

F. A. S. PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT

Formerly the FAS Newsletter

SPECIAL ISSUE
HELSINKI & THE SOVIET SCIENTIST

Vol. 28, No. 10

December, 1975

WHAT WILL THE HELSINKI AGREEMENT MEAN FOR SOVIET SCIENTISTS AND HUMAN RIGHTS?

In the official Soviet view, the Helsinki Agreement has no internal implications about which outsiders may complain. Its section on human rights is simply a kind of agenda for future negotiation toward increasing contacts, solving problems of divided families, etc. Moreover, this section does no more, in the official Soviet view, than codify those events that would take place in any case, in the normal course of detente; events that will not take place in its absence, notwithstanding the Agreement. Thus this so-called "basket three" of the Helsinki Agreement becomes, in the official view, simply a meaningless milestone on the road to making detente "irreversible".

In fact, the Helsinki Agreement declares the determination of the participating states to do a number of things that are strictly internal and which could not, in any case, be advanced by reciprocal agreement. For example, the states promise to:

"respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction . . ."

"promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms . . .".

The Agreement also notes that:

"all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine when and as they wish, their internal and external political status . . ."

The typical Soviet answer to these observations is to mind your own business. In the official view, these points are made almost solely by enemies of detente. As one commentator put it, there are "really few naive people" who are involved in the campaign to insist on basket three. It is felt that these "modern crusaders" can hardly be taken seriously. They are instructed to observe how much there is to be done in their own country; Watergate is often referred to.

The official view sees an acute struggle in America between the enemies and supporters of detente. It warns its countrymen to beware of provocation aimed at inducing a retaliatory campaign on the part of the socialist countries so as to unleash a noisy wrangle.

On the specifics of freedom of information, this view asserts that the Soviet Union will comply with

—Continued on page 2

Reviewed and Approved by the
FAS National Council

MISSION TO MOSCOW: SUMMARY REFLECTIONS

No Nation provides to its citizens a freedom that is *without blemish*. And for all Nations freedom depends upon "detente". Our own generation knows how easily, in a climate of vigilance against foreign dangers, blacklists can propagate, Presidents be intimidated, official lawlessness be tolerated. (See for example, page 12 on CIA mail opening.)

In the Soviet Union detente is producing certain stirrings. Soviet scientists are sometimes speaking freely. Often the reason is desperation — as in the case of the Jewish scientists refused visas and then denied jobs. Sometimes, it is the courage of conviction as in the case of those "dissident" scientists who are, in fact, "public defender" scientists working for rule of law.

In both cases, these scientists are acting entirely legally under any plausible interpretation of Soviet law. But their defense against official lawlessness, from one quarter or another, seems to depend almost entirely upon the extent to which their mistreatment might become an issue in the West. For them, Western contact is a lifeline rather than

a threat; they have crossed an invisible (but entirely legal) line in Soviet society.

It is extraordinary for a representative of our Federation to see our own history and aspirations writ large in the Soviet Union. American atomic scientists moved to Washington 30 years ago and put their new found prestige to work for control of the atom and, subsequently, for an end to McCarthyism. Today Andrei Sakharov's prestige as an inventor of the hydrogen bomb is being put to the same service.

The Soviet humans rights' movement, led by scientists, is today engaged in a momentous experiment. Can the consciousness of the Soviet citizenry, and of the Soviet bureaucracy, be brought to the point where the one demands, and the other provides, the rule of law? The only tool of our Soviet colleagues in this experiment is the courage with which to provide themselves as examples; their only defense is Western outcry. Will our voices match their courage?

—JEREMY J. STONE

Continued from page 1

Helsinki but will not fling open the door for "anti-Soviet subversive propaganda".

One problem here is that the Soviet authorities consider the Helsinki Agreement conditioned and limited, not only by Soviet law, but by Soviet customs and traditions. And these customs and traditions can make the provisions related to internal affairs a complete nullity.

For example, a biologist, Sergei Adamovich Kovalyev, and a physicist, Andrei Nikolayevich Tverdokhlebov, will apparently soon be tried for different versions of anti-Soviet slander (or agitation). The law on such slander requires that their statements be false and known to be false. We fear that no court effort will even be made to prove either condition. In fact, the \$64,000 question, "What is anti-Soviet?", has never been answered. Anti-Soviet slander is an undefined phrase.

Both of these scientists came to the attention of the authorities because of their activities in defense of human rights — advising others of their legal rights under Soviet law; distributing factual (samizdat) material on Soviet happenings; or just serving on an Amnesty International Group in defense of human rights in Yugoslavia, Spain and Ceylon!

Scientists engaged in such activities are truly our brothers, functioning in the Soviet Union as FAS does here, within the context of law, and in an effort to improve the application of law. And is not their cause the cause of detente as well? The Helsinki Agreement observes:

"The participating States recognize the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for which is an essential factor for the peace, justice and well being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation among themselves as among all States . . ."

Furthermore, as we have noted before, the Soviet Union cannot move forward without greater freedom of expression, and without attention to proper application of law. Surrounded as it is by states moving forward much more rapidly, it is positively dangerous for this great Nation to continue forever to shield itself from foreign influences by systematically divorcing what is legally permissible from what is truly permitted.

Finally, there are the few hundred Jewish scientists caught up in the oscillations of detente. For them the vision of emigration, produced by detente, has sufficed only to leave them stranded, without jobs and without visas. The bizarre notions that they are "too valuable" to the West to be permitted to leave, or that "Israel has not signed the Helsinki Agreement" reveal only too clearly what they confront. Pressured to leave their laboratories, and subsequently blacklisted, there is little hope of their re-entering the Soviet scientific world. And if they cannot function as Soviet scientists, they must be allowed to leave. Scientists must have the right to function as scientists; if Russia does not want them because of their temerity in asking for

permission to leave, then they should be permitted to become scientists elsewhere. In this way, we deduce a result that the Helsinki Agreement and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights deduce in other ways.

As Andrei D. Sakharov put it in a statement to FAS of November 8 (see page 7), scientists are the least egoistic part of society. This, their sense of international community with one another, and their intellectual capacities, place upon them a special obligation to help one another in the universal struggle to advance both human rights and the proper application of science. We urge scientists everywhere to join with us in discharging our obligations toward our Soviet colleagues over the coming months and years. □

FAS

Chairman: PHILIP MORRISON
Vice Chairman: JEROME D. FRANK
Secretary: HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.
Treasurer: HERBERT F. YORK
Director: JEREMY J. STONE

The Federation of American Scientists is a unique, non-profit, civic organization, licensed to lobby in the public interest, and composed of 7,000 natural and social scientists and engineers who are concerned with problems of science and society. Democratically organized with an elected National Council of 26 members, FAS was first organized in 1946 as the Federation of Atomic Scientists and has functioned as a conscience of the scientific community for more than a quarter century.

