

## World Atom Agency: Indian Reactor Accord, Agreement on Japan Point to More Significant Role for IAEA

Several good things have happened recently to that usually neglected offspring of the cold war and nuclear power, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

First of all, the Indian Government has swung around to the view that it would not be intolerable for the IAEA to apply the safeguards to a 380-megawatt power reactor that the United States plans to finance at Tarapur, near Bombay. The reactor would be the first with weapons potential to be constructed on the territory of a nuclear have-not nation, and, accordingly, the safeguards issue became a crucial one for IAEA's future as an organ for preventing the proliferation of weapons from power-producing facilities.

It was established from the outset that there would be safeguards, if not by IAEA, then on a bilateral basis. But IAEA, which grew out of Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace proposal, was concerned that its reason for existence would diminish if the Indians rejected its inspection services. Whether or not that was a reasonable fear, the fact is now that the Indians have agreed to permit IAEA inspectors to determine that the plant is not being used for the production of weapons-grade plutonium. The result is a considerable boost in the agency's prestige and morale. Just what brought the Indians around has not been publicly stated, but it is understood that the United States made it clear that its interest in putting some \$78 million into the Tarapur plant was tied to the Indians' acceptance of IAEA.

Closely allied to the Indian agreement was a decision taken several weeks ago by the IAEA Board of Governors to extend the agency's jurisdiction to reactors above 100 megawatts (thermal). The limitation has been a convenient excuse for nations that did not want IAEA inspectors looking into their nuclear power facilities. They still don't have to admit IAEA, especially since the agency's jurisdiction technically extends only to facilities for which it has provided materials. Nevertheless, some, including the United States, have admitted IAEA inspectors to small, experimental reactors that were constructed without IAEA assistance. The removal of the 100-megawatt limit must be formally endorsed by the IAEA general conference next September; at the moment,

the indications are that this will go through without any difficulty, but in fact there is no hurry, since the completion of the plant is expected to take about 5 years. However, until IAEA comes into the picture with an operational safeguards service, a U.S.-Indian bilateral agreement will cover the reactor. Eventually, IAEA would provide the safeguards, but as a courtesy to Indian sensibilities, it was agreed that these would have to be "generally consistent" with the bilateral safeguards.

Significantly, the Soviet Union, which has grudgingly cooperated with IAEA since its founding, switched its previous stand and voted in favor of raising the megawatt limit. This doesn't mean that IAEA inspectors will be invited to Soviet power installations, but since East-West cooperation is available in such small doses, the new Soviet position is considered to be a sign of still more cooperation in the sensitive area of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

Finally, it has been announced that the bilateral safeguards agreement on atomic materials between the United States and Japan will be administered by IAEA. The United States has some 40 such bilaterals with other nations, and the existence of these agreements has been a sore point with the international agency. It has asked, not unreasonably, why the U.S. simultaneously pays homage to IAEA and then goes off and signs bilateral agreements. The answer, in large part, is that many of the small nations consider IAEA inspection to be a symbol of second-class citizenship in the nuclear world. Japan, however, has come around to the view that it wouldn't hurt to have IAEA doing the inspecting job, and it is quite likely that other nations will arrive at this position. The United States is pushing hard in that direction.

Though no one talks about it very much, there is some speculation on what role IAEA might play if an East-West arms accord were reached. At this point, the possibility of such an accord is sufficiently remote to make the details of secondary interest, but within IAEA there is harbored the hope that the agency might be singled out for a significant inspection role. However, no one can claim any certainty, and it is perhaps worth recalling that when the Soviets agreed to inspection of their dismantled missile sites in Cuba, they called upon—of all organizations—the International Red Cross.—D.S.G.

## Congress: New Study Shows Federal Education Budget of \$2.2 Billion, \$613 Million of It for Research

Federal activities affecting education have, like Topsy, just grown, and the House Education and Labor Committee last week performed a welcome service by publishing a survey of federal education programs which pulls together information which has hitherto been scattered or submerged.

Initiative for the survey came from Congresswoman Edith Green (D.-Ore.), chairman of the Education and Labor Committee subcommittee which handles legislation on higher education, the area in which confusion about federal programs has perhaps been most prevalent.

Mrs. Green, who is both knowledgeable about education matters and determined, had urged for several years that an inventory survey be made, but not until Representative Adam Clayton Powell (D.-N.Y.) succeeded retiring Representative Graham Barden (D.-N.C.) as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee in 1961 did the idea gain headway. A study was authorized at the beginning of the 1962 session, and a year of work, involving hearings before the Green subcommittee and a good deal of staff work with Executive agencies and with colleges and universities produced the 176-page report, *The Federal Government and Education*, released last Friday (available from the House Education and Labor Committee, Washington 25, D.C.).

### Source of Confusion

It is worth noting, as Mrs. Green points out in a letter of transmittal accompanying the report, that "one reason for a good deal of the confusion in all debate on the Government's role in education is the inadequacy and misleading nature of available educational statistics."

For one thing, government agencies do not rush into print with statistics, and in the fast-moving field of education and research, figures may no longer be pertinent when they are published. To increase imprecision, definitions vary among agencies on what constitutes education programs. It is also not unheard of in an agency for the front office not to know of all that is being done in the back shop.

The internal political significance of the report is considerable, since congressional opponents of federal aid pro-