

Open Letter to Rockefeller Notes We Still Have Rat-Infested Slums

Norman Thomas Sees Build-Up for Preventive War in Fallout Shelter Program

Dear Governor Rockefeller:

My morning paper gives the summary of the report of your Special Task Force on Protection from Radioactive Fallout whose recommendations, we are told, you heartily approve. I would not lightly oppose recommendations looking to the savings of any lives in the horror of nuclear war. But the report raises some unanswered questions.

With probably unconscious irony the TV program, *Today*, followed its account of your Committee's recommendations of compulsory requirement of fallout shelters by a story of the campaign against rats in the slum districts in which a child died of a rat bite. (Her pathetic mother appeared on a screen).

It is indeed a mad world wherein the state must impose on us a great expense for dubious protection against radioactivity in possible war before it has protected its children from rats and the slums that breed them.

Our New Breed of Mad Scientists

But perhaps we must accept Blaise Pascal's judgment: 'Men are mad so unavoidably that not to be mad would constitute one a madman of another order of madness.' Anyway as long as scientists like Herman Kahn, directly or indirectly in the employ of our government, go around testifying that the question "Is it ever *profitable* to initiate a thermonuclear war?" (italics mine) must under some circumstances be answered in the affirmative, we are faced with a type of madness, American as well as Russian, that might justify our government in the year of our Lord 1959 in compelling this provision of poor shelters against a possibly suicidal annihilation of our race.

That they are poor protectors of our lives to say nothing of our civilization is obvious. What scientists say they are adequate? Remember recent testimony that one "moderate" sized attack with hydrogen bombs, without follow-up or supplementary use of bacteriological weapons, would kill 6,089,000 people in the New York area while destroying some quarter of our national population and about half of our homes. We would get no warning of this attack. Who would get into shelters? How long would those outside the immediate area of total destruction and great fallout have to stay inside crowded shelters sustained by the supplies your

Peace Is Horrible?

Dear Mr. Stone:

Although Herman Kahn may give the impression that he invented everything, Monte Carlo Problem is not a name coined for the occasion. More properly Monte Carlo Method is the name for the method used by J. von Neumann and Stanislaus Ulam whereby the answer to a mathematical problem may be obtained from the results of a related problem in statistics. Poor H. K. Peace is horrible? He never had it so good!

A Scientist Reader in Texas

Committee recommends us to hoard? Would they be insensitive to the misery outside the dubious shelters? What would happen to orderly processes of life and government, especially since we should have to expect a second attack to follow the first? These questions demand something far more definite than your Committee's cheerful assurance of survival to "millions." Might the survivors not envy the dead?

Survival is not the only concern of your Committee. It hopes to inspire confidence in our people—all of whom will identify themselves with survivors—and scare off a potential enemy. Compulsory provision of shelters it says "can instill in all our people a confidence that, while nuclear war need not come, if it is brought to our continent by an attacking enemy, we will respond with vigor and success. It will provide abundant notice of our purpose to achieve peace by assuring the survival of our people and democratic institutions."

Perhaps—provided, of course, that our survivors manage indiscriminately to kill more human beings called the enemy in or out of their shelters. But this rush to compel the building of shelters will everywhere be coupled with growing talk of "preemptive," i.e. preventive war and with our Federal government's zeal to enlarge the nuclear club by gifts to Germany, Turkey, Greece and others. May it not then be interpreted by the Russian people as final proof that we plan aggressive war and by their dictator as a stimulus to attack before shelters are built if he thinks he has the missile superiority which some experts credit him with? Such questions are not rhetorical. They require an answer.

Sincerely yours, Norman Thomas

Harriman Explains Why He Thinks Krushchev Wants Armament Reduction

Mr. COLLINGWOOD: Did you get any impression from him [Khrushchev] that this [i.e. the arms burden] is causing a conflict with his desires and his promises to raise the standard of living of the ordinary Soviet citizen?

Governor HARRIMAN: Oh, very definitely. He didn't say so in so many words. But he talked in such a way that I had the idea that there was a heavy load.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD: What kind of thing did he say?

Governor HARRIMAN: He asked me who would be the next President of the United States. And I told him that I didn't know, but I was quite convinced it would be a Democrat. I gave him the names of the five leading candidates. He didn't have any comment on any of them. But then he said what would be the change in policy. And I said, 'Well, of course, the Democrats wouldn't be so concerned about balancing the budget—they would be ready to spend the money necessary to keep abreast of you in the missile race and in the nuclear field, or in any other aspect of defense.'