SPONSORS (partial list)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| *Christian B. Anfinsen (Biochem.) | *Willis E. Lamb, Jr. (Physics) |
| *Kenneth J. Arrow (Economics) | *Wassily W. Leontief (Economics) |
| *Julius Axelrod (Biochemistry) | *Fritz Lipmann (Biochemistry) |
| *David Baltimore (Microbiology) | *S. E. Luria (Biology) |
| Leona Baumgartner (Pub. Health) | Roy Menninger (Psychiatry) |
| Paul Beeson (Medicine) | Robert Merton (Sociology) |
| *Hans A. Bethe (Physics) | Matthew S. Meselson (Biology) |
| *Konrad Bloch (Chemistry) | Neal E. Miller (Psychology) |
| *Norman E. Borlaug (Wheat) | Hans J. Morgenthau (Pol. Science) |
| Anne Pitts Carter (Economics) | Marston Morse (Mathematics) |
| *Owen Chamberlain (Physics) | *Robert S. Mulliken (Chemistry) |
| Abram Chayes (Law) | Franklin A. Neva (Medicine) |
| *Leon N. Cooper (Physics) | *Marshall Nirenberg (Biochem.) |
| *Carl F. Cori (Biochemistry) | *Severo Ochoa (Biochemistry) |
| Paul B. Corneily (Medicine) | Charles E. Osgood (Psychology) |
| *André Cournand (Medicine) | *Linus Pauling (Chemistry) |
| *Max Delbruck (Biology) | George Polyak (Mathematics) |
| John T. Edsall (Biology) | Oscar Rice (Physical Chemistry) |
| Paul R. Ehrlich (Biology) | David Riesman, Jr. (Sociology) |
| *John F. Enders (Biochemistry) | *J. Robert Schrieffer (Physics) |
| Adrian Fisher (Law) | *Julian Schwinger (Physics) |
| Jerome D. Frank (Psychology) | Alice Kimball Smith (History) |
| John Kenneth Galbraith (Econ.) | Cyril S. Smith (Metallurgy) |
| Richard L. Garwin (Physics) | *Robert M. Solow (Economics) |
| Edward L. Ginzton (Engineering) | *William H. Stein (Chemistry) |
| *Donald A. Glaser (Physics-Biol.) | *Albert Szent-Györgyi (Biochem.) |
| *H. K. Hartline (Physiology) | *Howard M. Temin (Microbiology) |
| Walter W. Heller (Economics) | James Tobin (Economics) |
| *Alfred D. Hershey (Biology) | *Charles H. Townes (Physics) |
| Hudson Hoagland (Biology) | *Harold C. Urey (Chemistry) |
| *Robert W. Holley (Biochemistry) | *George Wald (Biology) |
| Marc Kac (Mathematics) | Myron E. Wegman (Medicine) |
| Henry S. Kaplan (Medicine) | Victor F. Weisskopf (Physics) |
| Carl Kaysen (Economics) | Jerome B. Wiesner (Engineering) |
| *H. Gobind Khorana (Biochemistry) | Robert R. Wilson (Physics) |
| George B. Kistiakowsky (Chem.) | C. S. Wu (Physics) |
| *Arthur Kornberg (Biochemistry) | Alfred Yankauer (Medicine) |
| *Polykarp Kusch (Physics) | Herbert F. York (Physics) |

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS (elected)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Ruth S. Adams (Science Policy) | Franklin A. Long (Chemistry) |
| David Baltimore (Microbiology) | Francis E. Low (Physics) |
| Nina Byers (Physics) | Victor Rabinowitch (World Devel.) |
| Rose E. Frisch (Human Biology) | George W. Rathjens (Pol. Science) |
| Arthur W. Galston (Biology) | Leonard Rodberg (Economics) |
| Morton H. Halperin (Pol. Science) | Leonard Rodberg (Pol. Science) |
| Garrett Hardin (Human Ecology) | Joseph L. Sax (Environment) |
| Denis Hayes (Environ. Policy) | George A. Silver (Medicine) |
| William A. Higinbotham (Physics) | Jeremy J. Stone (Mathematics) |
| John P. Holdren (Energy Policy) | Vigdor Teplitz (Physics) |
| Daniel Koshland, Jr. (Biochem.) | Frank Von Hippel (Physics) |
| Raphael Littauer (Physics) | Myron E. Wegman (Medicine) |

*Nobel Laureates

The FAS Public Interest Report is published monthly except July and August at 307 Mass. Ave., NE, Washington, D.C. 20002. Annual subscription \$20/year. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

RELATING A JOURNEY WHEREIN SCIENTISTS REACH ACROSS THE BARRICADES

Moscow is eight time zones away. We had left Washington on Sunday at 5:30 p.m. and were touching down at 5:30 p.m. Moscow time on Monday — sleepy and disheveled. I watched the passport control officer attentively. In due course, he reached under his desk and unobtrusively clanged something and, after a pause, did so again. I saw approaching over my shoulder a heavy-set plainclothes official to whom he gave a high-sign. The official went off to converse with two others. We had evidently arrived.

As we waited to pass through baggage customs, the three officials conferred quietly, keeping us under surveillance, moving away nervously when I stood near them. The delay was extraordinary — two hours to pass twenty feet down a line — because all baggage was being searched.

Directly in front of us, a customs official was examining a newspaper his search had revealed. He asked its owner, "Are you a Communist?" The affirmative answer discouraged him not one whit. He went on to searching a wallet and even a pill box. The second most powerful country in the world, 58 years after its Revolution, was trembling lest the border be crossed by printed words.

Angling for a different customs officer availed us nothing. Our baggage revealed at least thirty fiction paperbacks in English, copies of the Helsinki Agreement (in Russian and English) and documents concerning that Agreement. The officer looked unhappy. I explained the purpose of our visit and the intention we had of discussing this very matter with Soviet officials. Would he like me to show him letters describing this purpose? He would. But someone outside my range of vision signaled him off. We were released.

Moving to Intourist, we found it awaiting us expectantly with an excellent car which, to our great pleasure, went to our desired Hotel National. The room, similar to one we had had on earlier visits, faced the square with the best view in Moscow: the Kremlin, Red Square and the Lenin Mausoleum. Depositing our bags, and despite the late hour and the 20 hours of travel, we rushed off to spend the evening with Russian friends until 1 a.m.

The First Day

Up early, we made arrangements by telephone to visit the Institute for the USA and to see its Director, Dr. Georgi Arbatov later in the afternoon. Thereupon we called and visited the home of the famous mathematician: Ilya Iossifovich Pjatetsky-Shapiro. Dr. Pjatetsky-Shapiro is a specialist on automorphic functions, number theory and mathematical biology. He is a refusenik — one who has been refused a visa. For requesting the right to emigrate to Israel, he lost his job and he now subsists on his wife's salary as a physician and his savings. Like all scientific refuseniks, he has problems publishing his work. Under Soviet law, even internal Soviet journals will not consider articles without a letter from their author's superior indicating that the material is not secret and may be printed. But no job means no superior to write such a letter.

At one point, a mathematical superior had tried sincerely to get Pjatetsky-Shapiro another job at good pay if somewhat lower academic status. But after Pjatetsky-Shapiro had, as requested, filled out an application saying

he would accept the job, it had been promptly denied. He was, he felt, too hot to handle. Like a "plasma", nothing could contain a refusenik. (I remembered black-listing in the fifties for television performers; it sounded much the same). Now he earns only 5 or 10 rubles a month as a referee for mathematics reviews. (Rubles are \$1.38 at the official rate.)

After further discussion, we visited Professor Alexander Lerner. Lerner was the first senior scientist to apply to go to Israel. His phone was removed by authorities — along with those of 30 others — at the time of the Nixon visit to Moscow and never replaced. A jovial man, with interests in cybernetics, he had, by accident, been at the visa office one hour after the Helsinki Agreement had been signed. When he asked whether it would improve the situation, they responded, "How can the situation be improved?", implying that it was perfect. He felt the Western officials must desire to be deceived in such matters.

Nevertheless, he had written the visa office and said that he was covered by Helsinki, being old and weak and wanting to be reunited with his daughter who had earlier been permitted to go to Israel. Four weeks later, he had received a post card asking him to call the officials (they could not call him since they had cut off his phone.)

—Continued on page 4

HOW THE TRIP WAS ARRANGED

FAS had promised its members for some time that it would undertake an investigation of the situation faced by Soviet scientists. The signing of the Helsinki Agreement seemed to make the trip especially timely.

My wife, Dr. B. J. Stone, and I simply applied for tourist visas as we had done on past visits. But we wrote also to the Soviet Embassy and to two Institutes advising them of our intention and asking the Directors of the Institutes if they would see us.

These Directors knew us from past activities. From 1966-1970, accompanied by my wife, I had lectured each year at one or both of these Institutes on disarmament in general, and on the undesirability of anti-ballistic missiles in particular. Some of these visits were in conjunction with mathematical conferences, others were simply associated with tourism. In order to advance the trips, my wife had learned quite serviceable Russian over those five years and it was with her assistance that we managed to make and keep so many appointments so quickly and without guides on this visit. She also served as interpreter for more than one of these conversations.

When the negotiations over the ABM had gotten underway, these efforts to help advance the now existing ABM treaty had seemed less necessary; we had turned to other matters for our vacations. As a result, this was our first visit to Moscow in five years.

The addresses and phone numbers of many of the scientists with problems were secured from the Committee of Concerned Scientists in New York City, 9 East 40th Street, but others were supplied by the Soviet scientists themselves. □

Continued from page 3

The officials said simply that this letter had been discussed but the earlier order "reaffirmed".

As a kind of Dean of refuseniks, Professor Lerner knew of 600 families in his situation, containing about 3,000 or 4,000 people of which he felt about 25% were scientists. He thought about 30,000 had left in 1974 and about 15,000 in 1975. Discrimination against Jews is slowly increasing.

