

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS — Founded 1946  
 A national organization of natural and social scientists and  
 engineers concerned with problems of science and society.

SPECIAL ISSUE ON  
 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH  
 AND SAFETY

Vol. 26, No. 6

June, 1973

## FAS URGES MEMBERS TO WORK FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

Occupational health and safety is a matter of life and death. Every year at least 14,500 people die as a direct result of their jobs; job-related illnesses and injuries afflicted one out of every eight workers during 1971. Because so little is known about the hazards of many commonly used substances, actual mortality and morbidity rates are probably even higher.

The cost to the nation in dollars and cents is equally staggering: \$1.5 billion a year in wages alone. Productivity lost because of occupational illnesses, injuries and deaths is ten times greater than the loss due to strikes.

In response to this situation, Congress enacted the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, the provisions of which are outlined below. Yet enforcement of the Act has been fraught with difficulties since its inception. Unions rightfully complain that the government's entire program is drastically underfunded. Enforcement of the Act is attempted by 456 compliance officers and 68 industrial hygienists who are supposed to protect 57,000,000 workers in 4 million workplaces. Research has fared no better: the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health just suffered a cut of 100 staff positions and a demotion in the bureaucratic structure.

Labor's displeasure with the Act is shared by businessmen, although for different reasons. Regulations are voluminous and complex; the language is convoluted beyond recognition except by a scientist or lawyer. Worse yet, there is no provision for a penalty-free consultation with an Occupational Safety and Health Administration inspector—he must file cita-

tions and propose penalties for every significant violation he observes.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act, in short, has surfaced at least as many problems as it was designed to solve. Workers are still subject to hazards of all descriptions—from recognized toxic substances to others as yet unidentified as dangerous.

For most adults in our society, the workplace is the major feature of the "environment." The interests of environmentalists, labor, business and socially concerned scientists are merged in the problems of industrial health and safety. A scientist can help in halting the annual toll of lives, lost workdays, and productivity by assisting employers and employees to identify and police the hazards.

At the moment, the role of scientists is especially critical. For the most part, the regulations concerning health are quite undefined. The government has just begun the laborious job of identifying chemical hazards and the formulation of regulations concerning them is still far off. Thus, the basic and scientific part of industrial health is before us now. And, for many reasons, scientists who are concerned with this problem are in especially short supply.

In conjunction with other interested organizations, FAS plans to give some priority to identifying, recruiting, organizing and advising scientists who want to help with occupational health and safety. We therefore urge such scientists to make themselves known to us through the coupon on page 7.

*Council of the Federation of American Scientists*

## LEGISLATIVE SAFEGUARDS FOR THE WORKPLACE

Many Congressmen and Senators contend that more constituent response has been provoked by the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 than any other single piece of legislation in recent years. Few would deny that some protection is needed for employees in the workplace. The HEW National Center for Health Statistics estimates that the average worker experiences six days a year of absence (and at least 16 days of restricted activity) due to job-related disabilities. Occupational illnesses, injuries and deaths costed American industry \$9.3 billion

in 1971 alone, excluding property damage.

Although the sweatshop conditions of the nineteenth century have almost disappeared, morbidity and mortality rates are still high. Today's worker is exposed, if anything, to more health hazards than ever before. Recent complex synthetic substances used as additives and for other purposes account for a large part of the new risk.

People are becoming more and more aware of workplace hazards. Some substances which have been used for

(Continued on Page 2)

**LEGISLATIVE SAFEGUARDS**, from Page 1

years are now found to be toxic. As research methods in the health area have become more sophisticated, knowledge of possible links between such commonly used substances as chromium compounds and diseases like cancer is increasing.

It is freely admitted, however, that almost nothing is known about the long-range effects on health of materials used daily in many workplaces—from cleaning compounds and dyes to paints and solvents. And there doesn't seem to be much hope of catching up, either; it is estimated that a new and potentially toxic chemical is introduced into industry every 20 minutes.

**Pollutants and Chain Link Fences**

Another reason for increased public concern about occupational health and safety is the recent awareness of environmental problems and their effects on health. Since so much pollution stems from industrial processes, the factory or shop is often a microcosm of the environment of its community. As Tony Mazzochi of the Oil, Atomic and Chemical Workers has pointed out, "Pollutants don't recognize chain link fences."

