

This memorandum covers in part the conversation which I had this morning in your presence, with Winston W. Wolvington and Jack B. Toll.

Dictated, not reread.

file <sup>new</sup>. W. E. S. Spitz

MEMORANDUM TO: Malcolm D. Crawford, Esq.

FROM: Leo Szillard

February 17, 1958

I am much concerned about Trudy's inability to drive a car. This is in part due to the pleurisy and the pain connected with it and partly it is due to the anxiety provoked by the trauma of the accident. As to the former cause, I personally am inclined to be confident that the treatment of the underlying condition (which I understand is due to a flareup of a latent TB infection at the site of the injury), will ultimately restore her physical health. I am more apprehensive concerning the psychological trauma. In her present position Trudy is dependent upon driving a car since she teaches not only at the Medical School in Denver, but also at the School of Nursing at Boulder. I have, therefore, yesterday consulted a psychiatrist, Dr. Rene Spitz, who is at present a visiting professor at the Medical School. He recently moved to Denver from New York, where for a time he headed the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. Dr. Spitz advised me that in this type of anxiety, caused by trauma, there is a reasonable chance that a treatment of six-month's duration might restore the ability of the patient to drive a car, but that this is by no means certain. He advised me further that the chances of success of such treatment are better if the treatment is not delayed too long after the accident.



He also confirmed, what I suspected, that if the patient has a claim for damages, the chances of a successful treatment are better if the treatment takes place after the patient's claim for damages are settled. This is one of the reasons why I personally would favor an early settlement of any damage claim that Trudy may have.

It seems to me conceivable that Trudy's driving difficulties might also be somehow connected with the fact that she was emotionally very much attached to her car, a 1951 Dodge Coupe, with a hydraulic clutch, which I understand is probably damaged beyond repair. She took very good care of her car, which was as good as new after having been driven 30,000 miles by the time of the accident. The book value of the car, I am told, is only about \$200, and she might not be able to recover more than that. In the circumstances, I am inclined to think that if perchance Mr. Kolowitz - who I understand was involved in the accident - were to promise Trudy to procure a car of her choosing, way below list price, say at 1/2 or 2/3 of the list price, if and when the psychiatrist in charge of her treatment certifies that she is fit to drive, such a promise might contribute to the success of the treatment. This, of course, is no more than a personal conjecture of mine.

During the short interval after her discharge from St. Joseph's Hospital and the present recurrence of her illness, Trudy was riding in taxis. She was jittery while doing so, but with



an effort she was able to overcome her anxiety to the point of being able to use taxis in going back and forth between her home and her office.

Because Trudy ~~is~~ used to <sup>be</sup> a very secure driver and very fond of driving, I am inclined to attribute her present depressed state of mind in part to the destruction of her car and to her doubts whether she might ever be able to drive again. This interpretation of the facts is one of my reasons for urging an early start of the psychiatric treatment, aimed at restoring her driving ability.

Another aspect of the case which causes me concern and which I know causes concern to Trudy, is the possible effect of her present state of illness on her future career in the field of public health. Trudy is now acting head of the Department of Preventive Medicine of the Medical School and it is at this time uncertain who will be appointed as head of the department. If as a result of her illness she is deprived of influence on the choice of head of the department, someone might be appointed with whom she could not easily get along. This might render her position at the Medical School rather difficult.

For a number of years now the Commissioner of Health of New York City, Dr. Leona Baumgartner, has tried to persuade Trudy to accept a position with the New York City Health Department as District Health Officer attached as a teaching health officer to one of the medical schools in New York City. Trudy has served in this capacity with the



New York City Health Department prior to her joining the Medical School in Denver, and as a result of her previous service would have a greatly improved position concerning her pension rights if she <sup>now</sup> passes the Civil Service examination and subsequently accepts a position of the type offered to her by Dr. Baumgartner. The position in New York City carries a higher salary than her present position at the Medical School and her retirement income would be very much greater.

