

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

Volume 18, No. 9  
November-December, 1965

- - - - - to provide information and to stimulate discussion. Not to be attributed as official FAS policy unless specifically so indicated.

## Recommendations of the N.C.C. Committee on Arms Control

*The following list of recommendations is the summary of the National Citizens Commission Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament report to the White House Conference on International Cooperation Year.*

I. To halt the growth and spread of nuclear arsenals we recommend the following steps:

(1) That the United States seek a non-proliferation treaty that prohibits the transfer by atomic powers of nuclear weapons and manufacturing capabilities and their acquisition or manufacture by non-nuclear powers.

(2) That the United States seek to establish the conditions—military, political, and economic—in which both the non-nuclear and nuclear powers will perceive that their security and other interests are best served by preventing any further spread of nuclear weapons through adherence to a non-proliferation treaty.

(3) That the United States seek an agreement with the other nuclear powers pledging them (a) not to attack or threaten to attack with nuclear weapons a non-nuclear power and (b), if a non-nuclear power is thus threatened or attacked, to defend it with all necessary means.

(4) That the United States seek acceptance of a series of other measures to halt the buildup and spread of nuclear weapons:

(a) A comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty adequately verified, perhaps utilizing recent improvements in national detection systems making it possible to rely on challenge inspections or to otherwise bridge the gap in acceptable numbers of on-site inspections that appeared to prevent agreement in 1963;

(b) A U.S., U.K., U.S.S.R. treaty to cease all production of weapons-grade fissionable material;

(c) The transfer of agreed quantities of such material to the IAEA for peaceful uses by the developing countries;

(d) Elaboration and intensification of IAEA inspection and the subordination of all transfers of fissionable material to IAEA controls;

(e) Opening of all U.S.S.R., U.K., and U.S. atomic energy plants to IAEA inspection.

(5) That the United States encourage the development of nuclear-free zones in Latin America, Africa, and the Near East, beginning with a U.S.-Soviet Treaty establishing a zone of nuclear and conventional arms limitation under U.N. inspection in the Bering Straits and including comparable areas in Alaska and Siberia.

II. To limit and reduce strategic delivery capabilities we recommend that the United States seek agreement with the Soviet Union and, if feasible, with the other nuclear powers on the following sequence:

(1) A moratorium of at least three years on the deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems;

(2) A freeze on the number of strategic delivery vehicles;

(Continued on Page 4)

## U.S. Votes for Chinese Inclusion in Arms Talks

Arthur J. Goldberg, chief United States representative to the United Nations, voted for a resolution of the Political Committee of the General Assembly which called for a world disarmament conference that would include China, on November 23. The American vote for the resolution completed a reversal in United States policy brought about on the initiative of the United States delegation itself, a U.N. official said. Over the previous weekend, he reported, the mission had pleaded with the State Department for permission to support the resolution. They reasoned that to vote against it would be to place the United States in virtual isolation and to excite criticism among the non-aligned states.

Goldberg emphasized the Johnson Administration's insistence on careful preparation for the conference in his speech. The American decision on participation, he said, will be taken in the light of the preparations.

Diplomats from nonaligned nations that have supported Communist China's membership in the United Nations saw the American vote as reflecting a change of policy on Peking's admission, even though the conference will not be held under the aegis of the world organization.

United States officials would not say that the Administration was rethinking its China policy as a result of the vote in the General Assembly the previous week, on admission to that body.

Peking's sponsors failed then to obtain a simple majority for admission, and the 47 favorable votes fell far short of the required two-thirds majority. But there were significant changes in the voting pattern and some diplomats now believe that the United States has seen the handwriting on the wall.

The United States, reliable sources said, views the coming months as a test of Communist China's true attitudes toward peace, disarmament and the United Nations. Peking's actions will be examined carefully, but this examination the American officials said, is not connected with the possibility that the Peking regime will be admitted to the United Nations next year.