And he said, 'You mean to say they would spend more money?' And I said, 'Yes, that's just what I mean.' He said, 'Well, that will mean we'll have to spend more money.'

I got the very great impression that not only did he not want to spend more money, but the money he was now spending was a burden to him, and he recognized it was competitive with the promises he hopes to fulfil.

Therefore, I think the summit conference should be thought of, not in terms of Berlin—I think there is too much emphasis on Berlin. I would like to see the Foreign Ministers get off it and get on the subject of control of nuclear tests and other aspects of disarmament which have been discussed between us for years and years and years, where at least we know where there are points of differences. And I cannot help but believe that there would be some progress made in this field, because I think this is an area that he wants to come to some understanding.

—Report on Russia: The Harriman Trip, CBS, July 12.

Hearings Open on Travel Bills, Including Humphrey's Measure to Guarantee It

Fulbright Bill Would Bar Faceless Informers in Passport Hearings

A welcome change in atmosphere is reflected in the passport bills on which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee began hearings last week. Two years ago, as readers will remember, the State Department was able to get liberal Democrats to sponsor a bill which would have written its star chamber passport hearings procedures into law.

This year only Wiley of Wisconsin could be prevailed on to introduce S. 2315, the State Department bill. Liberal Democrats led by Humphrey (with Anderson, Chavez, Hennings, Morse, Neuberger, and Symington) are sponsoring S. 806 which would affirm the right to travel and forbid the denial of passports on political grounds. This bill, S. 806, is supported by the American Civil Liberties Union, the ADA, and the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

The Right to Confront Accusers

A kind of compromise measure, S. 2287, is sponsored by Fulbright, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His bill deserves praise for one striking feature. It is the first bill to exclude "faceless informer" testimony from an administrative hearing dealing with loyalty-security matters. The bill would allow an applicant in passport hearings "to examine all documentary evidence, including confidential data, introduced against him to cross-examine the sources thereof; to cross-examine all witnesses, including confidential informants."

But the Fulbright bill does allow a passport to be denied where "there are reasonable grounds to believe" that the applicant when abroad would transit "highly classified secrets" or endanger the national security by "inciting, or conspiring to bring about," hostilities which might involve the United States or attempts to overthrow its government. Since conspiracy to commit any of these acts would be a crime, it can and should be punished by indictment or trial if there is evidence to prove it. If the evidence is not sufficient, why it should be the basis of denying the right to travel? The ACLU is opposing the bill on these grounds.

Senator Fulbright, in a memorandum on his bill, stresses the fact that its provisions "would not permit the Depart-

Affirming the Right to Travel

"Congress finds . . . the right to travel abroad a part of the liberty of which citizens . . . cannot be deprived . . . under the Fifth Amendment. . . . It is also the sense of the Congress . . . that no test of beliefs or associations shall be applied to issuance of passports."

—S. 806, by Humphrey (with Anderson, Chavez, Hennings, Morse, Neuberger and Symington).

ment to inquire into [Communist] Party affiliations in the 1930's and 40's, since in those days the nature of the Communist threat was unknown to many loyal, law-abiding Americans." Nor would the bill "sanction inquiry into the activities of applicants relating to so-called 'left-wing' or 'front' organizations" unless linked to proof of attempts to transmit secrets or overthrow the government.

"My bill," Senator Fulbright said, "focusses on conduct that presents a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and in no way attempts to curb expression of unpopular beliefs or association with unpopular groups."

It still seems to us that if the danger is clear and present, it should be clear enough for criminal prosecution under the conspiracy laws. Otherwise we create a dangerous twilight zone of surmise and suspicion in which due process in any real sense becomes impossible. Yet refusal of the right to travel on loyalty-security grounds creates as much of a stain on a man's reputation as conviction of a crime.

Scott Nearing's Passport Revoked

We also think the bill objectionable in that it allows the Department to use passport control to shut off travel to certain countries. This is really a modified form of thought control, an invasion of freedom of the press, a denial to the public of access to the facts on which to reach its own opinion on such matters as recognition of Communist China. In this connection we want to call attention to the Department's action in revoking the passports of Scott and Helen Nearing for having gone to China. This is the Iron Curtain mentality in our own country.

Make Friends and Influence People By Giving Them A Gift Subscription Using the Blank Below

**I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.**

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:*

Name

Street

CityZone.....State.....

7/20/59

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name

Street

CityZone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U. S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.