It is also significant that the major concern of many workers has shifted from occupational safety to health. The gases in a workplace's air may be at least as dangerous and potentially lethal as a ladder with loose rungs. The reasons for this shift in emphasis are dramatically indicated by examples like these:

- Workers exposed to asbestos for twenty years or more run a 50% chance of asbestosis and a 10% chance of mesothelioma, a rare malignancy which afflicts only one in 10,000 of the general working population.
- The Public Health Service estimates that more than 20,000 foundry workers are exposed to environmental conditions capable of producing disabling and fatal diseases.

**One Worker in Four Covered by Industry Services**

Even if cases like those cited above were insufficient to make Congress act, the small number of workers covered by employer-provided health services and professional surveillance of plant environments would surely have moved them. Only one in every four American workers is covered by the \$320 million annual expenditure for these services.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 is Congress' response to conditions in the American workplace. Passed under the powers of interstate commerce, the purpose of the Act is to "assure so far as possible every working man and woman in the Nation safe and healthful working conditions and to preserve our human resources . . ." Each employer with more than eight employees is required to comply with the standards promulgated under the Act and must furnish a workplace "free from recognized hazards that are causing or are likely to cause death or serious harm;" employees must likewise comply with standards, rules, regulations and orders issued under the Act.

**Occupational Safety and Health Administration**

The Secretary of Labor was given broad powers of enforcement and education under the Act, almost all of which he delegated to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) in the Department of Labor.

1. First and foremost, OSHA is responsible for setting and enforcing mandatory standards applicable to businesses affecting interstate commerce and having more than 8 employees. The basic criterion for all standards is that no employee should suffer material harm from any condition, even if he is exposed to it for his entire working life.

Enforcement provisions of the Act empower OSHA inspectors to enter workplaces immediately without notice, and to issue citations and propose penalties for violations. (For a more detailed description of enforcement procedures, see page 4.) These penalties range from up to \$1,000 a violation and \$10,000 for repeated violations.

2. OSHA requires employers to keep certain mortality and morbidity records.

3. OSHA is authorized to provide training and education on occupational safety and health to employers and employees nationwide.

4. OSHA has the task of approving or rejecting State plans for programs under the Act. In one of its more complex provisions, the Act offers each State with two choices:

**FAS**

*Chairman:* MARVIN L. GOLDBERGER

*Vice Chairman:* PHILIP MORRISON

*Secretary:* HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.

*Treasurer:* ARTHUR S. OBERMAYER

*Director:* JEREMY J. STONE

The Federation of American Scientists is a 27-year old organization of natural and social scientists and engineers concerned with problems of science and society. Democratically organized with an elected National Council of 26 members, FAS is a non-profit civic organization sponsored by world-famous scientists of all kinds. Members of FAS include many Nobel Prize winners and former science-related officials of the highest possible rank from the major Government agencies.

**SPONSORS (partial list)**

- |                                       |                                      |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| *Christian B. Anfinsen (Biochemistry) | *Willis E. Lamb, Jr. (Physics)       |
| *Kenneth J. Arrow (Economics)         | *Wassily W. Leontief (Economics)     |
| *Hans A. Bethe (Physics)              | Robert Merton (Sociology)            |
| *Konrad Bloch (Chemistry)             | *Marshall Nirenberg (Biochemistry)   |
| Anne Pitts Carter (Economics)         | Hans J. Morgenthau (Pol. Science)    |
| *Carl F. Cori (Biochemistry)          | *Robert S. Mulliken (Chemistry)      |
| *Owen Chamberlain (Physics)           | *Linus Pauling (Chemistry)           |
| *Leon N. Cooper (Physics)             | George Polya (Mathematics)           |
| *Andre Cournand (Medicine)            | *J. Robert Schrieffer (Physics)      |
| *Max Delbruck (Biology)               | Alice Kimball Smith (History)        |
| Paul R. Ehrlich (Biology)             | Robert M. Solow (Economics)          |
| Adrian Fisher (Law)                   | *William H. Stein (Chemistry)        |
| Jerome D. Frank (Psychology)          | *Albert Szent-Györgyi (Biochemistry) |
| John Kenneth Galbraith (Economics)    | *Edward L. Tatum (Biochemistry)      |
| *Donald A. Glaser (Physics-Biology)   | James Tobin (Economics)              |
| *Alfred D. Hershey (Biology)          | *Charles H. Townes (Physics)         |
| Hudson Hoagland (Biology)             | *Harold C. Urey (Chemistry)          |
| Marc Kac (Mathematics)                | *George Wald (Biology)               |
| George B. Kistiakowsky (Chemistry)    | Jerome B. Wiesner (Engineering)      |
| *Arthur Kornberg (Biochemistry)       | Herbert F. York (Physics)            |

**NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS (elected)**

- |                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Harrison Brown (Geochemistry)     | Joel Primack (Physics)                 |
| Nina Byers (Physics)              | John O. Rasmussen (Chemistry)          |
| William M. Capron (Economics)     | George W. Rathjens (Pol. Science)      |
| Barry M. Casper (Physics)         | Leonard S. Rodberg (Physics)           |
| Sidney Drell (Physics)            | Cameron B. Satterthwaite (Physics)     |
| Arthur W. Galston (Biology)       | Joseph L. Sax (Environment)            |
| Michael H. Goldhaber (Physics)    | Herbert Scoville, Jr. (Defense Policy) |
| Morton H. Halperin (Pol. Science) | Eugene B. Skolnikoff (Pol. Science)    |
| Franklin A. Long (Chemistry)      | Jeremy J. Stone (Mathematics)          |
| *S. E. Luria (Biology)            | Vigdor Teplitz (Physics)               |
| Philip Morrison (Physics)         | Victor Weisskopf (Physics)             |
| Laurence I. Moss (Engineering)    | Herbert F. York (Physics)              |
| John R. Platt (Physics)           | Quentin D. Young (Medicine)            |
| *Nobel Prize Laureates            |  |

- a—Accept gradually encroaching Federal authority, as Federal standards automatically preempt State standards; or
- b—Design a plan of its own, "at least as effective as" the Federal system.

States are encouraged to take the latter course, since funds are available through OSHA to help them in every phase from needs assessment to operating costs. Ten states have thus far had comprehensive occupational safety and health plans approved by OSHA. For at least 3 years, the State and Federal governments will have concurrent jurisdiction; at that time, OSHA will evaluate whether or not to withdraw Federal control.

5. OSHA has some other miscellaneous rights and responsibilities, such as the right to petition the U.S. District Courts to restrain imminent danger situations.

#### **Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission**

To settle conflicts between employers or employees and OSHA, Congress established an Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission (OSHRC) composed of three Presidentially appointed members and some 45 judges appointed by the Commission members' Chairman. The three members can, at the request of one member, act on any case decided by one of the 45 judges within 30 days of his decision.

#### **National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health**

Because Congress realized that only the Federal government has the resources and incentive necessary to research occupational safety and health problems adequately and impartially, it established the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), which is mandated to:

1. Develop and establish recommended standards for consideration by OSHA;
2. Conduct research and experimental programs to develop "criteria documents" for new standards;
3. Publish an annual list of known toxic substances and the concentrations which are dangerous;
4. Conduct industry-wide studies on chronic or low level exposure to certain materials;
5. Serve as a national center for technical information;
6. Administer programs for medical examinations and tests to determine incidence of occupational illness;
7. Provide hazard evaluation services on request from an employer or authorized employee representative;
8. Develop manpower to carry out the intent of the Act.

#### **Sources of Controversy**

The Act, in short, touches on every aspect of occupational health and safety. There is nothing blatantly preposterous about its provisions, yet it has aroused as much controversy as any recent law. Why?

Labor, predictably enough, finds enforcement of the Act inadequate, penalties low, standards weak, research efforts overly limited. The unions contend that OSHA cannot do even a superficial enforcement job with only 41¢ to spend per worker covered, as opposed to the \$309.54 per worker spent on safety by the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

Continued on Page 4

#### **BUSINESS COMPLAINS:**

"The single most important problem of the Act is the inability of the small businessman to learn what is expected of him. The small independent retailer, for example, would have to spend hours reading material, attempting to learn what applies to his business. And yet he would still be uncertain as to what the law requires.

Furthermore, if he were to inquire of the nearest Department of Labor office, he might receive conflicting interpretations.

I think Senator Curtis testified before the Senate hearing that he had some 6 feet of standards that were derived from the law.

One gentleman testified on the question of where to store rags, and it seemed he obtained three different views of whether he could keep them inside or outside or in a barrel . . .

The small businessman who desires to have an OSHA official visit his premises to show him what he needs to do to comply, is told that the official would have to make an inspection and issue citations and penalties should he find any violations."

*Rep. William L. Hungate of Missouri,  
September 13, 1972, before the House  
Select Subcommittee on Labor*

"This is just too ridiculous for words. I don't know what is meant by this regulation, except to change all the toilet seats that are round and do not have open fronts, at a cost of a quarter of a billion dollars to small business."