The American vote, the United States sources said, is not inconsistent with the pattern of Chinese-American meetings in Warsaw and Geneva in the past. This explanation does not convince those diplomats who believe that a shift in American policy may be in the offing.

France abstained from the vote in the Political Committee.

(Continued on Page 4)

## FROM THE CHAIRMAN

In the June *Newsletter* I asked members to drop me a note telling what they think FAS should be doing. I am happy to report that a number of members took the trouble to write, and that each letter was constructive and helpful. I would like to make a report on the suggestions which have been received so far and to invite others to write me if they feel the urge. Among those who wrote are an M.D., a psychologist, a health physicist in the Marine Corps, a physicist presently editing a DOD publication on the DEW line, and a former FAS treasurer. I hope the authors will forgive me for my arbitrary selections and for sometimes mentioning names and sometimes not.

Joseph W. Still, M.D., M.D.H., has founded the AD HOC COMMITTEE TO FOSTER PEACE BY FINESSE, 831 Milan St., South Pasadena, California. I would urge FAS members to write him for copies of his booklet (cost \$1). The proposal is concerned with ways to isolate the developing nations from the arms race via United Nations machinery. Dr. Still writes: "It seems to me that this is a proposal that FAS could and should take on."

From Israel Rotkin I quote: members "should study . . . and propagandize for programs in the following fields: (1) Science education, non-professional; it is essential for intelligent citizenship today. (2) Population control. (3) Water supply. (4) Environmental pollution. (5) Conservation of resources . . . I would fit in nuclear energy control at about 2½ above. I've omitted it because FAS is already active in this field."

We have had a couple of complaints about the statement opposing the use of gas warfare in Vietnam. Murray Kamrass says, for example, "FAS should be investigating the potential of chemical and biological weapons. The need for this . . . is clearly shown by the almost hysterical knee-jerk reaction of the FAS Council to the news that nonlethal chemicals had been used in Vietnam . . . It should consider the nature of the wars in which we are finding ourselves engaged . . . and a comparison with other weapons for accomplishing the same purpose."

A number of letters expressed deep concern about the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam. One letter says, "one of the more urgent things we could be insisting on is that the U.S. show some respect for the rules that we expect all nations . . . to follow. The president has ordered the bombing

of North Vietnam and has committed American troops to battle in South Vietnam—acts of war—without explicit approval of Congress. Don't you think that FAS has a clear responsibility here to protest this kind of madness?" Another letter says, "I decidedly feel that these are matters which, with the utmost importance, do most vitally concern" FAS. And another: "Only if you are working for World Peace do I care to belong."

The arms race still seems to be the main worry: "I feel that it is becoming time for FAS to cease being a not-really-recognized policy advising body and commence to become what it really represents—a union of scientists, unfortunately limited to one country. I need not speak here of the potential of such a union; perhaps there will be disputes, perhaps factions. But when the chips are down . . . there can be but one faction, that which favors and is determined to see the survival of the human race."

At least one of our members feels that scientists and engineers tend to be too narrow in their interests, that a bit of the Great Books approach of Hutchins at Chicago 20 years ago would be helpful. He goes on to advocate interdisciplinary training in nonrelated fields and suggests that the membership of FAS might try to enlighten each other in their different disciplines.

Robert J. Rogers writes: "I am a psychologist. One thing I would like FAS to do is provide a voluntary polling system for its members that would determine and display to ourselves and others the nature of our consensus and, on our differences of opinion on any matters on which we wish to express opinions. FAS could do this by inviting members to submit statements of opinion and by then publishing them in the *Newsletter* with an invitation to members to send in expressions of agreement or disagreement with the published statements."

Two respondents complained that they always get the *Newsletter* late, and suggest that if it is going to be late coming out, it should be dated to take this into account. One writer wondered what the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is up to, and asked if the *Newsletter* might report more about it.

I hope to find time to write personal replies to these letters. In the meantime I wish to express my gratitude to those who wrote and to assure them that their views will be presented to the Executive Committee in December.