Moreover, I have been negotiating for sometime with the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in New York about the possibility of my accepting a position at the Institute, which would mean that I would spend at least part of my time in New York City. I even might join the Institute on a fulltime basis in the course of the next 12 months. Because of all of these considerations involved, Turdy filed an application last year for a Civil Service examination given by New York City. At the time when the written part of this examination was given, she was ill in Denver, as a result of her automobile accident, and was unable to go to New York to take the examination. She succeeded, however, in arranging with the help of the Commissioner of Health, to take the examination in Denver.

The date for the oral examination that she must take <sup>still</sup> ~~in New York City~~ has not as yet been set, but it is likely that it will be in the spring. Should Trudy, because of her health, not be able to take the examination in New York, she will then lose her accumulated pension rights. Furthermore, no other Civil Service examination might be given for a number of years, which would mean that Trudy



would not be eligible for the position of a District Health Officer in New York City. Should I myself, in the course of the current year, move to New York, she would then not be able to join me there and at the same time have an acceptable position in the public health field open to her.

In the circumstances, Trudy argues that no settlement that may be obtained today <sup>is likely to</sup> ~~that is to help her~~ compensate for her hospital expenses and loss of wages, as well as all the other damage caused by the accident, which <sup>may</sup> ~~be~~ incurred in the course of the next 12 months. While I cannot refute this argument, I nevertheless favor to settle the case now if that is possible. It is my hope that such a settlement will speed Trudy's recovery, and I personally would be willing to take a gamble that at least some of the bad things which might conceivably happen in the next 12 months will not actually happen. Whether I can in good conscience urge Trudy to adopt my point of view in this matter will depend on just what settlement is offered at this time, if indeed any settlement is offered at all. I personally can see no harm in delaying the filing of a suit for one month. If no settlement is reached within one month, we may then have to pick a trial lawyer and file a suit promptly in order to get the case on the calendar within the next 8 to 12 months. This, of course, does not preclude our making one more attempt at settling the case in say 8 months time prior to going to trial.



My interests are represented by D. K. Wolfe in this case and if you need a release from me, you may address yourself to him.



MEMORANDUM by LEO SZILARD

QUEBEC, Sunday, April 6, 1958.

In the following I present a statement which I have drafted in a form in which it might be issued unanimously - with some slight modifications - by the Second Pugwash Conference if this conference should wish to issue a statement along these lines. If this is not the case, I plan to issue a statement along these lines - with appropriate modifications of the text heregiven and, if necessary, without any reference to the Second Pugwash Conference.

Proposed Text: ~~unorganized~~ (First rough draft)

At the Quebec meeting we have been discussing dispassionately controversial issues related to the problem that the bomb poses to the world. We succeeded in clarifying - through these discussions - these issues in our minds to a considerable degree. This was accomplished because we followed in our discussion the pattern of discussions that have proved to be so successful in the field of science.

When a scientist says anything in such a discussion, his fellow scientists have to ask themselves whether what he says is true, or whether he is in error. ~~This is in sharp contrast to the case of discussions which politicians carry out in public.~~ *more frank aim at* This is in sharp contrast to the public discussion of controversial issues in the political field. *the scientist's aim is to clarify the truth* If a politician says something in public, everybody asks himself, first of all, "For what purpose is he saying it?", and people may or may not get around to asking whether what he is saying is true or not. *to give a purpose* But people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and before we, scientists, raise our voice and scold politicians in public, we had better clean our own house. ~~Scientists~~ In recent years, when scientists spoke in public on controversial issues relating to the bomb, they have been frequently unable to resist the temptation to conduct the debate as if they were politicians, rather than to uphold the rules of scientific debate.

In the past twelve years, scientists have vigorously participated in the public



discussion of the problem created by the bomb. We believe they ought to continue to participate in the public debate of this problem, but we believe that they can make a significant contribution to the clarification of this problem only if they will observe the ground rules of scientific debate. The problem created by the bomb is a complex problem. Because of the existence of the bomb, the world is in trouble <sup>as always,</sup> and when in trouble, the best recipe is: "The truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth".

Measured by these standards, the public discussion of the issue of the cessation of the bomb tests, in which scientists have taken a leading part, must be regarded as unsatisfactory.

