

terests of the United States". According to an announcement made on November 5th by Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, the office was established at the direction of the President on the recommendation of the National Security Council.

"In this cooperative effort at self-protection," Mr. Weeks said, "we will undertake to revitalize the voluntary system of carefully evaluating the export of scientific, engineering, and other information of a non-statistical nature which, while unclassified, might nonetheless be prejudicial to our national security if it fell into unfriendly hands. Such watchfulness would not take the form of censorship. It would instead be a matter of exercising intelligent, reasonable precaution to make sure that in the necessarily free exchange of scientific information we do not provide nations whose interests are inimical to our own with material which they could some day use against us. The key to success of this program lies in the cooperation of all who develop and disseminate our national knowhow."

The Secretary has appointed R. Karl Honaman as special consultant and director of the new office. Mr. Honaman, an electrical engineer, is on loan from the Bell Telephone Laboratories in New York City, where he is director of publication. He will work with a committee of Commerce Department information, security, and administrative officials in carrying out the functions of the office.

Criticism of the Administration's action in establishing the Office of Strategic Information was promptly offered by the American Society of Newspaper Editors in the form of a report filed by the Society's Freedom of Information Committee. Terming the move "the most serious threat to freedom of information that has developed in the Eisenhower Administration," the committee said that, regardless of the voluntary devices employed, "a proposal under which the government is going to 'help' the American press decide what non-classified information it ought to print and what it ought not to print is a species of censorship of the most offensive and dangerous kind."

NAS-NRC Activities, 1953-54

HIGHLIGHTS of the varied undertakings of the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council for the period July 1953 to June 1954 have been summarized by S. D. Cornell, NAS-NRC executive officer, in the bimonthly publication *News Report*. During the year some four hundred meetings were held, several thousand fellowship and research grant applications were evaluated under programs in which the Academy-Research Council plays a part, about fifty NAS-NRC scientific and technical publications were printed, and a large number of permanent and ad hoc committees and other groups conducted special studies and prepared advice on scientific matters for government agencies and private organizations. These and other activities were carried out during the

one-year period with a total expenditure of approximately \$5.5 million, of which somewhat more than thirty percent came from private grants, contracts, and endowment income, while the remainder came from federal government sources. In addition, Dr. Cornell notes, the expenditure by other agencies of more than \$2 million of private funds and more than \$6 million of government funds in the support of science through fellowships, grants-in-aid of research, and by basic research contracts was directly guided by advice rendered by NAS-NRC.

AIP Advisory Committee to NBS

THE National Bureau of Standards faced a crisis in the spring of 1953 as a result of a controversy over the Bureau's position on certain types of battery additives. At the height of the tense situation, Secretary Weeks decided to attempt to resolve the controversy by seeking the advice of an Ad Hoc Committee composed of representatives of the professional scientific and engineering societies. L. A. DuBridge was appointed the American Institute of Physics representative of this group, which popularly came to be called the Kelly Committee since M. J. Kelly of the Bell Telephone Laboratories was its chairman. The committee was singularly effective in resolving the crisis through a series of actions and through recommendations contained in its final report of October 15, 1953. For example, its work in no small measure led to the reinstatement of A. V. Astin as Director of the Bureau.

Among other things, the Kelly Committee advised that the Bureau focus most of its attention on the activities of primary Bureau interest and serve appreciably less as an organization which operates installations for other governmental agencies through use of transferred funds.

The legislation establishing the Bureau of Standards provides that the Secretary of Commerce have a five man Visiting Committee to furnish him with advice on the activities of the Bureau. The Kelly Committee recommended that the advisory system be augmented by the formation of a set of Technical Advisory Committees whose members would be selected by the eight leading professional societies and which would report to the Director of the Bureau in order to advise both him and his staff on matters which the committees and staff consider worthwhile. This plan was accepted enthusiastically by Secretary Weeks and the Bureau staff and has now been placed in operation.

Since many of the most important activities of the Bureau lie in the various fields of physics, it is evident that the committee appointed by the AIP will play a central role in the new advisory structure. This group consists of J. W. Beams, D. M. Dennison, E. M. Purcell, J. A. Bearden, M. Deutsch, R. B. Lindsay, F. Seitz (Chairman), Hale Sabine, and R. A. Sawyer. L. D. Marinelli of the Radiological Physics Division of Argonne National Laboratory is also serving with the

committee by invitation. Three of the nine men appointed by the AIP will be replaced each year so that each man will serve for three years.