*Lewis C. Barbee, September 13, 1972  
Before the House Select Subcommittee on Labor*

#### **LABOR COMPLAINS:**

"Of 23 [brake relining] shops surveyed, 16 or 69 percent knew of the Act and only two had ever been inspected. Of those shops who knew of the Act, two-thirds knew asbestos was hazardous. Of those unaware of the Act, however, less than one-third—29 percent—knew asbestos to be a hazard. . . . Despite the fact that asbestos is a target health hazard, there were few inspections and little information about its dangers in many shops."

*Dr. Sidney Wolfe, Health Research Group  
September 19, 1972 before the Senate  
Subcommittee on Labor*

"But in the past year, if you were to look at the differences in efforts, for example, we have reached about 300,000 workers in our own training programs within the industrial union department working with the structures of the unions.

The Labor Department reached a fraction of this, about 5,000 or 6,000 using funds that were given to the Boeing Corporation, to conduct workshops around the country."

*Sheldon Samuels, AFL-CIO  
July 27, 1972 before the Senate  
Subcommittee on Labor*

**LEGISLATIVE SAFEGUARDS**, from Page 3

Excluding funds for grants to states, Mr. Nixon's FY 1974 budget request for OSHA allows only about one million dollars more than was spent in 1972—a sum which does not even offset inflation. The teeth of the Act are blunted from the worker's standpoint; the average \$23 penalty per violation (1971 figure) is far from reassuring.

To support its contention of inadequate funding on all fronts, labor points to problems like the OSHRC's backlog of hundreds of contested citations; a freeze on hiring and staff cut at NIOSH; and OSHA's low enforcement expenditure per worker. But even more alarming to the unions is the passage of control from the Federal to State governments. As the AFL-CIO's George Taylor puts it, "The highest priority from the outset has been that of precipitate abdication of Federal authority to the States, whose historical failure to protect the health and safety of workers on the job was the principal reason for the Act."

**Management Objections Numerous and Complex**

Labor's major problems with the Act are, then, extremely straightforward: too little money is provided to do too much, and control is passing from bad hands to worse. The objections from the business community are more complex and numerous.

It comes as no surprise to anyone who has ever delved into a technical government document that businessmen who have no legal or scientific training are unable to understand OSHA regulations. Unfortunately, few efforts are being made to translate this information into readable language. According to one businessman, even the Library of Congress has available only 70% of the standards, since some are out of print.

Equally unnerving to the businesses is the sheer volume of the regulations—thousands of them may apply to one small operation. In addition, the same regulations apply equally to all businesses even vaguely related to each other, because there are only three broad categories of standards. The Act has been described by Rep. James McClure of Idaho as "a catchall blanket applying equally to General Motors and to the corner grocer."

Because the Act works more to the detriment of small businesses than large ones, it has been suggested at various times that the number of employees required to exempt a business from the Act be raised from eight to a higher figure. So far these moves have been defeated on the grounds that 20 of 60 million covered workers are in establishments employing 25 people or less.

**First Visit Citations: Tyranny or Necessity?**

One of the most hotly contested issues of all on an already controversial topic is that of first visit citations and penalties. As the law now reads, an inspector who observes any violation must cite the employer accordingly and propose a penalty. This makes it impossible for the employer to call in an inspector for the purpose of determining whether or not he is in violation of the law, unless he is willing to risk a penalty. Since his chances of being inspected in a year are only about two in a hundred, the businessman is much better off if he makes no effort at all to comply with the Act.

Some businessmen have proposed that the Act be

modified to provide for consultations by OSHA inspectors, followed by a reasonable time for compliance. If violations were still present during a second inspection at a later date, the business would be cited and a penalty proposed.

Organized labor opposes any such changes in the legislation on several grounds. First, they fear that OSHA will become an agency which functions only as a free consulting service to business, tolerating interminable delays to the detriment of employees. Unions further contend that it is only the fear of first visit penalties which brings many businessmen into compliance at all.

These are only a few examples of the controversies engendered by the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. While no legislation of its scope can hope to pass by unnoticed, the extremities of opinion about this Act seem to allow for no middle ground. As Phyllis E. Newman of OSHA puts it:

"The Occupational Safety and Health Act and the agency created to administer it—OSHA—are two years old. It has been anything but a quiet two years. Even now, there is still a good bit of sound—and fury." □

**HOW OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY STANDARDS ARE ENFORCED**

1. Inspections are performed by OSHA (Department of Labor) compliance officers either on their initiative as part of a random survey of workplaces, or in response to an employee whose request for an inspection has been approved by OSHA.