It is understandable that those who believe that the solution of the problem that the bomb poses to the world will come through the early elimination of the stockpiles of the bomb, as well as ~~x~~ the vehicles adapted to their delivery, from the arsenals of all nations are inclined to favour the stopping of the bomb tests and of the further manufacture of bombs.

In contrast to them, those who believe that the stockpiles of the bombs will form, for a long time to come, a part of the arsenal of Russia and America will regard <sup>our</sup> as most urgent task to learn how to live with the bomb and how to avoid that the approaching stalemate between the strategic atomic striking forces of Russia and the United States lead to a war that neither of these two nations wants. Some of those who believe ~~this~~ that we shall have to live with the bomb for a long time to come may be anxious that both America and Russia may eliminate, from their stockpiles of hydrogen bombs, the kind of hydrogen bombs which may spread highly active radioactive dust over vast areas of <sup>the</sup> land over which they are exploded. ~~Based on this~~ On the basis of this consideration, they favour continued testing for the purpose of enabling both Russia and America to develop "clean" hydrogen bombs as a replacement for the "dirty" bombs which are now presumably contained in their stockpiles.



Both of the beliefs here stated are sincerely held by scientists and/stated <sup>freely</sup> in the discussions that are held by scientists in private, but neither of these points of view is/<sup>properly</sup> emphasized in the public discussion of the issue of whether bomb tests should or should not be halted. In the public discussion, those who demand the cessation of bomb tests justify their demand mainly on the grounds that the radioactive fall-out of these tests is harmful, and those who oppose the cessation of the bomb tests are mainly justifying the position they take by saying that Russia could/<sup>secretly</sup> violate an agreement providing for the cessation of bomb tests ~~in~~ in the absence of an inspection system which extends into the territory of Russia.

It would be only logical for those who are sincerely worried about the bomb tests because of the radioactive dust which such tests may disperse outside the territorial confines of the country which conducts such tests to demand that Russia, Britain and America agree to cease all tests which result in such spreading of radioactive dust in any appreciable degree. For, clearly, any such test is detectable without setting up an inspection system that extends into the territory of Russia.

Why don't those who wish to stop the bomb tests really because they wish to stop the ensuing radioactive fall-out call upon the governments of Russia, America and Britain to agree to a prohibition of detectable tests, instead of calling for an absolute prohibition of all tests? If they did that, those who publicly oppose the prohibition of bomb tests on the grounds of the absence of an inspection system would then, if they wished to continue to oppose the cessation of such ~~tests~~ tests, be forced to substantiate their remaining, presumably their real, reasons for opposing the cessation of tests. Then the public discussion of this issue would at last be raised to the level where the real reasons for the divergence of views on this issue would be out in the open, and people could slowly begin to make up their minds on the basis of the real issues,



rather than be kept in confusion by the faked issues upon which the public discussion of this issue has so far rested.

Propaganda has been defined as "the gentle art of successfully confusing our friends, without quite deceiving our enemies". We believe scientists ought not to indulge in the practice of this art, but rather should ~~be~~ regard as their role the stating of the truth-and let the chips fall where they may.



*Missio Washington June 2<sup>nd</sup> / 58*  
*from Leabro Clark*  
*to S. S. Jones Denver Middlebrook.*  
Memorandum

1. It seems to me that the general field of the work of the ~~Institute~~ *your Research Laboratory* ought to center around the *general* " problem of protein synthesis, " with a good deal of emphasis on the problem of antibody formation, delayed hypersensitivity (allergy), and *extending into the phenomena involved in* probably also tissue transplantation.

2. We ought to think in terms of ~~a group of five~~ *six* permanent staff members whose interests *strongly* overlap, and offers *to* ~~to them~~ *They ought to be approached* ought not to be made individually but collectively, *rather than individually.* Assuming that they *accept*, *dates at which each may start* the time of arrival may be staggered to suit their convenience and the convenience of the *R* research laboratory, but they should all *move to* be ~~at work~~ in Denver by the fall of 1960.

