

divorce ourselves from the present role of providing technical advice which is really only a tiny fraction of the total technical advice. *but a big huge chunk of the propaganda.*

Dr. Dimmick:

What is your reason for that? Is this because you would <sup>dis</sup>agree with the *concepts* of biological warfare or because you think *that our* technical advice is wrong? *If you disagree because you feel generally that any aid we give to the Department of Defense in terms of biological warfare is an immoral thing. I don't think the Society should take that kind of stand. I disagree with <sup>that let me agree with</sup> the morality of the *situation* but I disagree that the Society should take that stand.*

*Dr. Marr:*

Do you want to know what my beliefs are or do you want to know whether my statement is conditioned by my beliefs on that subject?

Dr. Dimmick:

*Your statement is what I'm directing at,*

*Dr. Marr:*

I don't really think so Dr Dimmick. I don't really believe that my position... I think that *its simple* if we are being used and we are being exploited in some way by having such an Advisory Committee <sup>if this</sup> does ~~that~~ give a sense of acceptability to the activities of the US Army Biological Laboratories, then I resent that as a member of that organization being exploited whether I do or don't <sup>believe that we should</sup> be doing such activities is irrelevant.

Dr. Dimmick:

*If the* Public Welfare Health Service <sup>us</sup> asked to set up an advisory committee *of the same type* to advise the Public Health Services, would you object to that?

Dr. Marr:

I don't think the Public Health Service is in trouble politically.

I don't think that there is any serious activity on the part of *citizens* ~~persons~~ in the US protesting the activities of the Public Health Service.

Dr. Dimmick: *Then it is a moral question.*

Dr. Clark:

*No it isn't* it is a question of exploitation. Here are some other opinions.

Question: *Dr. Wyatt*

I think that everyone ~~is~~ *agrees* that we ~~are~~ *are* being used.

~~Dr. Marr:~~

So why <sup>*it*</sup> do you want to fight? Why don't you just turn the tables and make this Committee into a viable <sup>*tough*</sup> ~~top~~ organization. It may ~~turn~~ <sup>*bit of a thorn*</sup> out to be a ~~toy~~ <sup>*in the Army's hide*</sup> but if you insist ~~x~~ on meeting with the Army four times a year and asking first ~~of~~ <sup>*then*</sup> all for a complete review of this program and then if they say no you go to the President's ~~of the~~ Scientific <sup>*you*</sup> Advisory Committee and <sup>*^*</sup> say look we are the ASM and they appointed our Committee and they won't even let us *know what they're doing*. I think you can ~~xxxxxxx~~ gain much more information *and get even for being used.*

Question:

*One thing I'm curious about.*  
*years ago all*

At the end of WW II quite a few of us were asked *and we were all concerned* about terrible weapons of warfare <sup>*dropping*</sup> a few atom bombs on Japan. Now <sup>*?*</sup> I've known for 22 years or longer <sup>*that they were working*</sup> that Fort Detrick exists and that the ASM had <sup>*indignation*</sup> on biological warfare. I've also known for a long time that the ASM had <sup>*that were being*</sup> an advisory Committee. I think Dr. Marr has known that just <sup>*exploited has*</sup> as long as I have. And I'm curious about why the great sense of <sup>*come up now.*</sup> ~~disappointing~~ <sup>*indignation*</sup> that were being exploited has come up now.

It didn't.

Question:

What did you do before?

Dr. Marr:

I was unsuccessful in directing the attention of my colleagues toward what I considered to be an exploitation of the Society. I guess each of us <sup>has</sup> to answer the question that you have directed to me for himself. Why is <sup>it so</sup> ~~late~~ <sup>that</sup> they were beginning to consider the matter. It takes time I guess to gain enough support for such an action.

Dr. Hegeman:

I think this question hinges more on <sup>our</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>view</sup> of the ASM as a scientific society ~~more~~ than any question of <sup>the</sup> propriety of biological warfare, the US Army, etc, etc, or anything of this sort. This is an international society. It is not nationally chartered. It is not legally binding on the Society that it advise the ARmy. The Society has had this Committee for a while it is true but I don't think it has been widely known that it existed.

I know that <sup>fairly recently</sup> at the time I joined I didn't know it existed <sup>and I only learned of it</sup>. This is probably an oversight on my part for not looking at the <sup>front page of the journal</sup> but I really don't think a question of the morality ~~is~~ of an individual being involved in the national defense effort <sup>things of this sort at all.</sup> It is a very simple legal question. A question of propriety of <sup>and</sup> ~~the~~ law, if you <sup>wish</sup> ~~would~~.

Dr. Clark:

May I interject that I think <sup>to reinforce</sup> ~~that~~ Dr. Hegeman's statement that if the ASM is an international organization that I would see it charged with international responsibility and perhaps responsible in the field of biological and ~~chemical~~ <sup>to</sup> warfare, ~~an~~ international organizations <sup>perhaps</sup> such as the UN or <sup>as</sup> perhaps to the Pugwash Conference. Or <sup>into</sup> even if the United ~~World~~ Federalists were carrying on research efforts on biological warfare that I would say that perhaps the ASM might have some responsibility

towards them.

Question: Dr. Neilands

I should like to ~~debate~~ <sup>agree</sup> with Gerry Marr that I think the Committee is <sup>the activities of</sup> ~~cloaking~~ Camp Detrick, in some kind of <sup>and should there</sup> position legitimacy that it probably doesn't have and that's what the Army gets out of this arrangement. I don't know ~~what~~ what the Committee members get out of it. Maybe when they go down there they get turned on or something. But in any case I think it is very detrimental to the best interests of the Society and I'm looking forward at the earliest opportunity to vote this Committee out of existence.

