

# F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS — Founded 1946 —  
A national organization of natural and social scientists and  
engineers concerned with problems of science and society.

SPECIAL ISSUE ON  
IMPROVING RELATIONS  
BETWEEN SCIENTISTS

Vol. 26, No. 1

January, 1973

## FAS WELCOMES FIRST DELEGATION OF CHINESE SCIENTISTS

In a poignant and unforgettable 27-day-visit, a delegation of ten Chinese scientists toured the U.S. in November-December, 1972, at the invitation of the FAS and the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the Peoples Republic of China (CSCPRC). All parties concerned seem to have considered the visit most successful; there are now high hopes on both sides for a rapid increase in the quality and breadth of scientific exchanges.

The delegation was sent by the Scientific and Technical Association of the People's Republic of China, rather than from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, evidently because of the absence of diplomatic relations. It was the Association that hosted the FAS delegation to China in May-June of last year.

The Chinese delegation was headed by Pei Shih-Chang who is President of the Institute of Biophysics of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. At 75, Professor Pei is also a most eminent member of the Presidium of the Scientific and Technical Association. Only four members of the Chinese Academy are so old, distinguished and modest that they are called "old" after their names, viz. "Pei old" rather than "old Pei." Professor Pei is the youngest of the four, the others being the President and two vice presidents of the Chinese Academy.

Professor Pei never faltered despite an extraordinarily wearing schedule that took the delegation to Sweden.

Continued on Page 4

## FORMER MEMBER OF HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE LOSES CITIZENSHIP

On January 19 and December 7, 1971, FAS addressed friendly introductory letters to Dr. Valery N. Chalidze, then a leading member of the Soviet Committee on Human Rights. Dr. Chalidze is a physicist who has trained himself as a lawyer. The Soviet Committee on Human Rights is led by academician A. D. Sakharov, a world-famous physicist who made important contributions to the development of the Soviet H-Bomb. The goal of the Committee was to work within the context of Soviet law to strengthen the democratic rights of citizens and scientists alike. There were many similarities between the role it wished to play in the Soviet Union and the role of the Federation of American Scientists in the United States.

The FAS letters were stopped by Soviet censors. As a direct result, in February 1972, the FAS National Council passed a resolution on the freedom of scientific communication, calling upon all nations to eschew censorship on matters of scientific and scholarly interest and to permit scientists to travel freely to meet with their peers.

In late November, 1972, Dr. Chalidze was permitted to visit the West with his wife, Vera, the granddaughter of the late Soviet Foreign Minister Maxim M. Litvinov. Their visit arose through the efforts of Professor Samuel Dash, Director of the Georgetown Law School's Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure. Professor Dash visited the Chalidze's in August of last year and, using George-

Continued on Page 3

## REPORT OF THE FAS VISIT TO CHINA OF GALBRAITH, LEONTIEF AND TOBIN

(Three American economists, all FAS sponsors, visited the People's Republic of China for two weeks September 8-22, 1972 in a trip arranged by FAS. The three economists were the current and immediately past Presidents of the American Economic Association, Professors J. K. Galbraith and Wassily Leontief of Harvard and James Tobin of Yale. Professor Galbraith, the current President of the Association, served as chairman of the delegation. What follows is their report.)

Our hosts in China were the Academy of Sciences, Peking University, and the Scientific and Technical Association of China. Peking University, in particular the Department of Economics, took logistical responsibility and provided escorts and interpreter to accompany us throughout our trip.

We spent a day in Canton, a week in Peking, a day

in Nanking and Hangchow, three days in Shanghai, and nearly two days seeing the countryside from comfortable Chinese trains.

In Peking the American trio met for two days and a half with about 60 Chinese economists from the University and the Academy's Institute of Economics. We presented three reports: Leontief on input-output analysis as a technique of planning, Tobin on the statistical and quantitative foundations of economic research in the U.S., Galbraith on sectoral imbalances in advanced capitalist economies. In response to written questions we had submitted, five Chinese spokesmen, one from the University and four from the Institute, reported on various aspects of their country's economic system: the planning mechanism, the determination of prices, the organization and develop-

Continued on Page 2

FAS COUNCIL DENOUNCES BOMBING OF HANOI — see page 6

**FAS VISIT TO CHINA**, from page 1

ment of agriculture, public finance, and foreign trade. The formal reports were followed by a day of questions, answers, and discussion, alternating between eager Chinese queries about the U.S. economy and western economics and further American questions about China. A similar but less elaborate and extensive discussion occurred later in Shanghai in Fu Dan University.

These exchanges were lively, candid, pleasant, and informative; and we were able to probe some subjects in considerable depth. The five reports in Peking were obviously prepared with great care, and they added up to a better picture of the present Chinese economic system, as the Chinese themselves view it and understand it, than has been available before. We suggested to the Academy of Sciences that the reports be published in English for the benefit of foreign economists.