2. The compliance officer can enter any workplace covered by the Act without delay at a reasonable hour.

3. The compliance officer is to be accompanied by employer and employee representatives during his inspection; if there is no employee representative, a "reasonable number" of employees must be consulted. Anyone may be questioned privately by the officer.

4. If the compliance officer finds violations of standards, he must, within 6 months of his inspection, file a citation which states the nature of the violation, what standard it violates, and the period allowed to remedy the situation. The employer is required to post the citation in his workplace.

5. In addition to a citation, the employer receives a notification of the penalty (fine) the inspector has proposed for each violation.

6. If the employer chooses to contest the penalty, he must notify the Secretary of Labor of his intent within fifteen days. When the case is docketed, the employer is obliged to notify affected employees and their union representative that he is contesting the penalty.

7. A similar procedure is used when either the employer or the employees wish to shorten or lengthen the period during which violations may be corrected without further penalty.

8. Hearings on all cases are held by a Judge of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission. The burden of proof is on the Secretary of Labor.

9. The judgment of the Review Commission can be appealed to a U.S. District Court. □

## HOW THE ACT HAS WORKED

### Occupational Safety and Health Administration

When OSHA was established in 1970, its mandate was so broad and its budget so limited that it could not possibly attack occupational illnesses, deaths and injuries across the board. Priorities were set under the Target Industry and Target Hazard programs. The industries ranked most hazardous to workers are longshoring, roofing and sheet metal, meat and meat products, lumber and wood products, and miscellaneous transportation equipment; inspections and other enforcement activities have been concentrated in these areas.

### Target Hazards

Selecting Target Hazards must have been an even more difficult task, since there are no fixed statistics which tell the whole story, and since there are so many substances with unknown properties. The five selected were:

- Asbestos, which can produce a lung disease, asbestosis, diffuse fibrosis, related respiratory ailments and perhaps lung cancer.
- Lead, which can cause severe gastrointestinal, blood and central nervous system disorders, and ultimately even death.
- Silica, which can cause acute or chronic silicosis, often complicated by tuberculosis.
- Cotton dust, which can cause byssinosis, a disabling lung disease, often progressing to chronic bronchitis and emphysema.
- Carbon monoxide, which can cause suffocation.

One permanent standard has been issued as a result of the Target Hazard program; it reduces the permissible level of asbestos fibers per cc of air from 12 to 5 as of July 7, 1972, and from 5 to 2 effective July 1, 1976. Employers are obliged by the standard to provide medical examinations for workers exposed to asbestos fibers.

The total enforcement activities of OSHA during 1972 included 36,100 inspections by 428 OSHA compliance officers. Proposed penalties added up to \$3,121,000 for 125,400 alleged violations. The OSHA compliance staff has since expanded to 456 compliance officers and 68 industrial hygienists, and modest staff increases are expected again this year.

Here are some highlights of OSHA's handling of another major responsibility, training and education:

- Sent officials to speak to 500 groups about the Act;
- Showed exhibits at conventions and fairs to one million people;
- Conducted 1500 seminars for about 100,000 employers and employees;
- Issued updated standards, including about 100 revisions and a subject index.

### Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission

The Commission tried and decided 369 cases prior to September 1972, indicating that only 5% of citations issued were contested. It is interesting to note that the Labor Department's judgment was not sustained in 134

of these cases. More recently the Commission has developed a backlog which, according to the AFL-CIO, runs upward of 700 cases. OHRC has been criticized by unions for dismissing small monetary penalties, on the grounds of the size of the business cited, gravity of the violation, good faith and history of previous violations. The OSHRC budget has increased from \$75,000 in 1971 to an estimated level of \$1,280,000 in 1973.

### National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

One of NIOSH's most ambitious projects is the National Occupational Hazard Survey of 8200 workplaces, a two year program to develop basic descriptive information about non-farm workplaces covered under the Act. Uses of the information will vary from measuring trends and assessing needs to setting priorities and directing future investigations.

The development of criteria documents is also at the forefront of NIOSH activities. As of March 1973, the Institute had conveyed eight documents to OSHA, covering asbestos, radiation and coke oven emissions.

This kind of research will undoubtedly be hampered by an anticipated cut of about \$600,000 in Federal grants. In addition, the total positions allowed NIOSH has dropped from 745 in FY 72 to 706 in FY 73, with a cut to 610 anticipated in FY 74.