The AIP committee held an organizational meeting on May 1, 1954, at the Bureau. In cooperation with the Bureau staff, it decided that it should devote most of its attention to three of the Bureau's 14 Divisions, namely Divisions 2, 3, and 4 which are concerned with Optics and Metrology, Heat and Power (including cryogenics) and Atomic and Radiation Physics. As a result the group divided into three panels, each of which will give particular attention to one of the Divisions.

The Committee chairmen met on August 15 to discuss intercommittee relations and agreed that it would be highly desirable to have members of one committee serve with the panels of another in cases in which individual interests evidently would make this profitable. For example, Mr. Sabine of the American Acoustical Society can serve very effectively on the panel of Division 6, devoted to Mechanics.

The Physics Committee held its first full-fledged meeting on November 13, at the Bureau. The morning session was spent with Dr. Astin, two of the Associate Directors, Drs. Brode and Huntoon, and six of the Division Chiefs, Drs. Alt, Brickwedde, Gardner, Ramberg, Silsbee and Taylor, in a detailed discussion of the Bureau's organization and operating problems. During the afternoon each of the three panels met with the heads of the Sections of the Divisions for which the panels have primary responsibility and discussed a wide variety of matters covering such topics as research programs, budget limitations, acquisition of new personnel, divisional meeting, and interdivisional cooperation.

It is felt that the Advisory Committee will aid the Bureau in many ways. Not only are the members experts in various fields of fundamental and applied physics, but many have first-hand experience in the problems of organizing, operating, and financing laboratories which can be added to the broad experience of the Bureau's excellent staff. Still further, the Committees provide a direct link between the typical Bureau scientist and engineer and his colleagues having parallel interest in other parts of the country. While membership in professional societies furnishes some of this, the committee pattern provides a far more intimate relationship.

It has already become evident to the AIP committee that the Bureau is operating under much too restricted a budget. This fact is clearly recognized by the Department of Commerce which authorized the Bureau last year to request from the Congress an increase in its budget of about 30 percent. Although only a fraction of the increase was allowed, the Department is actively supporting an even larger request for next year.

It is also evident to the Committee that the operations of the Bureau are greatly impeded by the fact that none of the funds allotted to it directly by the Congress have longevity beyond June 30 of the fiscal year in which the money is voted. This means, for example, that the Bureau is seriously restricted in employing new graduates of universities. It cannot make

commitments in the spring, when most graduates seek jobs, for the following summer or fall, since the new positions cannot be guaranteed until the new budget is passed after July 1. This disadvantage and others related to it would be remedied if a fraction of the budget of the Bureau were given a lifetime beyond one year. It is important to note that this principle is now clearly recognized by the government in contracting for research and development. Most of the funds allocated directly to organizations such as the Office of Naval Research and the Office of Scientific Research of ARDC have a longevity of three years, once they have been contracted.

The financial problems of the Bureau represent, of course, only one facet of the important complex being considered by the Committees, although they are among the most obviously pressing ones at the moment. Viewed in the whole, the National Bureau of Standards is an essential national agency which has no counterpart in our country and which provides a unique service to our scientific and technical life. Any help and advice which the professional groups can give to make certain that it is rendering its service in the most effective and efficient manner can only act to strengthen our material fabric.

F. Seitz

Applied Mathematics Committee

ANOTHER part of the advisory committee organization mentioned above, the Technical Advisory Committee for the Applied Mathematics Division of NBS, is nominated by the Policy Committee of the Mathematical Societies of America, which was one of the eight organizations represented on the original Kelly Committee.

Although the advisory group primarily represents mathematicians, parts of the Applied Mathematics Division's work are of considerable interest in terms of physics and the Policy Committee consequently nominated two physicists, Philip M. Morse of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Edward Teller of the University of California, to sit as members of the Advisory Committee. The other members are David Blackwell of Howard University, Mark Kac of Cornell University, Mina S. Rees of Hunter College, and A. H. Taub of the University of Illinois.

The latest meeting of the Committee was on October 23rd, at which time the work load of the Division was considered and the needs for new computing equipment were discussed. The Division deals with the computing and statistical problems of the Bureau and other governmental agencies and to some extent of research elsewhere in the country. It has four sections: a numerical analysis section; a statistical engineering laboratory; a mathematical physics section; and a computation laboratory, which puts out the NBS Mathematical Tables and programs and schedules the Bureau's high-speed computing machine, the SEAC.