Dr. Dimmick: What are you going to use for a reason.

Question: Dr. Neilands

The Army <sup>can</sup> gets its advisors privately and it would now <sup>and legitimacy</sup> except that its getting some kind of authenticity by deriving them through the offices of the Society.

Dr. Dimmick: ? I see the headlines:

~~The~~ "ASM Recalls their Advisory Committee ~~before~~ to Fort Detrick."

Down below: Why?

Dr. Neilands: The arrangement now is very unsatisfactory. It has no elements of democracy connected with it. Apparently the Army picks over the nominees and takes those which are considered reliable and then its report is not distributed.

Dr. Dimmick: That's not answering the question that bothers me. If we withdraw this <sup>if we as a Society withdraw this Committee</sup> ~~from its use by the Army~~, what <sup>is the</sup> are we going to say we did it for? <sup>all the information,</sup> ~~if we as a society~~ ~~all the information~~

Dr. Neilands

What you tell the public is no concern of mine. ~~Don't~~ I think we have to satisfy our concern and our problems.

Dr. Clark:

Dr. Clark:

I think that there ~~are~~ <sup>maybe</sup> some other answers to his question.

Question:

*I think the Committee is serving no effective function.*

Dr. Clark:

Yes. *that certainly* could be one reason.

Question:

Can you make a more effective Committee?

Dr. Clark:

In other words are there specific changes ~~that~~ <sup>which</sup> could be given to the Committee which would provide for some *muscle* in ~~implementing~~ <sup>implementing</sup> ~~some~~ ASM policy if the ASM could decide on a policy it wants to follow.

Dr. Hegeman:

Should ~~we~~ ~~we~~ make a more effective committee? *Given the Constitution of the ASM, and its* the nature of the organization that <sup>its</sup> the scientific society, dedicated to ~~the~~ <sup>ing</sup> dissemination knowledge (rather <sup>?</sup> *than*) specific arrangements for <sup>its</sup> ~~distribution~~ *distribution*

Dr. Clark:

Actually that is another purpose of the Society which does not seem to be fulfilled by the present Committee as born out by the security clearance and by the restrictions upon the Committee members in discussing <sup>indicating</sup> and ~~recommending~~ to the Society what their recommendations are. And I wonder if either of the two Committee members would care to comment upon their own psychological reactions to <sup>having to present</sup> ~~to present~~ the activities of their committee or <sup>them</sup> *having* to discuss in this kind of public gathering. That is to ASM members.

Dr. Moulder:

What other <sup>more appropriate body</sup> ~~society~~ is there to discuss <sup>them</sup> ~~this~~ with?

Dr. Clark:

Well I think that is right. Is there a feeling that perhaps some

secure

<sup>leak out</sup>  
~~SENSE~~ matters might be ~~bugged~~ or that some things that might be said might be misconstrued. Or in other words is there a sense of responsibility to the Army?

Dr. Romig:

Well there is a legal sense in that as it has been pointed there you do have to have a security clearance and as <sup>part</sup> of that you agree that if certain things are said to you with the clear meaning that they are secret that they are not to be discussed. And that part would have to be changed if the Committee were to report back everything that they felt relevant and they would have to get the ARmy to agree that this restriction no longer applies to the Committee. <sup>Or</sup> ~~So that~~ alternatively it would mean that you would not be told what they felt was secret and <sup>in that sense</sup> the most anything we could report you could read in the Journal of Bacteriology because as ~~as~~ has been pointed out most of the research done there anyway is <sup>printed</sup> ~~XXXXXX~~ in the open journals. It is only the five or ten percent in which we as Committee members are legally prohibited from discussing that is not printed in the open scientific literature. So <sup>some</sup> other arrangement would have to be made and I don't know whether that could be done or not. If it could be I wouldn't have any compunctions at all reporting to this or any other ASM meeting what is known. I kind of agree with the Lederberg's idea. There is not <sup>have any</sup> of secrecy. Usually it is a waste of time anyway.

Dr. Clark:

Is that a <sup>kind</sup> ~~point~~ of policy that the ASM could adopt as a policy of its members that would respect the views of the minority that it would initiate an attempt to remove secrecy from microbiological research?

Dr. ~~Maer~~ Moulden

It would be appropriate for any <sup>Councilors</sup> ~~councilings~~ of this branch to bring any resolution or action they choose up in Council and see what happens.

I think that this is the route that should be taken. I think that what <sup>you're going</sup> to find, what you see herexx even in this small ~~opinionxxx~~ meeting there is a tremendous diversity of opinion. This may preclude any collective action but I think the way to do it is if this group can arrive at a collective opinion to introduce it into Council and see what happens.

Question:

I would just like to suggest that if the Society wishes its views on technical matters or policy matters or this matter of secrecy considered or wishes to be an influence it could ~~acc~~ accomplish it a little more efficiently through official and allied (?) participation. In other words if you want to criticize it seems to me it can be done more effectively from inside while continuing to participate rather than resigning from the human race and criticizing from the outside

Dr. Clark:

~~Resigning from the Army?~~

I think that the meeting has obviously grown old and I thank you all for participating. I thank DR. Moulder, Dr. Romig, and Dr. Marr, Gen. Rothschild for participating and helping us in considering the Advisory Committee to the US Army Biological Laboratory.

~~Dr. Clark: Resigning from the Army?~~