3. In my experience, good men who are in demand *"* and *"* ~~can choose~~ will give some weight to the quality of the physical climate, in which Denver excels, but also they will give weight to considerations of *"* security *"*. Security does not merely mean security of an income, but, above all, it means the security of having good working conditions and of remaining



undisturbed by ~~arbitrary~~ <sup>to many</sup> arbitrary decisions emanating from others than their peers. <sup>P</sup> Such security cannot be provided by "tenure" alone or by any kind of contract that might be offered to them. Only an established "tradition" in conjunction with tenure or contract can give the kind of security which ~~some~~ <sup>many</sup> good men want, and this is ~~a~~ <sup>the</sup> kind of attraction that universities like Columbia, Harvard, or Yale are able to offer. ~~XXXXXXXX~~

Perhaps if ~~we~~ <sup>you and Sean</sup> reach a meeting of the minds on the individuals whom we would want to have for the ~~five~~ <sup>six</sup> permanent staff positions, I might <sup>then</sup> be of some help in convincing ~~gh~~ these men that they ~~would have~~ <sup>could count on this</sup> the kind of security which ~~they need~~ <sup>in the Research Laboratories</sup> in Denver, but first I need to be convinced myself, before I can convince others.

The problem of "security" raises a serious dilemma. On the one hand, security must be offered in order to get the good men that you would need. On the other hand, most of the places who ~~do~~ <sup>have all</sup> offer security have <sup>also</sup> accumulated <sup>much</sup> deadwood. At an institution <sup>S</sup> like Harvard ~~or~~ <sup>or</sup> the Rockefeller Institute



or the National Institutes of Health, which are not only

large but also expanding, the accumulation of deadwood is

~~deleterious~~ but not ~~catastrophic~~. At an institution like the

*your Research Laboratory*  
~~National Jewish Hospital~~, which is not very large and which

cannot go on expanding forever, the accumulation of deadwood

would be catastrophic, ~~and has to be avoided at all costs.~~

*P* I have given some thought to this ~~problem~~ *dilemma* in the last few

weeks in connection with the problems that have arisen at *the*  
NIH, and as far as *your Research Laboratory* ~~the National Jewish Hospital is~~ ~~concerned~~

*is* concerned, it seems to me that the best way out of this

dilemma ~~would~~ *might* be as follows:

The ~~five~~ *etc* permanent staff members will have to be

selected with great circumspection, but, in addition,

particularly in the case of the younger men, the security

which they are given ~~will~~ *can* consist *only* of a guaranteed minimum

of space, salary, and travel expense account. Whatever they

may be given in space, salary, and travel expense account

above this minimum ~~will~~ *must* remain *in* flexible and subject to the



decision of a body to which I shall refer as the Laboratory

Council. All these men will have security inasmuch as the

guaranteed minimum will not be taken away under any circum-

stances, and if they feel they ought to have more and if they

cannot get it in Denver, they might wish to move somewhere

else, but they will, under no circumstances, be under

pressure to move other than the pressure that they want to

have salary, space or travel expense ~~xxx~~ account above the

guaranteed minimum) and they may not be able to get it in

Denver.

4. The purpose of the Laboratory Council mentioned

above is to give scientists who join the laboratory a feeling

that they will be judged by their peers, whom they know and

respect, and protected against arbitrary decisions on the

part of administrators, whom they do not know and whose

~~identity~~ identity may change repeatedly during their lifetime.

The Laboratory Council might be composed of the

administration of the Hospital, the three senior members



*Research Laboratory - perhaps four in total*  
of the laboratory, and, perhaps, six distinguished scientists  
who function as consultants, not only *in name* but ~~defacto.~~ *in fact,*

*P* It would be my thought that these six consultants ought to be  
men who spend ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ four to six weeks every summer in

*Research Laboratories*  
the laboratory and, thus, *would be* are able to assume a ~~major~~ *the*

responsibility for expressing an opinion on new, *proposed*

*staff of the Research Laboratory*  
appointments to the laboratory and promotions within the