He felt that scientists traveling to the USSR must speak about the problem of refuseniks, remind the Russian scientists of it, and if necessary, technological cooperation must be impaired.

Our next stop was at the Steklov Institute office of Corresponding Member Igor Shafarevich. The Soviet National Academy of Sciences has about 250 full members (Academicians) and about another 400 Corresponding Members. Thus to be a Corresponding Member is somewhat more select than admission to our own National Academy of Sciences (1,000 members) and is a very high Soviet honor.

Human Rights Group: I. Shafarevich

Professor Shafarevich is not a refusenik and is not Jewish. He is one of three scientists who are members of the Human Rights Group in the Soviet Union. The others are Andrei D. Sakharov and Gregory Podiapolsky. Professor Shafarevich is an impressive man of presence and dignity, speaking several languages fluently. He spoke to us with precision and incisiveness about Soviet problems of human rights, and the problems in the prison camps. One new problem he raised was the insistence of the authorities on ideological education. Young people had to assert their support of the ideological line under the pressure of undermining their careers; it taught them early a kind of two-facedness. They were not allowed to parrot the line but were often asked, "But what do you think?", and so on.

Shafarevich spoke dispassionately of the problems others faced. One man had attempted to publish a journal, in each issue of which he noted that the journal was non-political but only concerned cultural and social matters. He was sent to prison. A Baptist leader had actually lived underground for months at a time (extremely difficult in the Soviet Union) much as had early Christians under the Romans; posters warned that he was a "dangerous criminal".

I asked why the Human Rights Group was so small; was it simply the fear of being associated with such a daring endeavor? Instead, he felt it was the doubt about whether their method of working for proper application of law would succeed. They were planting a seed. No one could be sure what would really come of it.

At 3:30, we took a quick look for a Soviet mathematician friend of ours also at Steklov (he was out of town) and began to head for the center of town and to the Institute for the USA. Arriving at 4:30, we had a useful off-the-record conversation with Academician Arbatov on the Helsinki Agreement; he is the main published Soviet authority on this subject and his article in *Izvestia*, republished in excerpts in the *New York Times*, is the most authoritative version of Soviet views.

We had lectured at this Institute on disarmament in its first years and knew, or were known to, many of its members. Afterwards, we exchanged views on SALT and

detente with the Deputy Director Dr. Shurkin and a retired three-star General and political scientist, Dr. Michael A. Milstein, who speaks excellent English and was very well informed.

Dozing Through Dinner

Returning to the National Hotel in bitter cold, feeling great exhaustion, we dozed through an excellent meal in the restaurant marred somewhat by having to watch soldiers on the Square freezing as they practiced for the November 7 parade commemorating the 58th anniversary of the Revolution. We collapsed into bed feeling that the first day had been well spent. (Visitors to Moscow will appreciate how difficult it is to arrange and carry out four visits in one day and we were feeling the strain of the recent travel.)

Arranging our visit to the Institute for World Economics and International Relations (IMEMO) took longer; its Director, Academician N. N. Innezemtsov, had agreed with Arbatov that the Deputy Director at IMEMO would arrange a meeting for us. But everyone was very busy because of the coming holidays.

We stopped in at the Embassy to see what it knew about the Helsinki Agreement and got a useful press clipping from a political officer. The science officials had only very out-dated lists of the Soviet Academy officials, however, containing names of persons I knew to be dead (e.g. Artsimovich). We had just time, we felt, to visit the Soviet Academy headquarters and leave some material on disarmament (FAS publications) for Academician Markov, who has become the leader of the Academy's disarmament group. (When I had submitted a paper to the 1973 Pugwash Conference [Finland] arguing that detente would produce problems of scientific cooperation, he had ordered the Soviet delegation, in effect, to "cool it" in responding to me. See FAS Public Interest Report, September, 1973.)

At IMEMO, we advised a small group of experts on American affairs of FAS ideas in the disarmament field. But realizing that they might not know of the cases that motivated FAS concern for Soviet scientists, I sketched the cases of Kovelav, Tverdeklevov and Plyusch.

On Thursday, a semi-official holiday before the November 7 celebration, B. J. shopped in the morning. We spent the afternoon with Roy Medvedev. Trained as a philosopher and historian, he is best known for his work on Stalin, (*Let History Judge*, Knopf, 1971) and on the Soviet Union (*On Socialist Democracy*, Knopf, 1975). Roy is the twin brother of Zhores Medvedev, the gerontologist and biochemist who had been imprisoned in a Soviet psychiatric hospital for a short time until freed by the appeals of his brother, of Solzhenitsyn and others. Later he was exiled in London.

Roy was having his 50th birthday and we had brought him some pens and pencils. He opted for lunch in our hotel room where we talked freely as friends over a pleasant meal. My wife served as translator, since, unlike his brother, whom he resembles completely, he speaks only Russian and German. Roy is supported by the Western royalties from his books. He is certainly the wealthiest of the unemployed dissidents. He could pass in appearance for a member of the Soviet establishment.

Earlier in the morning, upon return from breakfast, we had noticed that the key to our room was missing from the

—Continued on page 5

Continued from page 4

floor desk. A few hours later, we noticed that an address book was missing; we made light of it but urged the Hotel staff to have it returned. They said we should look around, it would turn up.

At 6:00 at a friend's home, we discovered that an unknown person had called and said he had found the address book. We could have it back if we wanted to pick it up. In due course, some friends picked it up for us. In effect, the "finder" had called the only Russian address in that particular address book that had a phone number. This was a natural and sensible thing to do. The only trouble is that we do not think that we lost the address book. We think the authorities did not have time to photograph it. But nothing in Russia is certain.

V. F. Turchin: A Scientist For All Seasons

At 7:00 we went to the home of V.F. Turchin for dinner. Turchin is a full doctor of physics. (The Soviet "candidate" is equivalent to our Ph.D. A Soviet doctor requires, among other things, another dissertation.) He is the author of a book published in English and Russian entitled "Slow Neutrons". When Sakharov was attacked in 1973 by 40 academicians, Turchin defended him in a letter. His wife, Tanya, who exudes sweetness, and uncomplainingly bears a painful spinal problem, continues to work. Turchin, himself, is a truly extraordinary person who bears his tribulations with a kind of forced gaiety. His English is excellent and he shares it with his less fluent comrades in a graceful way that reveals a great deal about the bonds that tie them together.

Reprisals in Turchin's case had been swift. Within five days of his defense of Sakharov, he was demoted to senior scientist from Chief of Laboratory. This was done by reorganizing him out. A year later he was expelled by a secret ballot of the 24 member Learned Council; the vote was 19-5. The 19 voting against Turchin evidently feared retaliation against the Institute if they did not act against him. At a general meeting of about 300 workers of his Institute, all condemned him for his action; despite his many friends in his Institute no one voted against the resolution and, indeed, no one dared answer "yes" when asked if they would abstain!

For a year and a half, he has sought work. Six or eight institutions have been interested; usually the Chief of Laboratory expresses interest. But the Party Committee and Directors turn down the application. Turchin has been invited by Columbia to come as a Visiting Scholar and has a personal invitation from an MIT professor to which the Ministry of Internal Affairs must make response by December 17.

Although he lost his job for defense of Sakharov, Turchin had organized an Amnesty International Group which started with 11 members in September, 1973 and was officially adopted by Amnesty a year later. The Acting Secretary was Tverdeklebov (now in prison) and is now Albrecht. Amnesty assigned this group cases in Yugoslavia, Spain and Sri Lanka. Indeed, the group felt that its letter had helped achieve the release of Alfonso Saste, an imprisoned Spanish playwright.

Orlov: Defender of Solzhenitsyn

At dinner with Turchin, we met Professor Yuri Fyodorovich Orlov, dismissed from his job for writing a letter to Leonid Brezhnev in defense of Solzhenitsyn.



V. F. Turchin, wife Tanya and children.

Orlov holds the high recognition of being a Corresponding Member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences. He told of how, at the time he was dismissed, his scientific comrades and he were slated to become candidates for a state scientific prize. His comrades urged him to resign from the group candidacy in order not to prevent them from being blackballed from consideration — and indeed, when he did withdraw, they thereupon won. I asked whether, perhaps, they had won *because* they had turned on him. Everyone laughed and then, seriously considering the question, called it hard to answer. It was obviously not that implausible.