I have a certain amount of sympathy for those who argue that it is more humane to use tear gas than flamethrowers in Vietnam. On the other side I would like to quote from a statement by the Pugwash Continuing Committee in the proceedings of the 14th conference, Venice, April 1965. "We have discussed the dangers inherent in the use of unconventional weapons. We condemn the use of gas warfare in any part of the world. There are 2 reasons that lead us to this belief: (1) there are gases of all grades of toxicity, running from gases with only brief effects to lethal nerve gases. But that which is only incapacitating for a healthy adult can be deadly for an infant or a weak person. Once gas of any kind is used and the various barriers to the use of gas are broken down, there is no clear line to prevent escala-

(Continued on Page 4)

### FAS NEWSLETTER

Published monthly except during July and August by the Federation of American Scientists, 2025 Eye St., N.W., Washington, D. C., 20006. Subscription price: \$2.00 per year.

Chairman . . . . . Dr. W. A. Higinbotham  
The FAS Newsletter is prepared in Washington.  
Editor: Judith Eckerson.

The FAS, founded in 1946, is a national organization of scientists and engineers concerned with the impact of science on national and world affairs.

Sources of information (given at the end of articles in parentheses) are for further reference. Items reprinted directly from other publications are designated as such in an introductory paragraph.

OF INTEREST . . .

A COMMITTEE AT THE WHITE HOUSE Conference on International Cooperation has suggested that the U.S. seriously consider negotiating a treaty, similar to the Antarctic Treaty of 1959, which would provide for peaceful activity only, and suspend all territorial claims, on the surface of the Moon. The recommendation went further to suggest that the United Nations might be the logical governing body, and if the Moon were ever to produce economically useful products and knowledge, that they be used for the benefit of all nations. (N.Y. Times, November 30, 1965)

THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS has urged the Selective Service to prevent local draft boards from inducting political dissenters as a form of punishment. The congress said that Selective Service officials in Delaware and Michigan were treating recent antiwar protests by students as grounds for immediate induction. "The selection of inductees on political grounds is clearly unconstitutional . . . it is absolutely prohibited under the Bill of Rights," said a letter from a congress committee. The congress called on the Director of the Selective Service to warn draft boards publicly against revoking deferments and drafting men "as a means of silencing political dissent." (N.Y. Times, November 26, 1965)

THE ROCHESTER COMMITTEE for Scientific Information has been conducting an intensive local investigation of the condition of the Genesee River and public beaches on Lake Ontario. Their first investigations were concerned with the presence of the bacterium E. coli and E. typhosa. They found pollution which they considered dangerous. Research into the levels of pesticide residues in local water are planned. Groups interested in conducting similar surveys may wish to write to them at P.O. Box 5236, River Campus Station, Rochester, N. Y. 14627. (R.C.S.I. Bulletin, October 4, 1965)

INDIAN OFFICIALS have finally officially admitted that they used American weapons in their fighting against Pakistan in September. The weapons were supplied to India under the conditions that they be used only for defense against China, but the Indians said that they felt justified in using the weapons against Pakistan when the Pakistanis began using American-made weapons against them. (N.Y. Times, November 11, 1965)

PHYSICIANS UNDER THE AGE of 35 face possible induction into the armed forces beginning January 1, 1966. A special call for 1,529 physicians and 350 dentists has been issued by the Defense Department. Fatherhood will not qualify doctors for deferment, although fathers in other occupations are generally being deferred. (N.Y. Times, November 12, 1965)

A RECENT BOOK by Thomas S. Szasz, Psychiatric Justice, published by Macmillan, points out the misuse to which insanity statutes are put, and illustrates a dangerous and growing disregard for civil liberties. Although the Constitution promises the right to a speedy and public trial, Dr. Szasz points out that district attorneys and judges frequently use insanity statutes to avoid a trial, even when the defendant insists he is ready and willing to plead his case and his attorney agrees. The result can be a life sentence to a mental hospital instead of facing a jury and maximum penalties of several months or years. Dr. Szasz gives examples, including a man who has been in a mental institution for ten years, waiting for a trial. He fired a shot over the head of a real estate developer who tried to take over land where he had operated a business for years, in 1955, and has never been indicted. (Wall Street Journal, November 10, 1965)

