

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 47

DECEMBER 9, 1957



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Ten Years After, Mr. X Would Substitute Disengagement for Containment

Exclusive! Kennan Opposes Nuclear Tests in BBC Talk

In a series of weekly lectures over the BBC in London, George F. Kennan has been having a fresh look at the doctrine of containment he launched ten years ago. In these lectures, of which four had been delivered at the time we write, our former Ambassador to Moscow is illustrating the poverty of ideas which mark not only the Eisenhower administration but the Democratic opposition, the former still inanely rigid, the latter feverishly insistent on greater urgency but in no visible direction other than the same brink on which Mr. Dulles performs. Unfortunately there are as yet available no full texts of the Kennan lectures as delivered. The *New York Times* has reported them less fully than the *Times* of London. Even coverage in the latter—judging by the uncorrected advance texts supplied us here in Washington by the British Broadcasting Company—has not been satisfactory. The most striking gap in coverage seems to be the omission from the news accounts of the eloquent passage reprinted in the adjoining box in which Mr. Kennan pleads for an end of nuclear testing. Whether this excerpt from the advance text was omitted at the last moment in delivery or whether it has just been ignored we were still unable to learn as we went to press.

If Socialism Is What They Want . . .

It is easy to understand from these lectures why Mr. Kennan was eased out of the State Department so soon after Mr. Dulles's advent. For in them Mr. Kennan not only proposes the abandonment of containment for disengagement but demolishes the foundations of cold war policy, particularly the notion that if it were not for our possession of the atomic bomb the Russians would have moved in on Western Europe and precipitated a new world war long ago. Though he has his own profound disagreements with the Russian leaders he knows so well and has some very just observations to make on the habits of self-deception to which the opportunistic Leninist dismissal of objective truth has led, he attacks as unsound the idea which since 1947 has equated them with the Hitler crowd and posited no means, of dealing with them except on the similar basis of unconditional surrender. He believes it unfair to expect them to agree to the reunification of a rearmed Germany in NATO, and he sees a neutralized Germany as the cornerstone of a mutual withdrawal of Soviet and American armies which would really liberate Eastern Europe. He would liberate it not only from Russian occupation but from American preconceptions. "If socialism is what these people want and need," Mr. Kennan said in the

Man's Duty to The Future

"I have expressly refrained from speaking, in connection with these other matters, of that aspect of the atomic problem that now worries many of my countrymen most of all: namely, the damage that may be done to our human environment and to the genetic make-up of human beings by the mere testing of these fearful weapons, not to mention their actual use in war.

"I would like to say that I have the deepest misgivings and feelings of conscience about the continued testing of these devices. I believe that man's duty is not to this generation alone, but also to those who have gone before and to those who will come after us.

"Could anything be more egotistical and more presumptuous than to alter, in the interests of our own physical survival, the environment in which it was given us to live? Surely it is better that many of us should die somewhat before our time, than that we should live at the cost of prejudicing the conditions of life for our children. So long, therefore, as the scientists disagree about the effects of all this testing, it is our duty to be guided by our obligation to the other generations—not just to our own."

—George F. Kennan, *Reith Lecture No. 4, BBC, Sun. Dec. 1 (uncorrected advance text).*

advance text of his third lecture, "so be it; but let it by all means be their own choice."

Against A Tighter NATO

In a striking distortion, the *New York Times* (Nov. 18) headlined its report of Mr. Kennan's second lecture, "Kennan Holds Talk with Soviet Futile." On the contrary, though dubious of sensational summit talks, Mr. Kennan pleaded for an unrelenting patient diplomatic effort, issue by issue, in search of agreement with the Russians. For this reason he strongly opposed a tighter NATO structure. "The delicate explorations and discussions which must precede accommodation in complex international questions," said the advance text of his second lecture, "cannot be conducted by a coalition, operating on the basis of sporadic, unanimous and highly formalized decisions." In his fourth he opposed the current policy of giving out nuclear weapons. "A defense posture," he said, "built around a weapon of suicidal destruction can serve only to paralyze national policy." As for the notion that tactical nuclear weapons would be "relatively harmless things," he added in the same address. "Even the tactical atomic weapons are destructive to a degree that sickens the imagination."

The Inside Story of Ten Years of Security-Loyalty Mania Persecution . . .

Dr. E. U. Condon Lifts the Curtain Before the American Physical Society

By Dr. Edward U. Condon

From an address the press neglected before the American Physical Society Nov. 29 in St. Louis by the former director of the National Bureau of Standards, now head of the department of physics at Washington University.