Also at the party was Vladimir Yan Albrecht, formerly the chief engineer in an Institute of Water Purification and a specialist in mathematical methods of optimization. We asked Albrecht how he had lost this job and had become an elevator operator. Apparently, when Tverdeklebov was arrested, there were official searches of Albrecht's and Turchin's flats and that of someone in Kiev. Albrecht's superiors at work had heard, over the Voice of America, that his apartment had been searched. They became nervous. A complicated history ensued in which it was unclear whether he had resigned, been forced to resign, or been fired. There wasn't much difference.

November 7: The Parade

Our hotel room was so well placed that one could see, with binoculars, the Politburo standing on Lenin's mausoleum reviewing the parade. Moreover, one could examine the weapons and marches on the immense square from which they entered Red Square to be reviewed. We had been cautioned by the Hotel staff that we could stay in our room and watch the parade, but that a representative of the "organs of power" would be stationed in the room to prevent any untoward action. Since we expected him at 8 a.m., we were up early. He arrived at 9:30 in the form of an apple-cheeked 30-year-old Komsomol.

This observer behaved himself in a most polite and

—Continued on page 6

Continued from page 5

dignified, but vigilant, fashion, unobtrusively keeping me under observation when, to get more film or whatever, I moved behind him. Not yet a member of the Party, he had delayed joining because he was not sure that he was "worthy". Asked whether the Soviet Government could make a mistake, he allowed that the Supreme Soviet was sufficiently large that it was hard to make mistakes. But he said, with every appearance of sincerity, that he did not know, when I pointed out that this body had never disapproved a proposal in 58 years. (This exchange despite the fact that his career had included service as an aide to a member of the Supreme Soviet.)

The Hotel being surrounded by crowds (even the subway entrances were sealed), we had no choice but to enjoy ourselves watching and taking photographs of amazingly shiny military equipment and crowds decked in red flags.

Levich: Highest Ranking Refusenik

We spent the afternoon with the highest ranking refusenik: Corresponding Member of the Soviet Academy Benjamin G. Levich.

After an international uproar, Levich had been permitted to attend a conference at Alma Ata but, he advised us, two reports he wanted to submit to the conference were not accepted. In one case there was no answer and, in the other, the paper was refused on a technical pretext without even a signature on the letter of refusal.

Levich is pretty well boycotted by his colleagues. Of about 35 associates only 2 or 3 will speak to him and then only privately. He is now somewhat numb from the ups and downs of pursuing his fate. But he retains a sense of humor and discusses his situation with considerable historical perspective. He notes wryly that Pushkin was denied the right to travel to the West 150 years ago because the Tsarist Government and the Russian bureaucracy considered him "too valuable". And Peter the Terrible had observed, in Russian style, "Keep your enemy near you".

Levich has two sons now in Israel. (FAS had complained about the reprisals against son Evgeny in December, 1973.) One year and a half ago, a Soviet Academy Commission had issued a report confirming that Levich did not know official secrets. Nevertheless, he still has no visa despite a promise a year ago that he would be allowed to leave. He considers this ominous and thinks his case has important "symbolic value". He felt that if the hard cases (like his) were solved, the easier ones would follow. (However recent Soviet preference may be to exile the hard cases and suppress the others.)

We discussed whether the leaving of Jews would spontaneously create anti-Semitism for those left behind. But, in any case, did anti-Semitism really come from the top, from hints and articles from above?

Levich is starting a new scientific seminar to meet at his apartment, 11 Leninski prospect, Apartment 5 on Thursdays at 3 p.m. It will cover physics and mathematics, physical chemistry, molecular biology and hydrodynamics.

Dinner was spent with Russian friends.

Sakharov's Dacha

The next day, early, we left for Andrei D. Sakharov's dacha, arriving at about 11:00 a.m. and catching the 5:00

ALBERT EINSTEIN ON THE OBLIGATIONS OF ACADEMIES

"A prime responsibility of every Academy is to encourage and defend the scientific life of the country. Despite this fact, scientists of German society, as far as I know, have become silent witnesses to the fact that a considerable part of German scientists, students and teachers have been stripped of the possibility to work and obtain for themselves the means for subsistence. I haven't the slightest desire to belong to any scientific society capable, even under outside pressure, of conducting itself in such a fashion". □

on resigning from the Bavarian Academy; 4/21/33

p.m. train back. His dacha is in the area in which the highest officials of the Soviet Union have theirs. En route, we passed the dacha of the Minister of Defense (Grechko) and there were police at most intersections to protect the leadership. Sakharov is the possessor of three (3) different Hero of the Soviet Union awards. This is as many as Brezhnev has, or as Khrushchev had. It provides him with extraordinary status.

At the dacha were a large number of children (from his two wives, a complicated family structure has resulted); Gregory Podiapolsky, a member of the Soviet Human Rights Committee; and V. F. Turchin.

We began by discussing the FAS action in trying to help Mrs. Sakharov achieve a visa to go to Italy for an eye operation. (She was in Italy during our visit, having had her operation, and being fitted with contact lenses.) He was interested in determining what had happened; a year before our protest, Willy Brandt had appealed directly to Brezhnev and the King of Belgium had later. The day before the visa had been awarded, it had been denied. But on hearing of the denial, Mrs. Sakharov had said to the official, "So I will go blind and it will be on your head". The next day, she was told to come immediately to the office where the visa was granted. I noted that that day had been the last day of the World Federation of Scientific Workers' conference. The Soviet authorities had said that the visa was a tribute to the conference. (This was the conference we had boycotted; see FAS Public Interest Report, October 1975). It seemed likely that our boycotting and possible resultant efforts by the World Federation had been the last straw.

We discussed the Voice of America. There was general agreement that the Voice transmissions had dealt less often with arrests of dissidents, with refuseniks, etc. All felt the Voice was "rather careful to be too careful", rarely read from Samizdat, and that "many people were losing interest". The service was "deteriorating" and was "not interesting today" — this from Sakharov, but all agreed. (Incidentally, to FAS members, Sakharov had heard over the Voice of our dispute with the National Academy of Sciences over its report on nuclear war.)

Re anti-Semitism, it was observed that an article in Trud on October 29, 1975 had hinted that Mrs. Sakharov was Jewish by saying that it did not know how much the Nobel Prize was worth in terms of 30 pieces of silver but that "perhaps Mrs. Sakharov knows better". To protect

—Continued on page 7

SAKHAROV STATEMENT TO FAS

The role of FAS can be very great. It might correct certain relationships between American scientists and Soviet scientists. Soviet authorities try to shape this relationship along very strict lines of ideological control. A good model of how this occurs involves the Soviet participants in the Pugwash Movement.

In general, as far as I can tell, American authorities have many issues in mind at any one time and are prone to make concessions on particular issues in order to advance detente. U. S. Governmental decisions are therefore over-flexible and too agreeable. So it is very important that such an organized force as FAS should exist that is free of political restrictions, free to base its positions on principles, free of political conformism.

On many questions, the Federation could correct what is being done in governmental circles. For example, it could try to achieve a goal in which contacts would be less official. It could work to permit scientists to go to conferences who are invited to them, not just the scientists whose political qualifications are deemed correct.

Contact with scientific young might be an important field in this connection. The young people need scientific contacts. For them, alleviation of the conditions of contact would be most important. But again, those permitted the contact should not be chosen by political considerations.

The personal defense of concrete persons is very important. Of necessity, it would involve only separate persons: persons deprived of work for political reasons and imprisoned for the same reasons. In some of these cases, such defense must take the form of an ultimatum. But the most important thing is permanent interest in this circle of problems.

Finally, the general problems, not only for scientists, are the problems of disarmament, environment and the rest.

Maybe I am wrong, but it seems to me that the U. S. Government line is not quite consistent in these matters. The U. S. Government wishes to have immediate agreement — in order to use it in internal politics. This wish leads to agreements which, in fact, are not strong enough to move toward the solution of the fundamental problems.

With regard to these problems, the Federation could make relevant statements impartially, without political prejudice. I can imagine two ways of applying this rule.

Consultation to your Government, as you do, is one way. And, second, public statements which make a sort of pressure on our own Government. Finally, using international contacts, the American scientists could realize a common line with all scientists in doing both of the above.