AMERICAN BRIEFING OFFICERS in Saigon have been accused by American reporters of giving false information,

distorted reports, and making statements in carefully chosen language to avoid precise meanings. They are also accused of making statements about situations of which they have no knowledge at all. Reporters who visited troops found that battles of which they had been informed had not taken place. In other cases, troops that had retreated or pulled back were announced as having "readjusted their position." There is great pressure for body counts, and the men in the field joke about the WEG's that get into print (wild-eyed guesses). (N.Y. Times, November 26, 1965)

AN EDITORIAL in the N.Y. Times called Pope Paul's categorical prohibition of any medicinal or mechanical method of contraception "profoundly disturbing" although expected. "It is bound to exercise a partial brake on population control for an indefinite period." The religious as well as the social dilemma was exemplified by the very high figures on abortions among married women in Catholic areas, notably South America. (N.Y. Times, November 30, 1965)

THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT has conceded that nuclear weapons have been shipped through New York City without the knowledge of the Mayor, the Health Department, or the Fire Department. The DOD said that assembled weapons have not been shipped. The Mayor had tried unsuccessfully since February to learn whether nuclear weapons were being sent through the city streets at night, but could not elicit an answer until November. (N.Y. Times, November 23 & 30, 1965)

Sources in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency report that new positions for scientists and scientific-oriented people may be available over the next few months. Applicants with FAS backgrounds have in the past been hired, and qualified people may wish to consider the value of this agency's work. The ACDA is at Constitution Avenue and C Street in Washington, D.C.

ENROLL A NEW FAS MEMBER NOW!

Federation of American Scientists, Suite 313, 2025 Eye St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. I wish to support FAS by becoming a:

- Member  Subscriber  Contributor

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

Membership Dues: Regular -\$7.50 (income below \$4500 -\$4) Supporting -\$10; Patron -\$25; Student -\$2

Subscription to FAS Newsletter -\$2 (10 issues per year; free to members)

Contribution . . . . . \$

Make check payable to: FAS

- Please send information on Group Life Insurance
 Please send information on special rates to FAS members for Bulletin of Atomic Scientists

## FROM THE CHAIRMAN

(Continued from Page 2)

tion to the use of the entire range of gas weapons available. (2) If weapons said to be merely incapacitating come into general use, they would be directed against civilian populations in cases where more destructive weapons would never have been used, thus civilians would become exposed to military action to which they are not now subject."

On the legislative side of things, Albert I. Drachman writes: "You mention Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, 'That the President should be supported in his efforts to achieve peace and disarmament. . . .' Yes and no. Certainly we should support, encourage and work for any and every thing which would help bring about peace and disarmament. However, the language is that of a politician, not that of a scientist or logician. As Socrates would say, 'Define your terms.' In other words, peace and disarmament, and efforts to achieve them, should by all means be encouraged. But that does not necessarily mean that Johnson and his efforts should be encouraged. Are his efforts directed toward peace and disarmament? When he bombs North Vietnam, spreads napalm in South Vietnam, and invades Santo Domingo, he says that is for peace. Is that what we should encourage? When he pushes the MLF, he says that it is in the interest of nuclear disarmament or at least nonproliferation. In other words, saying vaguely that we support 'his efforts to achieve peace and disarmament' may be, and undoubtedly would be, taken by the establishment as support for his policies, which, at least to me and many other seriously concerned scholars, seem to be, on the contrary, militaristic and destructive. In any event, as scientists, accustomed to precision, FAS, in supporting or opposing any governmental proposal, should demand clear, precise, and unambiguous language."

