

# Nine Noted Scientists Urge War Ban

## Warning on Nuclear Peril Was Signed by Einstein

By PETER D. WHITNEY

Special to The New York Times.

LONDON, July 9.—Nine eminent scientists, including the late Albert Einstein, have appealed to the nations to forswear war because the hydrogen bomb threatens "the continued existence of mankind."

Bertrand Russell, British mathematician and philosopher, revealed today that Einstein subscribed to the appeal in a letter that reached London today the physicist died in Princeton, N. J., April 18.

The appeal called on other scientists, in both the Communist and non-Communist worlds, to join in a conference. Its object would be to drive home to the average man the "very real danger of the extermination of the human race by dust and rain from radioactive clouds."

Among the signers were seven Nobel Prize winners. One of them, Prof. Leopold Infeld of Warsaw University, is behind the Iron Curtain. Another, Prof. Frédéric Joliot-Curie of France, is well known as a Communist sympathizer.

The American signers, besides Einstein, were Prof. Percy W. Bridgman, physicist of Harvard, and Prof. Hermann J. Muller,



Bertrand Russell reads a statement subscribed to by Albert Einstein just before his death and signed by eight other scientists calling for the renunciation of war.

Associated Press Radio photo

geneticist of Indiana University, both Nobel Prize winners.

Lord Russell today sent copies of the statement to President Eisenhower, Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin of the Soviet Union, Prime Minister Eden of Britain, President René Coty of France, Mao Tse-tung, Chinese Communist leader, and Prime Minister

Louis S. St. Laurent of Canada—the heads of countries that have acquired or will eventually acquire nuclear armaments. Lord Russell said the campaign by the scientists grew out of a broadcast he gave here last Dec. 23 on the nuclear peril. He received many letters of congratulation.

Continued on Page 25, Column 2

# PENTAGON IS GOING TO RUSSELL PLAN TO PRESERVE BONUS

## Burgess Expresses Doubt That Method Would Win Enough Volunteers

By The United Press.

WASHINGTON, July 9.—Senator L. Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense, voiced today that a voluntary Reserve training program, even with bonus inducements, would in the type and size of reserve needed for national defense.

He indicated that the Department would oppose proposal by Senator Richard Russell that the Administrative Reserve plan scrapped in favor of a voluntary \$400 bonus-incentive plan. Georgia Democrat is chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Senator Russell's proposal offered yesterday, caught Administration by surprise. Defense officials had expected compulsory plan would be stronger than the House version.

Now President Eisenhower finds himself embroiled in opposition move that may result in jettisoning one of main planks of his plan. Defense officials, headed by Mr. Burgess, will go before Senate committee Monday in effort to salvage the President's program.

# Texts of Appeal by Noted Scientists for Abolition of War

Sent to The New York Times  
LONDON, July 9.—Following are the facts of a statement to the press by Bertrand Russell and of a statement on nuclear warfare, signed by leading scientists (Albert Einstein signed just before his death):

## Russell Statement

The accompanying statement, which has been signed by some of the most eminent scientific authorities in different parts of the world, deals with the perils of a nuclear war. It makes it clear that neither side can hope for victory in such a war and that there is a very real danger of the extermination of the human race by dust and rain from radioactive clouds.

It suggests that neither the public nor the governments of the world are adequately aware of the danger. It points out that an agreed prohibition of nuclear weapons, while it might be useful in lessening tension, would not afford a solution, since such weapons would certainly be manufactured and used in a great war in spite of previous agreements to the contrary.

The only hope for mankind is the avoidance of war. To call for a way of thinking which shall make such avoidance possible is the purpose of this statement.

The first move came as a collaboration between Einstein and myself. Einstein's signature was given in the last week of his life. Since his death I have approached men of scientific competence both in the East and in the West, for political disagreements should not influence men of science in estimating what is probable, but since those approached have not yet replied, I am bringing the warning pronounced by the signatories to the notice of the world in the earnest hope that they may agree to allow their citizens to survive.