Please forgive me if tonight I discuss an old and tiresome subject. I want to make some remarks about the political abuse of the personnel security system, which has done so much in the past decade to blight the relations of loyal American scientists and their Government.

During the last two months there has come about a general public awareness that America is not automatically, and effortlessly and unquestionably the leader of the world in science and technology. This comes as no surprise to those of us who have watched and tried to warn against the steady deterioration in the teaching of science and mathematics in the schools for the past quarter century.

It comes as no surprise to those who have known dozens of cases of scientists who have been hounded out of jobs by silly disloyalty charges, and kept out of all professional employment by widespread blacklisting practices. It comes as no surprise to those of us who have known how good American scientists have had to face vilification by political speech-makers in and out of Congress, and have been falsely prosecuted for perjury, and have been improperly denied passports, or have had their passports seized and invalidated without due process by the State Department, or who have had their telephones tapped or their letters intercepted by government agents.

Ten Years of Persecution

I do not wish to be boastful, and in this respect I would gladly change places with any of you, but I think that I have probably had a bigger dose of this kind of mistreatment than any of my fellow members of the American Physical Society. It began ten years ago last summer.

In that time I have had two full scale loyalty hearings in the Department of Commerce, a full field investigation for the Atomic Energy Commission which occupied the best efforts of 300 FBI agents, and finally in 1954 had a hearing under the policies and procedures set up by this administration. In all of these I received full clearance. All covered essentially the same ground which was no ground at all. The House Committee on Un-American Activities made numerous attacks on me in 1947 and 1948 before its then chairman went off to serve a term in Federal penitentiary as a common crook. Finally this Committee staged a political hearing on the same old stale and outworn material just before the 1952 elections.

During most of this period I kept on working to develop the scientific strength and stature of the National Bureau of Standards.

Helped on H-Bomb

Edward Teller told this last personnel security board hearing in April 1954 that the Bureau's work on the hydrogen bomb which I organized advanced our achievement of that goal by many months, probably a year. If he is correct in

Dangerous National Habit

"It seems to me that the population of this country has a considerable predilection for trusting essentially stupid people and mistrusting those who are brilliant.

—Nobel Prize Winner Harold C. Urey, addressing Science and Mathematics Teachers, Chicago, Nov. 30.

the implication that without that work we would have been delayed by about a year, then the lack of that work would have made us come in second in the international rivalry for the hydrogen bomb.

Nevertheless all the old stuff was rehashed once again in 1952 and again in 1954. I was badgered all those years for having been interested in the American Soviet Science Society, an organization which received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation ten years ago to foster translation and wider distribution in this country of the Russian scientific literature. Now, a decade later, we read of crash programs to translate the Russian scientific literature and spread it around in this country. Why, man, you can't do that: that's subversive!

In July 1954 I was given complete security clearance by the Eastern Industrial Personnel Security Board. You might think now that I would be allowed to go back to work. Yet in October, 1954, just before the election, we find Nixon making his twenty-years-of-treason speeches and boasting that he got the Secretary of the Navy to suspend my clearance, as was done on October 21.

Seven Years of Smear

Try to picture the situation. I had been under steady political attack for seven years, and had won at every hearing. But now I was told that I would have to go over all the same material again, before a kangaroo court whose members were to be hand picked to do their job by Defense Department officials.

Many of my friends had been persecuted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Some of them had taken refuge abroad. Our good friend and past president, Robert Oppenheimer, who brilliantly built and led the Los Alamos laboratory during the war, had just been publicly disgraced by an official action of the government. The scientific staff of the Signal Corps laboratories at Fort Monmouth had suffered a blow from which it has not yet recovered through the irresponsible attacks of Joseph McCarthy—attacks which the President had not resisted until McCarthy began lobbying his shots toward the White House.

It was plain that our scientific leadership in Washington felt powerless to do anything. I discussed the problem at the National Academy of Sciences. I asked our good friend and past president, I. I. Rabi, whether possibly something could be done by another of our good friends and past presidents, Lee DuBridge. For Lee was at that time chairman of the same scientific advisory board to the President that Rabi now heads. I was told that Lee himself was having security clearance troubles!

Under those circumstances, I decided then, and I still think correctly, that the Administration was committed by policy to persecution of scientists, or, at the very least, to a callous in-