### Manpower Development Cut

Dr. Marcus Key, Director of NIOSH, has said that "The effectiveness of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 is directly dependent on NIOSH's ability to produce sufficient manpower to carry it out." This emphasis was reflected in a broad range of programs, including grants to colleges and universities for training at both graduate and undergraduate levels, and short term education grants for courses aimed at occupational health nurses, industrial hygienists, and similar professionals. Unfortunately, the cuts in NIOSH's budget fall heavily in the manpower development and training area.

Another important service provided by NIOSH is the Job Hazard Evaluation program. On request by an employer or authorized employee representative, an evaluation of potentially toxic substances can be carried out and the results communicated to both workers and management.

Other highlights of NIOSH activities:

- Continued the Illness and Injury Surveillance Program to define the distribution and magnitude of occupational injuries and illnesses;
- Continued the National Surveillance Network to provide the States with a detailed and standardized procedure to record workplace environmental conditions.

In addition to suffering a staff cut of about 100 and phaseout of some of its programs, NIOSH is being cut down several echelons in the bureaucracy. It is currently scheduled to be shifted to the jurisdiction of the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia, an organization currently at the same bureaucratic level as NIOSH.

## ACTIVITIES OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

**The Society for Occupational and Environmental Health** was first conceived in November 1972 in response to the pro-industry orientation of existing organizations of environmental and occupational health professionals. In striving to achieve an impartial viewpoint, the Society includes on its Governing Council and among its members representatives of labor, industry, government and academia. The antipathies often associated with these divergent groups seem submerged by the sense of common enterprise in creating a new organization with a truly objective stance. An interdisciplinary approach is fostered by the inclusion of a great variety of professionals in the field, from occupational physicians and nurses to industrial hygienists.

Since its inception the Society has selected about 150 members with a special interest in and commitment to occupational and/or environmental health. Thus far a premium has been placed on keeping the Society a small group of highly expert people who will have real credibility in dealing with all sectors.

Projects now under consideration include a Society sponsored book on occupational lung disease, and conferences on Occupational Health at the Crossroads, on occupational carcinogenesis, and on the basis for beryl-

lium standards. The Society is also attempting to make arrangements with NIOSH to ensure professional input on criteria documents, and with other Federal agencies on similar issues.

Federation members with a special interest in occupational or environmental health may wish to write to Dr. Harry Heimann, Environmental Sciences Laboratory, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, 100th St. & Fifth Avenue, New York City, New York 10029 for application forms. The Society's membership committee will notify you of their decision on the application after it is received.

A different approach is taken by the **Medical Committee for Human Rights'** Occupational Health Project. The crux of the Project is conferences of MCHR doctors and medical students along with local union leaders who gather to organize workers to improve workplace conditions. The Project endeavors to provide the scientific and medical expertise necessary to assist workers in assessing hazards and proposing solutions.

If you are interested in participating in an MCHR conference or in helping in some other way, please contact the Committee at 2251 W. Taylor St., Chicago, Ill. 60612, (312) 243-4137.

### SHELL STRIKE

As of this writing the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union (OCAW) is striking Shell oil refineries, and is asking consumers to boycott Shell products. Rather than the usual demands for more wages, the issues here are a liberalized pension plan and a health and safety contract clause which provides that:

- A Joint Labor-Management Health and Safety Committee with equal representation will be formed.
- At the Committee's determination, the Company will retain at its expense qualified independent industrial health consultants acceptable to both parties, for the purpose of assessing health hazards in the workplace.
- The consultant will furnish measurements of exposures to the Company, the Union President, and the Committee.
- At the Committee's determination, the Company will provide physical examinations and medical tests as the survey shows necessary.
- The Company will annually furnish the Union all morbidity and mortality information on employees.

#### Other Oil Companies Have Already Accepted the Clause

Among the oil companies who have already agreed to this occupational safety and health clause are American, Gulf, Mobil, Atlantic Richfield, Phillips and Citgo. Only Shell and Standard Oil of California (where there are too few OCAW workers to warrant a strike) have held out. What are the reasons?

First of all, the Company holds that the major is-

sue is the Union's demand for increased pension benefits, not the health and safety of the workers.

Second, Shell believes that the clause is really a means for the union to gain control of manpower levels and utilization, as well as capital investment decisions.

#### 1600 Chemicals a Day—How Many Hazards?

These two points are at the heart of the controversy. Neither side attempts to deny the hard facts: workers come in contact with at least 1600 chemicals each day, and little is known about their toxicity—even in the short run.

Another major consideration in the health issue is the physical operation of a refinery. Oil companies can make their profit only if they run each refinery at maximum capacity 24 hours a day. Thus an investment in refurbishing or new equipment to make the plant a better place to work is a bad one from the company's financial standpoint.

