

Nuclear physics, nuclear energy and dual-use knowledge

Juan Segurola

Core question

How did nuclear physics turn experimentally measurable atomic processes into an energy technology whose scientific power could not be separated from military, political and ethical consequences?

Historical and evolutionary context

Radioactivity, the electron and the nuclear atom had already made matter experimentally penetrable by the early twentieth century. Quantum mechanics supplied a new microscopic language, and Enrico Fermi's neutron-bombardment experiments from 1934 opened access to nuclear transformations. In late 1938 Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassmann obtained chemical evidence for barium among neutron-bombarded uranium products. In early 1939 Lise Meitner and Otto Frisch interpreted the result as nuclear fission and estimated the large energy release; Frisch then reported direct physical evidence. On 2 December 1942, Fermi's Chicago Pile-1 achieved the first controlled self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction. By July 1945 the Manhattan Project had produced the Trinity nuclear explosion. Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 made the dual-use character of nuclear knowledge unavoidable.

What could communities know before this transition?

By the 1930s physicists could measure radioactive decay, nuclear charge and particle interactions. PIO-075 had established the atom as a measurable internal system, while PIO-080 supplied quantum mechanics. The limitation was that nuclear transformation was still primarily an experimental phenomenon rather than a controllable macroscopic energy source.

What changed?

Fission linked nuclear structure to a macroscopic energy budget

Meitner and Frisch's 1939 interpretation connected the split nucleus to mass-energy conversion and a release of roughly hundreds of megaelectronvolts per event. Frisch's ionisation measurements gave physical evidence for energetic fission fragments. Nuclear change could now be understood as an energy source, not only a decay signature.

Chain reactions made scale a systems problem

The possibility that emitted neutrons could induce further fissions converted a microscopic reaction into a branching process. Reactor design therefore required neutron economy, material purity, geometry, moderation and heat removal. Nuclear physics became inseparable from large-scale engineering and state organisation.

Scientific publication became entangled with secrecy and strategic control

The Manhattan Project showed that knowledge production could be deliberately compartmentalised. The 1945 Smyth Report was simultaneously an account of scientific development and a boundary around what could be publicly released. The Franck Report of June 1945 showed that scientists themselves were debating the political consequences before wartime use.

Why could this capability emerge?

The transition depended on quantum and nuclear physics, particle detection, isotope chemistry, large industrial plants, precision engineering, government funding and wartime mobilisation. It also relied on transnational scientific migration, including researchers displaced by fascism and war.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Nuclear physics enabled reactors, isotopic tracers, radiometric methods, nuclear medicine, particle physics and new astrophysical models. It also institutionalised research on radiation protection, arms control, safeguards and technology assessment.

New limits and risks

Nuclear knowledge can support energy, medicine and measurement while also enabling weapons, proliferation and long-lived waste. Low-probability failures can have large consequences, and radiation effects can extend across generations and borders. Dual-use responsibility therefore cannot be treated as an optional ethical appendix to the science.

What changed in the architecture of knowledge?

Scientific capability became a **state-scale intervention system with irreversible strategic consequences**. The epistemic chain now ran from subatomic theory through industrial engineering to governance, secrecy and international risk.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

Accounts that begin with a single “discovery of fission” obscure the chemical work of Hahn and Strassmann, the theoretical interpretation of Meitner and Frisch, the role of earlier neutron physics, and the vast labour of the Manhattan Project. They can also understate the human consequences of uranium mining, weapons production and the bombings themselves. Historical explanation should distinguish discovery, interpretation, engineering and political decision.

Dependency map

- INDIRECT ← PIO-063 Thermodynamics and energy accounting
- DIRECT ← PIO-075 X-rays, radioactivity and the measurable atom
- INDIRECT ← PIO-076 Einstein and spacetime
- INDIRECT ← PIO-079 Noether, symmetry and conservation
- DIRECT ← PIO-080 Quantum mechanics and the limits of classical description
- PARALLEL → PIO-086 Research ethics, consent and the limits of permissible inquiry

References

1. Meitner, L. & Frisch, O. R. “Disintegration of Uranium by Neutrons: a New Type of Nuclear Reaction.” *Nature* 143, 239–240 (1939). DOI: 10.1038/143239a0.
2. Frisch, O. R. “Physical Evidence for the Division of Heavy Nuclei under Neutron Bombardment.” *Nature* 143, 276 (1939). DOI: 10.1038/143276a0.
3. Smyth, H. D. “Atomic Energy for Military Purposes.” *Reviews of Modern Physics* 17(4), 351–471 (1945). DOI: 10.1103/RevModPhys.17.351.
4. Hahn, O. & Strassmann, F. “Über den Nachweis und das Verhalten der bei der Bestrahlung des Urans mittels Neutronen entstehenden Erdalkalimetalle.” *Die Naturwissenschaften* 27, 11–15 (1939).
5. Franck, J. et al. *Report of the Committee on Political and Social Problems (Franck Report)*. Metallurgical Laboratory, University of Chicago (11 June 1945).