*of staff members*  
laboratory, including the allocation of laboratory space,

salaries, and travel expense money. These six consultants

might cost the laboratory a total of, perhaps, \$10,000 to

\$15,000 a year, ~~and~~ *They* might contribute greatly to the

attraction that the laboratory might hold for the younger

staff members, *by having men* and to give these younger staff members a

*by generally*  
feeling of security and to keep up the morale of the

laboratory ~~in general.~~ ~~I do not believe, however, that an~~

outside body of advisors who do not spend four to six weeks

a year in the laboratory could serve any useful purpose, and,

~~as a matter of fact, I think that they might do considerable harm.~~



5. One reason why good men may hesitate to move to Denver is the scientific isolation of Denver. This can be overcome by travel and each member of the laboratory ought, therefore, to have a fixed travel expense account which is guaranteed to him. If he needs more than the guaranteed minimum, he will have to ask for it and ~~for~~ there ought to be some orderly procedure regulating <sup>the all members of</sup> travel expense money over and above the guaranteed minimum. <sup>P</sup> I believe the laboratory ought not to pay more than 80 <sup>%</sup> ~~per cent~~ of the travel expenses and the rest of it <sup>should</sup> ~~to be~~ paid by the man himself. I also believe that if a man does not use up his travel expense allowance for the year, between one-half or two-thirds of it ought to be transferred to his next year's account, whereas the rest <sup>should</sup> ~~might~~ revert back to the general travel fund of the laboratory.

Apart from going to meetings, there ought to be some provision made whereby a member of the laboratory can spend an average of at least <sup>MA</sup> between a month or six weeks a year



at some <sup>other</sup> laboratory where work is going on which lies in his general field of interest. A man who does not make use of this privilege one year ought to be free to transfer this privilege to the next year and spend a longer time next year away from the ~~Denver~~ <sup>Research Laboratory</sup> laboratory.

The general sphere of activity of the laboratory, as I envision it at the moment, <sup>would</sup> comes very close to that of Hilary ~~Hilary~~ Koprowski, who recently became Director of the

~~Wistar~~ Wistar Institute in Philadelphia. Therefore, if

~~my proposal concerning the general field of the Denver~~ <sup>this were to become the general area of interest of the Research Laboratory</sup> ~~laboratory were adopted,~~ some arrangement relating to

exchange of scientific personnel, on a visiting basis, might be of great benefit to both laboratories.

If we <sup>can</sup> reached a meeting of the minds on the general field of work, the means of maintaining the right spirit in the laboratory, the solution of the dilemma of security and accumulation of "deadwood", and if you <sup>then</sup> wanted me to assume the



responsibility for a laboratory operation ~~at the Hospital,~~

*Research Laboratory*  
~~then there will be time to discuss~~ what may be regarded as

*we might turn to the discussion of*  
my ~~personal~~ personal requirements. At Chicago, I would

reach the obligatory retirement age in five years, and ~~the~~ *from the personal point of view*

greatest single attraction of any new arrangement would be the

possibility of settling down in some place *say* until the year of

1973 or else until my *"ultimately"* death, whichever is earlier. This would *is*

*also* be the chief attraction of the offer that is being made to

me by Berlin. Whether *you could obtain* any similar situation ~~can be obtained~~

*from* anywhere in the United States is at this time not clear.

*The following are the kind*  
6. ~~My present list of permanent staff members, subject~~

*of men whom I would like to see* regard  
~~to change through further discussion and otherwise, is as~~

*is* desirable staff members:  
follows:

*and he is*  
Renato Lubecko, M.D., ~~age~~ *associate Professor* age about 35  
At present at Caltech, Pasadena, California

Milton Weiner, M.D., age about 30 *Reader*  
At present at ~~the~~ Medical School,  
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Penna.

Michison, Ph.D., age about 30  
At present at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland

*Reader* age about 26  
Frank Rothman, Ph.D., ~~age about~~ *organic chemist - known*  
At present at Massachusetts Institute of *biologist*  
Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts



Messelson, Ph.D., age about 26  
At present at Caltech, Pasadena, California

Ed Lennox, Ph.D., age about 35  
At present Associate Professor of Biochemistry,  
University of Urbana, Urbana, Illinois