#### Alliance with Environmentalists

An interesting sidelight: for the first time, environmentalists have forged an alliance with working people. Such organizations as the Sierra Club and Environmental Action are strongly supporting the strike and boycott.

The Shell strike could continue for another day or another year—the refineries are so automated that they can operate at almost their usual capacity, even when most workers are on strike. If the real issue is, as the union contends, the occupational health and safety clause, the wrangling might last far longer than a simple resolution of the pension review. □

**WHAT YOU CAN DO**

A scientist with a social conscience can help by assisting employers and employees in spotting hazards and interpreting the law. If you are interested in using your expertise to make a better workplace, we suggest that you:

1. Please fill out the box below and send it to us. We will forward you a packet of basic background information on occupational safety and health, and advise organized labor that you are available to provide technical assistance in your area. If your skills are relevant to designing national safety standards, be sure to advise us of that also.
2. Check with your local chamber of commerce or Better Business Bureau and see if you can be useful as an expert consultant or speaker.
3. Check with local labor unions working in areas of special interest to you. Possibly you could organize a "clinic" for workers to keep them informed on job hazards and the law.
4. Ask the stores you patronize if they are aware of the Act and its provisions. Offer to help them interpret and apply it.
5. See if any organization in your area could be persuaded to sponsor an occupational safety and health campaign to improve conditions for workers, especially in small shops.
6. Check with local high school and college vocational counselors to be sure that they are aware of the need for more industrial hygienists and people in allied professions. (Full information is available from the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Assistant Director for Public Information, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20852).
7. Alert your local newspaper to the issues. An enterprising reporter might be glad to have technical assistance in unravelling provisions of the Act and spotting unchecked violations as part of a series on local industrial health conditions. Press attention to these problems can be very useful.

**PLEASE MAIL THIS  
to FAS, 203 C Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20003**

Name -----

Address -----  
-----

Primary Professional Discipline -----

- I enclose \$3.00 for a packet of background information on occupational safety and health.
- Please advise organized labor that I am willing to help in my area.
- I am qualified and willing to assist in projects involving design and review of national safety standards.
- I will also help by -----  
-----

**WATERGATE CONFIRMS DECEMBER  
NEWSLETTER ON DANGER OF  
COVERT OPERATIONS**

In December, FAS released a newsletter on the intelligence community calling for a review, especially of its covert operations. It was noted that political operations—"dirty tricks" that have included secret wars, overthrow of governments and fixing elections as well as more minor activities—were not authorized by the National Security Act of 1947 under which CIA functions.

Furthermore the emergency had passed under which these operations were justified. The hot war associated with the World War II Office of Strategic Services (OSS) was over. The cold war associated with CIA had been punctured by Presidential trips to Moscow and Peking. Did we need to institutionalize interference in the internal affairs of other countries indefinitely? And weren't most of these activities destined to take place in the third world where we were not even at cold war? A *New York Times* op ed article by the FAS Director appeared summarizing this newsletter.

Most important, the newsletter suggested that loss of liberty at home would result from these activities abroad. Recent events involving Watergate have confirmed many of these fears. And a great many commentators have followed the FAS lead. First, Senator William Proxmire produced an excellent speech calling for a review of CIA activities and a 40% cut in the budget for covert operations. Stewart Alsop wrote a widely quoted piece in *Newsweek* calling CRP (Committee to Reelect the President) a direct descendant of the OSS. He said it was waging "war not politics."

Press clippings reveal that E. Howard Hunt sought ex-CIA agents for his activities (i.e. CIA provided a pool of manpower); that he and McCord used their CIA training for their activities; and that CRP, like CIA, got into trouble for having too much money. The Administration effort to involve the CIA in domestic operations, or to use it as a cover for domestic operations, is further indicative of the dangers of doing abroad what one would not countenance at home.

FAS Council Member Morton H. Halperin and FAS Director Jeremy J. Stone prepared a paper on covert operations for the Committee on Public Justice which was holding a meeting on secrecy in New York on May 18-19. The paper argued that the supersecrecy associated with covert operations put them outside the possibility of governmental, much less public, control. The bureaucracy was effectively cut out of planning the operation because of secrecy. The public could not understand many foreign policy dilemmas because it did not know what in fact U.S. foreign policy was permitting; hence the public control over foreign policy was lost. And the judicial branch was forced to hard decisions concerning secrecy and prior restraint of publication, because of the fear that clandestine operations might be disclosed by a free press. The *New York Times* reported on this paper at length on May 20 and it excited a good deal of interest elsewhere.