In all of these functions, the West badly needs a form of unity in these vital problems. Especially, it seems without any doubt that the normal course of detente requires a certain amount of Western unity,

since it is easier for scientists to get together in thinking than it is for politicians (even in the West). This unity is therefore most probably to be achieved by scientists, who are the least egoistic part of society. I still think this, that scientists are the least egoistic part of society. □

Moscow, November 8, 1975

Continued from page 6

against the charge of anti-Semitism, the article was signed with a Jewish pseudonym.

The problem of Yuri Golfand was described. OVIR officials had told him that he was "too valuable to be allowed to emigrate" but he was fired for the official reason that his "scientific production was too low". Sakharov described Golfand's theories in quantum physics and called them very interesting.

Too Valuable To The West

I asked what "too valuable" to be allowed to leave meant: too valuable to the Soviet Union, or too valuable to be given to the West. The answer was the latter, evidently, since he was not being allowed to work at home. Sakharov noted that Golfand is pasting up placards now — but has to do it under his wife's name since he is "unqualified" (i.e., over-qualified) for the work.

Sakharov complained about the treatment of prisoners. Russian prisoners were allowed, at most, three packages per year of 5 kilograms each; the scientists could therefore choose "mind or body", books or foodstuffs, for their total 15 kilograms. The list of the prohibited has been constantly increased and now includes vitamins! No reason is given except, often, "prison is no place for resort".

Several complained about the ubiquitous phrase "ne polozheno" — literally "no foundation". It is used constantly by bureaucrats as an excuse for doing nothing when regulations do not strictly require doing something. Thus a publishing house decides not to print a manuscript because its author has gotten into political difficulties and gone to prison. But the publishing house will not give the manuscript back to the author's wife because "ne polozheno". Or an imprisoned scientist translates a detective mystery into Russian for his daughter and is told that he cannot give it to her: "ne polozheno". The same scientist, Lyubarsky, went on a hunger strike for the right to be permitted more than five books.

Complaints were voiced about the withdrawing of degrees for the crime: "conduct unbecoming a Soviet citizen". Thus full doctor Alexander Bolonkin was deprived of his degree. The method requires the scientist's institute itself to send a request to the authorities to withdraw the degree. This was termed "typical of the self-beating of our system".

Academician Sakharov recalled the outcry in the Soviet Union when Angela Davis was not permitted to deal with students and compared this with the indignities suffered by Soviet scientists. He said it was most important to get Orlov and Turchin back to work. This was the most fundamental point. It was now considered natural to deprive persons of a job for legitimate dissent and was not considered serious (compared to arrest).

Sakharov said that citizens could and must cross this now-normal psychology of citizens. At present, citizens

—Continued on page 8

Continued from page 7

in the Soviet Union want to work but give little or no weight to freedom and are easily frightened.

Timidity Even Among Academicians

As an example, a certain academician of high position and bold in his scientific pursuits was not among the 72 Academicians and Corresponding Members who attacked Sakharov recently. Sakharov called him about a scientific matter but, evidently fearing that Sakharov had called to thank him for not signing the attack, this physicist immediately began speaking as follows:

"Academician Sakharov, I do not approve and have long not approved of your activities. That I did not sign this letter does not mean that I approve of them. I will send you a personal letter explaining my position."

— all this designed for the operator. And indeed, he did send such a letter, which began: "I did not approve of your activities for a long time but now, after the Nobel Prize, it seems a good time . . ."

I asked Academician Sakharov for a message that I could convey to our scientists. After a moment's reflection, he dictated the remarks on the preceding page.

Thereupon, Turchin had to rush to the train to make an appointment in Moscow. We were invited with Podiapolsky to have supper. Crowded into a tiny kitchen with two of his children and a housekeeper, we talked informally about common friends, scientific conferences, and world events.

At 5:00, Sakharov escorted us through dark woods and vacation homes to the nearby railroad station where we just made the train. Getting off in a suburban Moscow station with the Podiapolskys, I noticed a man observing us and, in due course, jumping into a phone booth. B. J. and I got into a taxi and headed for a scheduled dinner with Pjatetsky-Shapiro. It became obvious over the next five miles of twists and turns that we had picked up a "tail". When we were a few blocks from our destination, we asked the driver to stop, and walked back to the now standing car. The two plainclothesmen looked rigidly ahead as if we did not exist — a further confirmation of their role, if their repeatedly witnessed license plate had not been enough. We advised them sternly in B. J.'s Russian: "We are doing nothing wrong, please stop following us" They responded by saying that they were waiting for "guests".

Walking to our destination (with one of them trying to stay both invisible, and close by, in the darkening fog), we went to dinner.

Sunday: The Seminar

The morning was spent with an old friend, now writing for the Washington Post, Peter Osnos. To our surprise, we discovered that being a foreign correspondent in Moscow was not the lonely life we had remembered from our earlier trips in 1966-1970. Peter was being invited out often (five nights a week) by many Russians, and even courted assiduously by the Chinese. His Russian had developed accordingly, and he was having a very good time. The rise of a sector in Soviet life that finds it protective, rather than dangerous, to deal with foreign correspondents seems to be the reason.

At 12:30 we set out for the oldest of the refusenik scientific seminars, one founded by Azbel and Voronel, the latter now in Israel. It requires a metro ride to the

end of the line (Metro Zhdanovskaya) and then a fairly long walk or bus ride along Ul Vishiyakovskovo to 4/2/5. This is further complicated by the fact that building 4 is behind building 6 and the taxi-drivers have trouble locating it. But by 1:30 we were passing the stationed plainclothesman and going to apartment 5. The seminar was in progress and we sat down to observe a lecture on fluid flow through a membrane.

At the close of the lecture, we were greeted very warmly. And when I described the purpose of our visit (relate Helsinki Agreement to the problems of scientists) and the nature of our organization, there was extreme interest.

The seminar meets every Sunday at noon in Azbel's parlor. (See photo). Of the twenty-five or so persons, one was a Corresponding Member of the Soviet Academy, five were full Soviet professors, five full doctors of science, and the rest about the level of candidate.

The seminar discusses "Collective Phenomena" and has a schedule that is planned for six months ahead, including such topics as:

- 2/8 Doctor L. Regelson, Conservation of Energy in Elementary Interactions
- 2/15 Prof. Y. Gofand, Several Properties of s-Matrices
- 2/22 Prof. D. Samilovich, Photographic Methods in Science and Technology
- 2/29 Doctor V. Brailovsky, The Jew in Western Disapora

The seminar has involved 50 scientists from 12 cities, including a dozen professors and 25 full doctors; when we visited, for example, there was a professor from Kiev.

Situation Deteriorating

In the first two and one-half years of the seminar, there was reasonably rapid turnover, with 20 or 30 scientists getting visas to leave. Thus of those present, except for three or four, the rest were new. After Helsinki, however, the situation had changed and, during the last 7 or 8 months, no permissions to leave the country had been granted. This was unprecedented; meanwhile many refusals had been repeated. The situation is evidently typical also of non-scientists.

It was felt that the situation was deteriorating; Levich's case was considered an example since he had been promised a visa a year ago, a promise upon which the authorities had reneged.

The seminar's problems began when it tried to organize an international seminar. Its organizers had gone to prison for 15 days. In May of 1975, the KGB had advised the seminar that they did not mind the existence of a "local" seminar but did not want foreign scientists to visit it. The KGB had said that, if the situation were not changed, it would charge the seminar with being part of Israeli intelligence, thus with espionage. This would make participation in the seminar a capital offense. Azbel was interrogated twice and solemnly warned.

A further problem faced by seminar members is, of course, surviving without jobs. And another is the latent threat of application of parasite laws. Under the newest revisions of these laws, it is not enough to have a job but one must lead a "right" life.

The local authorities play a kind of shell game with applicants. Those without family in Israel are told that this precludes affirmative action. Those with families are told that, because they have close relations there, it would

—Continued on page 9



September 1975: Seminar is addressed by Harvard Biochemist Walter Gilbert (standing, right of bookcase) as Azbel translates (standing to left of bookcase) with Harvard's Mark Ptashne sitting between. M. Azbel's wife can be seen sitting (behind Azbel's right elbow).

Continued from page 8

not be "appropriate". Sometimes they just say, "We don't like Israel" or "We do not want you to work for Israel."