All comments continue to be welcome.

W. A. HIGINBOTHAM

## U. S. VOTES FOR CHINESE INCLUSION IN ARMS TALKS

(Continued from Page 1)

The French Government has refused to sign the nuclear test ban treaty or to attend the disarmament talks in Geneva concluded under United Nations auspices.

Mr. Goldberg told the committee that the United States had dropped its earlier objections to the resolution but that it still had some reservations. The resolution, he noted, "would have us decide only in principle to convene a conference."

The first of two operative paragraphs endorses a proposal, adopted at a conference of non-aligned states in Cairo in 1964, on the convening of a world disarmament conference to which all countries would be invited.

The second paragraph "urges that the necessary consultations be conducted with all countries for the purpose of establishing a widely representative preparatory committee which will take appropriate steps for the convening of a world disarmament conference not later than 1967."

The wording of the resolution, some sponsors conceded, is fuzzy. This is intentional. They did not want it to include specifications to which the Chinese Communists could object at this stage, hurting the prospects for a conference. (*N.Y. Times, November 24, 1965*)

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF NCC COMMITTEE ON ARMS CONTROL

(Continued from Page 1)

(3) A reduction in total numbers amounting to one-third of each party's medium- and long-range delivery vehicles, beginning with the destruction of obsolete stocks.

III. To curb conventional arms races among the underdeveloped countries we recommend the following initiatives:

(1) That the United States seek to have controls established over the traffic in arms by (a) major-power agreement to refrain from introduction of sophisticated weapons; (b) regional non-acquisition agreements; (c) U.N.-supervised agreements regarding sale and acquisition; (d) the establishment of a U.N. monitoring system to record the traffic in arms.

(2) That the United States join with other major powers to provide adequate security for the less developed nations; in addition, the United States support the establishment of U.N. peacekeeping procedures to the same end.

IV. To further reduce tensions in Europe and move toward settlement of the outstanding East-West differences we recommend the following measures:

(1) That the United States, working with its allies, seek a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization.

(2) That the United States seek to ensure that measures to improve Western security arrangements do not result in the creation of new nuclear forces, but instead provide for greater involvement of our Western European allies in the planning for use of U.S. strategic forces as well as other military planning and arms control problems.

(3) That the United States explore arms control, related security provisions, and other measures which would help lead to German reunification; and, in this connection, the possibilities for balanced reductions of U.S. and Soviet troops and weapons in Central Europe be examined.

V. That the United States attempt to bring the People's Republic of China into a genuine dialogue on disarmament and other security matters: (a) by seeking bilateral talks on arms control matters of joint concern; (b) by ascertaining the conditions under which Communist China could qualify for and accept the responsibilities of membership in the United Nations; and (c) by supporting efforts to bring Communist China into the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference or a World Disarmament Conference, if held.

VI. To make the law of the U.N. Charter more effective and to strengthen U.N. peacekeeping machinery we recommend:

(1) That the United States support the creation of a U.N. Peace Force, perhaps composed of two parts, (a) standby forces committed by member nations and (b) an elite force of one to two thousand men recruited by the United Nations.

(2) That the United States offer to provide training and logistic support for the U.N. Peace Force and encourage others to do so.

(3) That the United States support the development of an effective U.N. Peace Observation Corps recruited by and available to the Secretary-General.

(4) That the United States and other nuclear powers commit a fraction, such as one-half of one per cent, of their annual defense expenditures to support the U.N. Peace Observation Corps and other peacekeeping activities of the U.N.

(5) That the United States encourage regional and worldwide non-aggression arrangements embodying the proposals made by President Johnson in January, 1964.

(6) That the United States devote further study to mechanisms to facilitate peaceful change, such as a World Court of Equity to deal with political disputes, as well as ways and means of making greater use of the International Court of Justice and regional tribunals to deal with juridical disputes.

(7) That the United States repeal the Connally Amendment.