## Scientists' Statement

In the tragic situation which confronts humanity, we feel that scientists should assemble in conference to appraise the perils that have arisen as a result of the development of weapons of mass destruction, and to discuss a resolution in the spirit of the appended draft.

We are speaking on this occasion, not as members of one or that nation, continent or creed, but as human beings, members of the species man, whose continued existence is in doubt. The world is full of conflicts, and overshadowing all human activities the terrible struggle between communism and anti-communism.

## Scientists Ask Abolition of War; Einstein Among Signers of Plea

Continued From Page 1

Frakulation, among them one from Professor Joliot-Curie.

"I was pleased, because he is not only an eminent scientist but a noted Communist," Lord Russell said at a press conference today. The letter encouraged him to try to bridge differences between the Communist and anti-Communist worlds by an appeal to the scientists, who understand the great danger.

Lord Russell was a pacifist in World War I, but in 1949 he said he would prefer a third world with atomic bombs to world domination by the Soviet Union. He made clear today his views had changed only in that he considered nuclear weapons had made the atomic bomb "like bows and arrows."

He said he wrote to Einstein suggesting that scientists "do something dramatic, and get wholehearted approval. The anti-physicist nominated Lord Russell to be "dictator of the letter" and signed the letter when it was sent to him before the others.

The letter was sent to eighteen scientists, of whom seven more agreed. Others were unwilling to sign because they held official posts but they were sympathetic. Prof. Dmitry V. Sitobeltzky of Moscow gave a friendly but noncommittal reply. Others, including China's Prof. Li See-Kuang, did not answer.

Professor Joliot-Curie's letter, last to arrive, contained a reservation limiting the ban on war to its use "as means of settling differences between states." This was construed by Lord Russell as intended to preserve the right of internal revolution.

Professor Muller also entered a reservation making plain that a reservation should not be solely in nuclear weapons but a balanced reduction "of all armaments."

Asked if he did not fear that

his campaign might be exploited by the Communists, Lord Russell said he was sure he could prevent that.

"Their line is to prohibit the bomb," he said. "I am not in favor of prohibition, but of making it quite clear what will happen if it is used."

The scientists' appeal says the hope for safety by prohibition is "illusory." It argues that both sides would consider agreements no longer binding when war broke out and would set to work to manufacture hydrogen bombs. The only solution, it declared, is the abolition of war itself.

The significance of the adherence by Professor Joliot-Curie and Professor Infield to a statement so thoroughly at variance with the Communist line of the last ten years was being discussed today.

Lord Russell said the statement meant that all nine signers dissented from the official anti-Communist line of the United States put forward in the limited danger of radioactivity. He said he thought "some of these" had been "not strictly accurate."

The statement declared that "the best authorities are unanimous in saying that a war with H-bombs might quite possibly put an end to the human race."

"Here, then," the statement declared, "is the problem which we present to you, stark and dreadful, and inescapable: shall we put an end to the human race—or shall mankind renounce war?"

## Vatican Praises Appeal

ROME, July 9 (UP)—Vatican sources tonight praised Einstein's warning against the danger of atomic war as a "noble appeal" and recalled similar warnings by Pope Pius XIII.

"Any warning in this field is always welcome," the more so as many who unfortunately would not listen to the voice of faith and revelation do listen to scientists," the sources said.

Other, all, equally, are in peril, and if the peril is understood, there is hope that they may collectively avert it. We have to learn to think in a new way. We have to learn to ask ourselves, not what steps can be taken to give military victory to whatever group we prefer, for there no longer are such steps; the question we have to ask ourselves is: what steps can be taken to prevent a military

## Senators Call War Ban Futile Unless Enforced

WASHINGTON, July 9 (UP)—Congressmen and Government officials today happily endorsed the plea of Albert Einstein and eight other renowned scientists that the new renounce war rather than risk atomic annihilation.

Two Democratic Senators said, however, that an agreement against war was a lofty ideal, but something that defied enforcement.

Senator Henry M. Jackson, Washington Democrat, a member of the Senate Atomic Energy Committee on Atomic Energy, said "for the past thirty years we have had people suggesting that we renounce war and make agreements to do so."