One participant alleged that the purpose of the authorities is to dispel any hopes that Helsinki might have aroused so as to discourage applicants — which indeed has happened.

Waiting For (Scientific) Death

It was emphasized that the seminar was a very stop-gap procedure. Only the refuseniks that could work theoretically with paper and pencil could even attempt to continue; others needed laboratories or machines. They were all quietly dying as scientists and it was frightening.

Azbel, who speaks with considerable eloquence, noted that an experiment was being attempted on one hundred scientists: "For how long could a scientist continue as a scientist" without scientific nourishment. Three years of waiting for visas has become typical.

The situation was graphed on a blackboard. Applications by scientists to leave had risen slowly, only after applications by non-scientists. Scientific applications had then risen rapidly but had fallen off as hope faded. I was startled to learn that fully half of the seminar participants already had family members in Israel who had earlier gotten visas; a simple application of the Helsinki approach to divided families would solve their problem.

One participant quoted, "Do not ask for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for you", in encouraging American scientists to show more concern about them.

We dined with the Leviches, who had earlier examined minutely the FAS Report of September, 1973 which dealt with this problem. Mrs. Levich cross-examined me upon

—Continued on page 11

COMPLAINTS ABOUT NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

From a variety of sources, there were complaints about the National Academy of Sciences' posture with regard to refuseniks.

One scientist observed that no Western scientist had visited the refusenik seminars during the visit of Western scientists to the 250th anniversary of the Soviet Academy.

Another related this story: During that week, the Academy Foreign Secretary, who led the U. S. delegation, had mentioned the problem of Levich and other refuseniks at a cocktail party with his opposite number. Acting Chief Scientific Secretary of the Soviet Academy Corresponding Member G. K. Skryabin had said, "It is not up to us". The Foreign Secretary George Hammond said, "O.K.". Later refuseniks were advised by Skryabin maliciously to the effect: "You see, they complained and bounced right off us; do not expect any help from them, they are calmed down."* One refusenik quoted, in this connection, from Albert Einstein who resigned from the Bavarian Academy when it would not protect scientists being politically persecuted. (See box page 6.)

A third story that is quoted in Moscow concerns an earlier visit of National Academy of Sciences' President Philip Handler and Corresponding Member Levich. Levich had been told to expect a call from Handler and not receiving one, had called Handler directly. Handler had "hemmed and hawed" and said he did not feel that he could meet with Levich since he was an official representative. Later his wife called to smooth over the situation but without effect.

*Foreign Secretary George Hammond denied that the conversation had occurred during a cocktail party but, instead, said it had taken place at the end of a serious three hour discussion of exchange problems. He was not at liberty to disclose the substance of the conversation. □

SOVIET REFUSENIKS NEED SCIENTIFIC CORRESPONDENTS

Soviet practice permits applications for exit visas only from Jewish scientists and, after such applications are refused, the authorities often blacklist the scientists from continuing their work. What follows is as accurate a list of such Soviet scientific "refuseniks" as we could find in the United States with the birth year and whatever is known about the technical field of the scientist.

As an initial but all important step toward alleviating the plight of these scientists, FAS is seeking to provide each such refusenik with a scientific pen pal (or pals). These Americans would serve to link the American scientific community in general, and FAS in particular, with these Soviet scientists with a view toward monitoring their condition, sending occasional books of scientific interest, and petitioning the authorities either for their release or for their being provided with suitable scientific duties.

With this in mind, FAS urges its members to adopt one of these scientists as a correspondent. Such members should circle and rank three names of persons with whom he or she would be willing to correspond; FAS will select one of these and will subsequently advise which Soviet scientist has been assigned to the member and that scientist's address. Groups of scientists at an institution can apply together to correspond with a given Soviet scientist.)

Just rank 1, 2 and 3, three names in a discipline of interest to you and return this page with the rankings to us; or send an appropriate letter. And many thanks to those of you who offer to help — especially to those who undertake correspondence with scientists about whom little is known at present.

Jeremy J. Stone, Director

Physics and Related Fields

Azbel, Mark Yakovlevich (1932) Theoretical Physicist
Benor, Dorotea Fish
formerly lecturer in Radio Technology
Bailovsky, Irina
Candidat of Physical & Mathematical Sciences
Brayman, Matvey Yudelovich, Physicist
Bykova, Elizabeth (1949)
Drabkin, Aleksanor Osipovich (1912)
Fain, Veniamin Moiseevich (1930)
Finkelshtein, Eitan (1942)
Finkelstein, Edward
Fish, Zina
Fuerst, Mark Isakovich (1936)
Assistant to chief technician in Galvanization
Gerber, Leonid (1928) Dr. of Physical Math Science
Goldenfeld, Ilyia Vulfovitch (1924) Physical Chemistry
Goldfarb, Aleks (1974) Atomic Physicist
Goldshtein, Isai Abramovich (1938)
Goldstein, Grigory (1931)
Decorate of Physical Science
Goman, Grigory Yurkovich (1935) Radio Physicist
Gurevich, Boris Na'anovich (1929) Geophysicist
Gutman, Elazar (1939)
Candidat of Physical Sciences
Koagn, Lev Naumovich (1948)
Krumberg, Yacov (1933)
Lenshik, Yevgeny (1940) Thermal Physicist
Levich, Benjamin
Corresponding Member, Soviet Academy
Mikulinsky, Mikhail Aronovich (1937)
Milstein, Samson Hiemovich
Polsky, Viktor (1940) Physical Engineer
Privorotsky, Ilyia Abramovich
Dr. of Physical and Math Sciences
Rabinkin, Anatoly Geselevich, Candat of Physics
Rozenstein, Grigory Shmulevich
Candidat of Physical & Mathematical Sciences
Raiz, Vladimir
Rubinstein, Boris (1925)
Candidat of Physical & Mathematical Sciences
Shaiber, Iosif (1951)
Shilman, Leonid (1950), Theoretical Physicist
Starobinets, Solomon
Dr. of Physical and Math Sciences
Ulanovsky, Lev Eframovich
Verkhovsky, Eduard (1943)
Zhigun, Lev Mikhailovich (1958)

Computer Science and Related Fields

Agursky, Mikhail Samuelevich (1933)
Cybernetics Engineer
Braiловsky, Victor (1935), Cyberneticist
Galperin, Anatoly (1930), Cyberneticist
Gel'man, Ovsei (1932), Cyberneticist
Goldshtein, Isai, Cyberneticist
Lerner, Aleksander Yakovlevich,
Dr. of Technical Sciences
Lubinsky, Leonid, Computer Scientist,
Candidat of Technical Sciences
Lunts, Aleksander (1942), Cyberneticist
Smordinskaya, Ester Borisovna,
Computer Programmer
Zabelishensky, Leonid Yakovlevich
(See Electrical Engineer)

Linguistics

Berkovskaya, Anna (1932), Philologist
Estrov, Roman (1944), Philologist
Feldman, Riva Isaakovna,
German Language Teacher
Gel'man, Eva, Philologist
Gorelick, Mikhail, Sinologist
Kellerman, Galina (1948), Oriental Linguist
Nazarov, Vladimir (1947), Oriental Linguist
Vaserman, Shaul (1938)
Rubina, Inessa Akseirod (1928),
Candidate of Philology

Philosophy

Gorehk, Mikhail Solomonovich (1945), Sinologist
Rubin, Vitaly, Ancient Chinese Philosophy
Semeca, Helen, Sinologist
Ziberman, David Benjaminovich,
Ancient Indian Philosophy

Chemistry

Faermark, Victor (1941), Physical Chemist
Gersberg, Boris
Gof, Mikhail (1939), Candidate of Chemistry
Lerner, Veniamin Grigorevich (1917)
Varnavitskaya, Ludmilla,
Specialist in Synthetic Rubber
Yoffe, Grigory Lvovich (1946)

Technical Sciences

Gokhstein, Anatoly (1932),
Candidat of Technical Sciences
Karp, Lev Aleksandrovich (1938),
Dr. of Technical Science
Kheifitz, Semen Abramovich,
Candidat of Technical Sciences
Lainer, Bronislav Davidovich (1938),
Candidate of Technical Science, Metallurgy
Lapidus, Victor (1921), Dr. of Technical Sciences
Lerner, Aleksandr Yakovlevich (1915)
Llanders, Mikhail (1922)
Candidat of Technical Sciences
Laratuta, Aba
Raines, Leonid Shmuilovich (1934)
Metallurgical Engineer