Presented November 28-December 1, 1965

## REPORT ON MEETING OF WFSW

*This is a brief report on the International Symposium sponsored by the World Federation of Scientific Workers (WFSW) in September, on the Problems of the Advancement of Science in Developing Countries.*

There were about 200 people (at the conference) from about 50 different countries in Europe, Africa, Asia, South America and the Caribbean. I was the only person there from the United States. In addition, there were representatives from six international organizations including UNESCO, Pugwash and the World Health Organization.

About 90 papers were presented all of which were written up and distributed among the delegates. The papers were diverse in nature and subject matters and could (perhaps) be divided into five different topics: 1. Training and education of scientists and technicians, 2. Patterns of technical and economic development, 3. Specific research projects, 4. Food and population problems, 5. Political discussions. This division may be a little too sharp. Although none of the papers were completely devoid of some discussion of science and technology, a large fraction of them also discussed the social, economic and political conditions under which science and technology could prosper.

In sessions devoted to the training of scientists and technicians and to the science education of the populace there were about four dominant problems. They concerned 1. How to organize the teaching of science in technically advanced countries for the students who come from the developing countries, 2. How to build up the schools and universities in the developing countries, 3. How to prevent the migration of trained scientists away from the developing countries and 4. The popular and secondary school science education in the developing countries. Most of the technically advanced countries, especially those of Western Europe, seem to include the students from the developing countries in the regular college curricula. Some countries, such as Bulgaria, start the students in a preliminary institute in order that they can learn the language and discover their individual needs. The Students then enroll in a regular university. A few countries, for example Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, have set up special universities solely for students from the developing countries. They claim that the initial preparation, and also the future needs and the conditions which the students will meet when they return are so different from those of the developed countries that the special curricula provided by a separate university can be much more helpful. A figure was quoted that there are about 200,000 students from the developing countries who are now studying in the more developed countries. It was pointed out that even within these special universities, the training is not necessarily appropriate and is, furthermore, not conducive to the establishment of a native intellectual community. The sooner a nation can set up its own schools and colleges and technical institutes, the more rapid its progress can be. Nevertheless, it was agreed that special post-graduate educational opportunities will probably have to be continued in the more advanced countries for a long time.

The problem of getting universities started in the developing countries is a very thorny one. Not only is it hard to

get staff, but often indigenous empire builders dominate the scene so that schools get off on the wrong track. I gather this condition is especially true in South America. On the other hand in Africa and to some extent in Asia, the countries which are trying to set up universities tend to follow the educational patterns of the countries which were at one time their colonizers. This practice was quite generally felt to be a corrupting influence. Almost all the speakers agreed that the colleges and schools should be taught using their own languages and that too strong ties with the educational establishment of the developed countries tended to separate the trained people and the intellectuals from the most pressing problems of their own country. However, since most developing countries have not as yet enough of their own trained teachers, they have to recruit a large part of their staff from other places. Therefore it is certainly only a long term hope that they can completely break away from the patterns of the more advanced countries.

The problem of the migration of scientists from the developing countries to the developed ones was discussed in several papers without offering many helpful suggestions. The United Arab Republic does not allow any students to go abroad for study unless they are married before they leave and this practice seems to bring a good many of them back. It was suggested that the developing countries could send teams or groups of students abroad who would stay together during their study period and come back as a unit to work and talk together after they had returned. Yet only seldom, especially for students at the advanced level, can the developing countries spare enough people at once to make such a team-scheme possible.

In some countries, for example in Chile, very misleading and often alarming pseudo-science is flourishing in the public press. There is thus an enormous need for public education through exhibits, museums and articles written by responsible scientists in newspapers and periodicals.

Virtually all of the developing countries complained about the difficulties of keeping in touch with current developments and of getting current periodicals, literature and abstracts. This latter problem seems to me to be one which is more amenable to a rapid solution than some of the others discussed.