"This declaration from Lord Einstein is a pious hope," he added, "but it will have very little meaning in this atomic age until there is means of enforcing it."

Senator Albert Gore, Tennessee Democrat, also a member of the atomic committee, said he agreed with the declaration "as an ideal," "But," he added, "there remains the practical problem of dealing with aggression in its devious modern-day forms—subversion, infiltration and revolution."

## The Power of New Bombs

It is stated on very good authority that a bomb can now be manufactured which will be 2,500 times as powerful as that which destroyed Hiroshima.

Such a bomb, if exploded near the ground or under water, sends radioactive particles into the upper air. They sink gradually and reach the surface of the earth in the form of a deadly dust or rain. It was this dust which infected the Japanese fishermen and their catch of fish.

No one knows how widely such lethal radioactive particles might be diffused, but the best authorities are unanimous in saying that a war with H-bombs might quite possibly put an end to the human race. It is feared that if many H-bombs are used there will be universal death—sudden only for a minority, but for the majority a slow torture of disease and disintegration.

Many warnings have been uttered by eminent men of science and by authorities in military strategy. "None of them will say that the worst results are certain. What they do say is that these results are possible, and no one can be sure that they will not be realized. We have not yet found that the views of experts on this question depend in any degree upon their politics or prejudices. They depend only, so far as our researches have revealed, upon the extent of the particular expert's knowledge. We have found that the men who know most are the most gloomy. Here, then, is the problem which we present to you, stark and dreadful, and inescapable: shall we put an end to the human race; or shall mankind renounce war? People will not face this alternative because it

is so difficult to abolish war. The abolition of war will demand drastic limitations of national sovereignty. But what perhaps impedes more than anything else is that the term "mankind" leads vaguely and abstractly. People scarcely realize in imagining that the danger is to themselves and their children and not only to a dimly apprehended humanity. They can scarcely bring themselves to grasp that when they love are in imminent danger of poisoning themselves. And so they hope that perhaps war may be allowed to continue provided modern weapons are prohibited.

## An Illusory Hope

This hope is illusory. Whatever agreements not to use H-bombs had been reached in time of peace, they would no longer be considered binding in time of war, and both sides would set to work to manufacture H-bombs as soon as war broke out. For, if one side manufactured the bombs and the other did not, the side that manufactured them would inevitably be victorious.

Although an agreement to re-

nounce nuclear weapons as part of a general reduction of armaments\* would not afford an ultimate solution, it would serve certain important purposes.

First, any agreement between East and West is to the detriment in so far as it tends to diminish of themonoclear weapons. If each side believed that the other had carried it out sincerely, would lessen the fear of a sudden attack in the style of Pearl Harbor which at present keeps both sides in a state of nervous apprehension. We would therefore, welcome such an agreement, though only as a first step.

Most of us are not neutral in feeling, but as human beings, we wish to remember that if the issues between East and West are to be decided in any manner that can give any possible satisfaction to anybody, whether Communist or anti-Communist, whether Asian or European or American, whether white or black, then these issues must not be decided by war. We should wish this to be understood, both in the East and in the West.

## Resolution

We invite this congress to be convened, and through it the scientists of the world and the general public, to subscribe to the following resolution:

"In view of the fact that in any future world war nuclear weapons will certainly be employed, and that such weapons threaten the continued existence of mankind, we urge the Governments of the world to realize, and to acknowledge publicly, that their purposes cannot be furthered by a world war, and we urge them, consequently, to find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of dispute between them."

ALBERT EINSTEIN.  
Prof. LEOPOLD INFELD.  
Prof. HERMANN JOSEPH MULLER.\*  
Prof. CECIL F. POWELL.  
Prof. JOSEPH FORRELL.  
BERNARD RUSSELL.  
Prof. HERBERT YUKAWA.  
Prof. FREDERIC JOLIOT-CURIE.\*

\*Professor Muller makes the reservation that a general reduction of all armaments is not a means of settling differences between states, and that the renunciation of nuclear weapons should be done by all, and not by the interests of all.