Psychiatry

Levit, Bladimir Gregorievich (1932),
Dr. of Medical Sciences
Troper, Maingrad (1929)

Economists

Adziashvili, Mikhail (1933)
Beilina, Dina
Beinor, Goruful
Kofman, Isaak
Markish, Yuri (1918)
Nudel, Ida (1931)
Orisischer, Lev Ya (1919)
Ovshischer, Leu Perovich (1919)
Pavlotsky, Miron (1947)
Tsirlin, Chaim (1947)

Dental Sciences

Grinberg, Yakov (1931), Stomatologist
Nashpits, Mark (1948), Stomatologist
Reifgor, Galina, Dentist
Shvartsman, David, Dentist
Smoliansky, Yakov (1917), Stomatologist

Mathematics

Begun, Iosif Ziselevich (1932), Candidate Tech. Sc.
Belotserkovskaya, Sofia Matvierna (1945)
Beilin, Josif (1937)
Blikh, Yosef (1937)
Braiловsky, Victor Lvovich (1935),
Candidate of Physical and Math Sciences
Essas, Eliyas Girshovitch (1946)
Fishkin, Boris Pavlovich (1927)
Fradkin, Daniel (1949)
Galperin, Anatoly Mendelevich (1930)
Gokhberg, Isik Tzudikovich
Former Professor of Mathematics
Goldblat, Mikhail (1944)
Drot, Yury Abramovich (1922)
Gorina, Elena (1939)
Jaffe, Leonid K. (1945)
Knif, Seman Grigorevich (1947)
Koltunov, Ilya Zakharovich (1939)
Krein, Mark (1907), Candiat of Mathematical Science
Lerner, Vladimir (1945), Systems Analyst
Luntz, Aleksandr Lazarevich (1924)
Mixaelov, Sergei,
Former Professor of Applied Mathematics
Oliker, Elena
Oliker, Vladimir (1944), Candidat of Physical and
Mathematical Sciences, Dr. of Science
Palatnik, Bella, Dr. of Mathematical Science
Piragovsky, Mikhail Rafailovich (1941)
Ramm, Dimitri Vitalovich,
Dr. of Mathematical Science
Samoilovich, Debora Moiseevna (1918),
Dr. of Physical and Mathematical Sciences
Shakhnovich, Evgeny Valerevich (1947)
Shakhnovsky, Vladimir (1941)
Shariro-Pyatetsky, Ilya Iosifovich,
Dr. of Physical and Mathematical Sciences
Sharansky, Anatoly Borisovich (1948)
Shikhanovich, Yuri Alexandrovich (1933)
Taratuta, Aba Yakovlevich (1930)
Uo'vousky, Leonid Ananuzhich (1942),
Candidat Tech. Sci., Mathematician

Medicine and Related Fields

Alshansky, Klara (1923)
Ass, Iosif Aralovich (1944)
Beilinson, Yulia (1942)
Berslichovskute, Sonya, Pharmacist
Berg, Raiza (1913), Geneticist
Blank, Natalia Lvovna (1041),
Pathology and Hematology
Dondych, Leonid
Epelman, Palina (1941), Pharmacist

Fisher, Larisa (1944), Roentgenologist
Flaksman, Ovshie, Pharmacist
Gafanovich, Sarra (1923), Nurse
Glod, Anatoly (1931)
Gutmanas, Yudelis (1948)
Kalk, Frida (1940), Pharmacist
Kharakh, David
Khatskelson, Lev (1945)
Koifman, Lina Davidovna (1923)
Doctor in Medical lab
Krikin, Boris
Krikin, Ludmilla
Linas, Abramas (1943)
Levit, Alla
Lipavsky, Sania Lusievich, Neuropathologist
Paltinnikov, Irma Bernshtein (1922), Cardiologist
Paltinnikob, Isak (1920), Ophthalmologist
Paltinnikov, Victoria, Radiologist
Piskun, Semion
Polotsk, Mikhail, Expert in Medical Technology
Polsky, Sonia (1928)
Primak, Anatoly (1932),
Candidat of Medical Sciences
Reznik, Dina (1933)
Roizman, Raisa (1931), Surgeon
Slepak, Maria (1926), Medical Laboratory Assistant
Slepak, Yri
Tsy-pin, Leonid, Anesthesiologist
Zvenaite, Miriam K.

Engineering and Related Fields

Abezgaus, Aleksandr Israilevich (1949)
Physical Eng.
Abramovich, Igor Aleksandrovich (1936),
Electronic Eng.
Abramovich, Mark (1947), Mechanical Eng.
Abramovich, Pavel (1939), Radio Eng.
Abramovich, Marta (1940)
Adamsky, Piotr (1945)
Aronovich, Felix Semenovitch (1911),
Mechanical Eng.
Azbel, David Semenovitch (1911), Chemical Eng.
Basello, Shalom (1946)
Berkovsky, Yuri (1931), Electrical Eng.
Bidritsky, Anatoly (1936)
Braun, Ernest (1947)
Braz, Raul Yakovivich (1938)
Bregor, Igor Anatolevich (1945) Radio Eng.
Breitman, Arkady (1946)
Chernyak, Irma (Jereimiah), Mechanical Eng.
Certin, Aleksandr, Radio Eng.
Chervinsky, Vladimir K. (1946)
Dimshitz, Isaak Grigorevich (1926),
Mechanical Eng.
Dakhis, Solomon (1947), Chemical Eng.
Drot, Vladimir (1945), Radio Eng.
Druk, Aleksandr (1924) Electronic Eng.
Dubrovsky, Boris (1948)
Dubosarsky, Arkady Itskhofovich (1940)
Dymshitz, Isaak (1926), Mechanical Eng.
Eidinov, Izrael (1921)
Eisenberg, Aleksander
Elistratov, Victor Mikhailovich (1939)
Ekhlavskaya, Rosaliya Gesselevna (1937)
Feldman, Leonid, Radio Eng.
Finger, Susanna (1916),
Electrical Measurements Eng.
Framovich, Riva, Radio Eng.
Fridman, Kim (1934), Radio Eng.
Frustin, Karl
Fuks, Boris (1945), Electrical Eng.
Furman, Vladimir Borisovich (1939)
Gelfandbein, Vladimir (1944)
Gelikh, Abram Isidorovich
Gendin, Lev (1941), Radio Electronic Eng.
Ginzburg, Ilya Solomonovich (1937), Radio Eng.
Goberman, Sofia (1947)
Godlin, Lev (1948)
Gofman, Boris (1925)
Goldin, Ilya Solomonovich (1949), Construction Eng.
Goman, Grigori, Radio Physicist
Goldberg, Gita (1947)
Gottlieb, Veniamin (1948)
Gottler, Aleksander Mikhailovich (1941),
Electrographer
Grinberg, Revokka Isaakovna (1922)
Grinshpyn, Aleksandr (1948)
Gurevich, Aron Borisovich (1938), Electronic Eng.
Gusman, Ephram Abramovich (1949)
Gvinter, Aleksandr Ilch, Metallurgical Technologist
Inditsky, Solomon (1912), Mechanical Eng.
Iosifin, Girsch
Kalenov, Yury, Chemical Eng.
Kalk, Yekhezkel (1938)

Continued from page 9

every aspect of it. The intellectual basis of FAS positions was carefully scrutinized. This conversation is beyond summary merging as it did objective intellectual observations on the situation with requests that FAS do more than it had done; all the intellectual chaos of quasi-debate and quasi-disinterested exchange between highly involved parties.

Our Last Day

We went home to pack. On Monday morning, it was evident that two things were "time-urgent". Moving around the city by taxi, we first left a letter with a high Soviet official known to us warning of what a refusal to let Sakharov leave for Oslo would look like in the West. With a second official, we left a letter inquiring whether, if FAS applied to do so, it could send an observer to the trial of Sergei Kovalev, which was certain to come up soon: "Would this be permitted under Helsinki or some other convention?"

A half an hour before we were expected, we arrived at V. F. Turchin's apartment to find some uneasiness. Mrs. Turchin unbolted the door cautiously and it developed that there was some apprehension that the police might be arriving to conduct an official search.