The papers which discussed the connection between science and technology and economic development were also varied. Frequent mention was made of the fact that many of the problems of the developing countries involved research which was not, and perhaps could not be done in the developed countries. Typical of such problems is the operation of equipment in different climates, including the humidity of the tropics and the dust and dryness of the deserts. Other examples of areas in which local research is required are the improvement of tropical soils, the breeding of plants and animals suited to special climates and soils, the development of resources which might be uneconomical for export but economical for indigenous use, the use of native and tropical plants for drugs and chemical processes, and the study of local diseases. In particular it was pointed out that if the dung which was now consumed as fuel in India could be

(Continued on Page 6)

## REPORT ON MEETING OF WFSW

(Continued from Page 5)

used as a fertilizer 7 million additional tons of cereals could be produced a year.

Many papers, however, stressed the futility of technical advances in the face of the social and economic organization current in some of the countries. The land ownership pattern, for example, in South America seems to be an effective obstacle to increased agricultural production despite a great deal of successful research in this field. In Chile the animal production is about the same now as it was in 1900 despite enormous advances in animal husbandry. Although food production per acre has been increased for many crops, the South American countries still remain enormous importers of food. In some places even the per capita importation of food has increased.

Many of the papers also contain complaints against the kind of aid which is given by England and France and especially by America. There is a very general concern that this aid is given with unnecessary pre-conditions that will tend to prolong the period during which the developing countries will be completely dependent on the more developed ones. The WFSW has strong representations in many of the Communist countries, and even in the non-communist countries, some of its members consider themselves as socialists. However, even allowing for this initial bias, I think that many criticisms of American technical aid practices must be taken seriously by Americans. I talked at some length with a physicist from Cambodia, (Cambodia is a Kingdom with two houses of parliament and a unique popular congress which meets for three days at a time every six months). The Cambodian physicist said that the Cambodians were terribly disappointed with American aid because it always come with so many conditions. Every item is accompanied by restrictions or prerequisites which may be political but which are more often just technical. He told of two well-drilling machines, one given by America and the other by the Soviet Union. The American one came with some spare parts and a technician. The one given by the Soviet Union apparently had no such advantages. When the one from

the Soviet Union broke down the American spare parts could have repaired it, but the Americans refused to let the Cambodians use these spare parts on the other well-digger. The Americans may have believed that they were being very clever but to the Cambodians they were just being mean. I asked him about the Peace Corps, saying that most of the people I had met in the Peace Corps were genuinely idealistic. He agreed that some were, but it seems that the Cambodians can't tell an idealistic peace corps worker from an agent of the CIA and therefore reject the whole lot of them.

There was a fairly large delegation at the symposium from North Vietnam and I felt compelled to talk with them. They were very friendly and had publicly announced their gratitude to the American academic people for their protest against the bombing of North Vietnam. The families of these delegates had left Hanoi and were some place out in the forests but none of the delegates had any assurance that they were still alive. They appeared to believe that the American people were distinct from the American government, but I could not concur in this distinction.

There was also a delegation at the conference from Cuba. The report on the training of scientists and technicians in Cuba was certainly one of the most refreshing and least doctrinaire of the lot. In addition to their reports they had brought along an exhibition of photographs organized around a long poem and more or less resembling, on a small scale, the Museum of Modern Art exhibition on the Family of Man. And perhaps the most remarkable note of optimism of the whole conference was the fact that the Cubans are organizing a conference, to be held in Havana sometime next year, on the Use of Leisure Time.

The isolation between socialist and non-socialist efforts, especially American efforts, along these lines, which has been fostered by some factions in all groups, seems to me both wasteful and deplorable. It evidently has resulted in political and organizational encumbrances which amplify the difficulties in bringing the fruits of science and technology to people who urgently need them.

FRANK OPPENHEIMER

## FAS NEWSLETTER

Federation of American Scientists  
Suite 313  
2025 Eye Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20006

Volume 18, No. 9 November-December, 1965

Second Class Postage  
Paid at  
Washington, D. C.

Return Postage  
Guaranteed