Many commentators have wondered why the White House risked so much for so little—undertaking patently illegal operations when little of value could have been disclosed. One answer is this: once the general authoriza-



tion for covert activities was provided little attention was given subsequently to the cost-effectiveness of particular covert operations. Thus the President's Watergate statement of May 22 noted that he had given no "specific" authorization for the illegal activities that resulted. Similarly, the Congress—and perhaps on occasion the National Security Council as well—might argue that it had given no "specific" authorization for a particular CIA covert operation. In short, the moral of our December newsletter may be the moral of Watergate—it can be a fatal error to institutionalize covert operations. Like the proverbial Pandora's box, control is lost when the lid is lifted. □

**MORRISON-ANFINSSEN ELECTED CHAIRMAN, VICE CHAIRMAN OF FAS**

Dr. Philip Morrison, MIT Professor of Physics and book reviewer for *Scientific American*, was elected Chairman of FAS for the one year term beginning June 1. Formerly FAS Vice Chairman, Dr. Morrison was a founding member of the Association of Los Alamos Scientists and has been involved in FAS affairs for more than a quarter century. He is known for his encyclopedic knowledge of many fields of science.

In a close contest, biochemist Christian B. Anfinsen defeated physicist Francis E. Low for Vice Chairman. Dr. Anfinsen, of the National Heart Institute, received the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 1972. He is a former Vice Chairman of FAS from the late fifties. Dr. Low, of the MIT faculty, was elected to a four year term on the Federation's National Council. In the past, he has served as Chairman of two different FAS chapters.

An uncommonly strong slate of nine candidates stood for election for six slots on the FAS Council. Besides Dr. Low, the new Council members elected were:

Dr. Garret Hardin, professor of Human Ecology at the University of California at Santa Barbara. Dr. Hardin is a leading writer and lecturer on human ecology and the author of *The Tragedy of the Commons*.

Mr. Denis Hayes, graduate student in Environmental Policy studies at Stanford University. Mr. Hayes organized

Earth Day 1970 as well as Environmental Action, and has served on a wide range of environmental study groups.

Dr. Marc J. Roberts, Associate Professor of Economics at Harvard University. Professor Roberts was a leading adviser on environmental economics to Senator George McGovern during the 1972 campaign.

Dr. Raphael Littauer, Professor of Physics at Cornell. Dr. Littauer assembled and directed the interdisciplinary group at Cornell which completed the famous study *Air War in Indochina* summarized in the February 1972 newsletter.

Dr. David Baltimore, American Cancer Society Professor of Microbiology at MIT. Dr. Baltimore was the winner of the Eli Lilly Award in 1971 and is an adviser to the Center for Science in the Public Interest.

**SUMMER AT FAS**

The FAS Newsletter is not published during the summer. Instead, activity centers on lobbying and preparing for the next academic year including promotional material and plans for growth.

In particular, we plan to inaugurate a new publication during the 1973-74 academic year: the FAS Professional Bulletin. This publication will discuss those matters of overriding professional concern to scientists which are simultaneously, if indirectly, also of national concern. It will serve also as a vehicle for organizational concerns and discussions, and will be sent only to members.

The present FAS Newsletter will be rechristened the FAS Public Interest Report (for short, the FAS Report) and will continue, as before to be devoted to legislative lobbying in the public interest. Our complete reasoning and detailed plans will be sent to members subsequently. But we wanted you to know that we would be as busy as always.

June 1973, Vol. 26, No. 6

**FAS NEWSLETTER** (202) 546-3300  
203 C Street, N.E., Washington, D. C. 20002

I wish to join FAS and receive the Newsletter. Enclosed is my check for 1973 calendar year dues. ( I am not a natural or social scientist or engineer, but wish to become a non-voting Associate Member.)

\$15 Member     \$50 Supporting     \$100 Patron     \$500 Life     \$7.50 Student or Retired

In addition to joining FAS, I wish to become a TACTIC Participant and enclose an additional \$5. My Congressional District is \_\_\_\_\_

**NEWSLETTER ONLY:** I do not wish to become a member, but would like a subscription to the FAS Newsletter. Rates: \$15 per calendar year for individuals or institutions, (libraries, government, etc.).

NAME AND TITLE \_\_\_\_\_  
Please Print

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY AND STATE \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE: \_\_\_\_\_

Second Class Postage  
Paid at  
Washington, D. C.

Return Postage  
Guaranteed