Reform in Security?

One problem of military security in a free country is to protect the national interest without jeopardizing the progress of science and technology and without putting individual rights in danger. Continuing efforts to solve this problem have produced in this country a vast jumble of laws, directives, and administrative orders. The interests of efficiency and justice alike require that security controls be simplified.

In August 1955 Congress recognized the need for a reappraisal of our security measures when it set up a Commission on Security. The Commission was given a framework of policy within which to work: the program for security should be sound and the procedures for security investigation and evaluation of employees, either public or private, who have access to defense secrets, should be carried out in a way to protect security as well as basic human rights.

Within this framework of policy, the Commission was charged with the investigation of the entire security program and asked to determine whether the present laws and practices are consistent with the policies set forth above. It was ordered to recommend any necessary and desirable changes in security laws, directives, and practices.

Thus Congress has laid out a program that leaves much to the initiative of the Commission. Aside from the policy limitations, which are quite general, the Commission has been given a free hand to conduct studies and recommend reforms to Congress. The fact that Congress found it necessary to extend the life of the Commission from 31 December 1956 to 30 June 1957 suggests that progress has been less rapid than expected. A good suggestion has come from another source. The Bar Association of the City of New York has recommended far-reaching changes in the security laws to protect both the national interest and individual rights.

Other good suggestions for revising a set of regulations may come from the people who must live and work under them. Many governmental bodies find out what people think by holding hearings, but the Commission on Security plans to proceed in a different way. It wants to benefit from the experiences of our readers and others who are concerned. Its suggestion box is open. If you want to recommend changes in the security program, send your comments to Lloyd Wright, Chairman, Commission on Security, 441 G St., Washington 25, D. C.

There is an alternative way to voice an opinion about these matters. The alternative way has what some people will regard as the advantage—and this is a significant gage of the temper of the times—of protecting the anonymity of the correspondent. Anyone who prefers this protection should send his suggestions to the newly created Scientists’ Committee on Security, Inc., 2153 Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut (see this issue, p. 396).

Either way, public opinion can be brought to bear upon actions of the Commission on Security. The difficult problems of security and freedom require sensible and practical answers. We hope that private citizens will come up with some good ideas, and that the Commission and ultimately Congress will accept them.—G. DuS.