My mind raced in circles. During an official search, all persons arriving at the apartment being searched (or persons found there) must wait until the search is concluded before leaving. The search sometimes lasts several hours. We would miss our plane and outrun our visa. So? This was not my problem. On being reassured that our presence would not complicate his life, we relaxed, as did the Turchins, though to a lesser extent. It developed that the rumors, which had been around Moscow for days, had suggested that such searches would take place after the holidays and that Sakharov's apartment was included. Dr. Turchin was calling Sakharov frequently but getting busy signals. Could it really be true that such an action was being taken against Sakharov — and at this time? We could hardly believe it but the continued busy signal seemed to make it ever more plausible. Such searches are intended either to frighten, or to provide the basis for a subsequent arrest. Could this really be the authorities' desire while they wrestled with the problem of Oslo?

Finally Val got through and all was well. Tanya made us a superb home-cooked meal. Val asked for an English language copy of his book "Slow Neutrons" if we could find one.

Returning to the Hotel, we finished packing, said good-bye to friends, and were transported to the airport in a car fit for Brezhnev. Whisked through customs so fast we were not entirely sure where bags are normally examined, we found ourselves, three hours later, in London. □



ENGINEERS IN EXCESS

The names of about 120 engineers would not fit onto the adjoining page. Persons interested in corresponding with one of these engineers should describe their field so that our office can arrange a suitable match.

Continued from page 12

his dilemma is that he owes loyalty now to the Postmaster General.

5. When the DCI mentioned the theft of FBI documents from their Media, Pa., office, the DDP stated that he had been informed that the copy of the letter mentioned in the press had come from HTLINGUAL. The C/CI/Project interposed, with apologies to the DDP, that it had been positively verified from the Project's record, and a memo had been written to the effect, that the Project had never seen the letter, and that, as a piece of domestic mail, the letter would not have been available to HTLINGUAL, which has access only to an international airmail facility.

6. Mr. Helms stated that he would accept the evidence of the HTLINGUAL record, but he then asked, how long has the FBI known about the operation and how long have they been getting its material. The C/CI replied that FBI awareness came in 1958 when, in January, they requested permission from Chief Postal Inspector Stevens to examine mail to/from the USSR. Stevens had advised CIA of the request and had sanctioned CIA's revealing the operation to the FBI and thereafter servicing the Bureau with items of national security interest. This was five years after the operation had started in 1953.

7. Mr. Helms asked whether the FBI passes the material to other agencies, or outside its headquarters office. The D/CI replied that it did not, in accordance with the original agreement; that the unit receiving the material passes only sanitized leads within the Bureau whenever investigation is warranted.

8. The DCI then inquired how many persons in the FBI know about the operation or are privy to its take. The C/CI/Project stated that he had originally been told that only a small unit of two or three see and handle the material, and that this had been confirmed by the FBI liaison officer, Mr. Papich, about three years ago. The DCI stated that he wants to know how many and who in the FBI know about it *now*.

9. On the question of continuance, the DDP stated that he is gravely concerned, for any flap would cause CIA the worst possible publicity and embarrassment. He opined that the operation should be done by the FBI because they could better withstand such publicity, inasmuch as it is a type of domestic surveillance. The D/S stated that he thought the operation served mainly an FBI requirement. The C/CI countered that the Bureau would not take over the operation now, and could not serve essential CIA requirements as we have served theirs; that, moreover, CI Staff sees the operation as *Foreign* surveillance.

10. Mr. Helms when asked what should be done: do we want to continue the operation in view of the known risks? The C/CI replied that we can and should continue to live with them.

11. The DCI then stated that he would have to discuss the matter with Mr. Cotter, and requested the D/S to arrange a meeting. After that meeting, he said, he would determine whether Mr. Blount should be informed.

12. As the meeting closed, the DCI told the C/CI/Project to monitor the operation most discreetly, and bring any problem or difficulty to him.

13. The meeting ended at about 10:45. □

TOP CIA BRASS PONDER FAS LETTER IN SUPERSECRET CONFERENCE

On January 13, 1971, FAS wrote the Chief Postal Inspector a letter asking a number of questions concerning the privacy of the mails; this was in connection with the January, 1971 FAS newsletter: Privacy in American Life. We asked, among other things, whether the Post Office was permitting any other agency to open the mails improperly.

By an interesting coincidence, the only Post Office official who knew that, in fact, this was occurring was the Chief Postal Inspector himself; he had previously been in charge of this operation while a CIA employee. He wrote FAS on February 10 boldly denying any such impropriety but privately sent our letter on to the CIA and added his complaint that the operation should be stopped. In due course, the operation was stopped, but not before a complicated history ensued in which Attorney Generals and Postmaster Generals were consulted, gave a go ahead and subsequently resigned, followed by more complaints by the Inspector General. (For the complete story see Science Magazine, June 27, 1975.)

FOA Request Succeeds

Through a Freedom of Information Act request, the Federation has received from the CIA this never-before-disclosed and previously supersecret document: the memorandum of conversation in which the CIA first reviewed the problem caused by the FAS letter. We produce it in its entirety with the exception of a deletion to protect the privacy of one individual.

FAS Director Stone emphasized that no secret information or private encouragement caused him to write the letter in question or to pose any of the questions in that letter. Indeed, the questions on mail opening were not only natural ones to ask but they were subordinate to FAS's primary interest, in that newsletter on wiretapping.

The initials in the memorandum may be decoded as follows: DCI — Director of Central Intelligence; DDP — Deputy Director for Plans (i.e. covert operations or so-called "dirty tricks"); C/CI — Chief of Counterintelligence; D/S — Director of CIA Security; DC/CI — Deputy Chief of Counter Intelligence; C/CI/Project — Chief of the Counter Intelligence Mail-Opening Project.

May 19, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: DCI's Meeting Concerning HTLINGUAL

1. At 10:00 A.M. this date, Mr. Helms convened the following in his office to discuss the HTLINGUAL operation: the DDP, the C/CI, the D/S, the DC/CI and C/CI/Project.

2. The DCI opened the meeting with a reference to an inquiry as to possible mail tampering by Government agencies, addressed to the Chief Postal Inspector, Mr. Cotter, by Dr. Jeremy J. Stone on behalf of the Federation of American Scientists. On the question as to what may have prompted the letter, the DDP mentioned the possibility that the information might have come from [deleted] who, while in CIA employ, had been briefed in the Project. It was stated that [deleted] had not been a consumer of HTLINGUAL material for many years, and could not know that HTLINGUAL had continued beyond the time when he was informed of it. The DCI stated that he was not over-concerned about [deleted].

3. The DCI then asked, who outside of CIA knows about the HTLINGUAL operation or gets its material. The C/CI replied: only the FBI. The D/S added, "and the little gray man." He explained that a postal clerk had been engaged since the beginning to bring the bags to the room in the airmail facility where the material is screened for "take"; that the man had been checked and cleared by Security, and was paid a \$50 monthly bonus for this duty. (The D/S did not state what this clerk knew about the activity beyond the screening and copying of exteriors.)

4. The DCI then asked, who in the POD knows the full extent of the operation — beyond cover surveillance. The C/CI replied that only Mr. Cotter knows, for he had been witting while with CIA and the O/S. The previous Chief Postal Inspector, Mr. Montague, had never wanted to know the extent of examination actually done, and was thus able to deny on oath before a congressional committee that there was any tampering. Mr. Cotter would be unable to make such denial under oath. In an exchange between the DCI and the DDP it was observed that while Mr. Cotter's loyalty to CIA could be assumed,

—Continued on page 11

FAS PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT (202) 546-3300
307 Mass. Ave., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002
December 1975, Vol. 28, No. 10

Second Class Postage

Paid at

Washington, D. C.

Return Postage
Guaranteed

I wish to renew membership for calendar year 1976.

I wish to join FAS and receive the newsletter as a full member.
Enclosed is my check for 1976 calendar year dues. (I am not a natural or social scientist, lawyer, doctor or engineer, but wish to become a non-voting associate member.)

\$20 Member \$50 Supporting \$100 Patron \$500 Life \$10 Under \$10,000

Subscription only: I do not wish to become a member but would like a subscription to:

FAS Public Interest Report — \$20 for calendar year

Enclosed is my tax deductible contribution of _____ to the FAS Fund.

NAME AND TITLE _____
Please Print

ADDRESS _____

CITY AND STATE _____ Zip _____

PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE: _____