nuclear incident, was elaborated within the European Nuclear Energy Agency and was signed in July 1960 by sixteen European countries.

Following the recent British ratification of the Paris Convention on 23 February, this brings the total number of ratifications to four, the other two—those of Spain and Turkey—having been deposited in October 1961. However, subsequent to these first two ratifications, the Convention itself was slightly modified by an Additional Protocol, designed to eliminate possible discrepancies with a world-wide Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage which was prepared under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency and opened for signature in May 1963. The modified OECD (Paris) Convention has since been ratified by Spain.

Five ratifications are needed to bring the Paris Convention into force.

### BACKGROUND NOTE

The 1960 Paris Convention was signed by the following sixteen countries:

|              |             |                |
|--------------|-------------|----------------|
| Austria      | Italy       | Sweden         |
| Belgium      | Luxembourg  | Switzerland    |
| Denmark      | Netherlands | Turkey         |
| France       | Norway      | United Kingdom |
| Germany F.R. | Portugal    |                |
| Greece       | Spain       |                |

The Convention defined for the first time the main principles on which all international agreements on nuclear liability and, in fact, most national legislation in this field are now based. These main principles are:

- Absolute and exclusive liability — without proof of fault — of the operator of the nuclear installation concerned.
- Limitation of liability in time (in principle 10 years from date of incident).
- Limit of liability in amount (\$15 million).
- Obligation of operator to cover his liability by insurance or otherwise.
- One court — that of the place where the incident occurs — competent for all claims arising out of the same incident, with obligatory enforcement of its judgments in all countries party to the Convention.

(*Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, News Release, 10 March 1966*)

## FAS NEWSLETTER

Federation of American Scientists  
Suite 313.  
2025 Eye Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20006

Volume 19, No. 5

May, 1966

## FRANCE RUSHES ATOM TEST PREPARATIONS

United States officials think that France is rushing preparations for tests of atomic weapons in the Pacific to coincide with President de Gaulle's planned June visit to the Soviet Union. France has reportedly expressed interest in relaxation of American restrictions on transit rights for French planes flying equipment to the French proving grounds in the southwest Pacific. U.S. sources thought such a request unlikely to be honored by the United States.

The atmospheric tests have long been scheduled for this summer at an atoll in French Polynesia several hundred miles from Tahiti. It is believed that the test will be of a fission trigger for hydrogen bombs that are being developed. Technical and logistic difficulties have apparently put the test behind schedule. Nevertheless, de Gaulle was understood by diplomatic sources to have ordered that, if anything, the test schedule should be accelerated. He is scheduled to arrive in Moscow on June 20 for a two to three-week visit.

The United States has been contributing to the logistic difficulties of the French by imposing tight restrictions on transit and over-flight rights. In compliance with an injunction included in the Limited-Test-Ban treaty, the U.S. has refused to allow French planes carrying materials for use in the Pacific tests to land in the United States. Planes carrying technicians and general supplies have been permitted to land on a half-dozen occasions. In the opinion of some disarmament officials, even this permission raises legal problems within the treaty. (*N.Y. Times, 15 April 1966*)

## TV CHANGING THE ROLE OF PRESIDENT?

A new book, entitled *The Lonely Quest: The Evolution of Presidential Leadership*, by Robert and Leona Train Rienow, has suggested some of the changes taking place in the office of the presidency as a result of the close scrutiny it is given. Television, they suggest, has made the President an entertainer. Microphones at every turn record trivia, but may also give the President more power than any previous leader. The book is published by the Follett Publishing Company.

**FAS BACKS McNAMARA** (*Continued from page 1*)  
tions. And while the hope of encouraging Soviet restraint is an additional important argument against U.S. missile defenses, we do not believe that our Nation need engage in a puerile contest of matching the wasteful blunders of others. The answers to a Soviet defense are the very improvements in U.S. offensive capability in which we are already engaged. We do not believe that the Congress, or any of its Committees, has yet given this matter the organized thought that characterizes the Secretary of Defense's decision-making; we support his reluctance to buy the unnecessary.

Second Class Postage

Paid at

Washington, D. C.

Return Postage  
Guaranteed