Nevertheless, we left China with many old questions unanswered and many new ones unasked. One reason is that only fragmentary statistical data were provided. Evidently many economic and demographic statistics routinely published for other countries are simply not collected or compiled, and many data that must be known to government planners and operating officials are not available for dissemination. The absence of national income accounts, whatever the reason for it, is a severe handicap to western economists seeking to comprehend an unfamiliar economy.

**Communication is a Barrier**

Even on non-quantitative topics—economic structure and organization, the planning mechanism—communication was sometimes difficult. Language is a barrier, even with the best of translators; and in the social sciences there are also undeniable differences in modes of analysis and standards of explanation. To the Chinese, no doubt, some of the "problems" we asked about did not seem at all problematical. If we inquired how scarce investment funds were allocated among industries and projects, especially in the absence of calculation and comparison of prospective rates of return, they found a sufficient answer in the needs of the state and the objectives of the plan. If we wondered how supplies and demands were kept in balance, especially for perishable commodities, if prices were as unchanging as they reported, they reminded us that theirs was a planned economy.

Chinese economists have been cut off from the rest of the World for twenty-five years, and their views of western economics and economic institutions are quite out of date. China's physical isolation is now slowly ending, but ideological barriers will remain strong, and it would be foolish to pretend otherwise. The June FAS Newsletter on China reported the impact of the Cultural Revolution on the universities. Like other Chinese institutions, the universities are now more than ever politically and ideologically oriented. The principal task of university economics departments is to convey the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao, not only to students specializing in political economy but also to everyone else. The general approach of university economists is philosophical rather than analytical and quantitative.

The Academy's Institute of Economics, a research organization, is more analytically and empirically oriented.

The Institute, like the university departments, is still in the process of redefining its role and program after interruptions and reorganizations stemming from the Cultural Revolution. It is quite possible that the methodology of empirical economic research, in particular mathematical, statistical, and computational techniques, could provide the focus for fruitful interchanges between economic research workers in the Academy and western economic scientists. Leontief's input-output analysis and related methods of representing production technology are examples of topics where ideological interference should be minimal.

We were not able to make contact with economists or their surrogates in government agencies concerned with economic plans and their implementation. We expressed the hope to our hosts that in future visits foreign economists will be able to meet government economists as well as academicians. We stressed the close relationship between academic and practicing economists in the United States.

Besides the two universities, we visited an arts and crafts workshop, a cotton textile factory, a machine tool plant, an agricultural commune, a grocery supermarket, a large department store, an industrial exhibition, a high school, and a hospital. All of these tours were extremely informative. The responsible officials readily provided full descriptions of their institutions and in almost all cases precise information on wages, prices, profits, investment, employment and productivity. We were consistently im-

**FAS**

*Chairman:* MARVIN L. GOLDBERGER

*Vice Chairman:* PHILIP MORRISON

*Secretary:* HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.

*Treasurer:* ARTHUR S. OBERMAYER

*Director:* JEREMY J. STONE

The Federation of American Scientists is a 26-year old organization of natural and social scientists and engineers concerned with problems of science and society. Democratically organized with an elected National Council of 26 members, FAS is a non-profit civic organization sponsored by world-famous scientists of all kinds. Members of FAS include many Nobel Prize winners and former science-related officials of the highest possible rank from the major Government agencies.

**SPONSORS (partial list)**

- |                                     |                                      |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| *Kenneth J. Arrow (Economics)       | Robert Merton (Sociology)            |
| *Hans A. Bethe (Physics)            | *Marshall Nirenberg (Biochemistry)   |
| *Konrad Bloch (Chemistry)           | Hans J. Morgenthau (Pol. Science)    |
| *Anne Pitts Carter (Economics)      | *Robert S. Mulliken (Chemistry)      |
| *Owen Chamberlain (Physics)         | George Polya (Mathematics)           |
| Abram Chayes (Law)                  | Oscar K. Rice (Chemistry)            |
| *Leon N. Cooper (Physics)           | David Riesman (Sociology)            |
| *Andre Courmand (Medicine)          | Alice Kimball Smith (History)        |
| *Max Delbruck (Biology)             | Cyril S. Smith (Metallurgy)          |
| Paul R. Ehrlich (Biology)           | Robert M. Solow (Economics)          |
| Adrian Fisher (Law)                 | *Albert Szent-Györgyi (Biochemistry) |
| Jerome D. Frank (Psychology)        | *Edward L. Tatum (Biochemistry)      |
| John Kenneth Galbraith (Economics)  | James Tobin (Economics)              |
| *Donald A. Glaser (Physics-Biology) | *Charles H. Townes (Physics)         |
| Hudson Hoagland (Biology)           | *Harold C. Urey (Chemistry)          |
| Marc Kac (Mathematics)              | *George Wald (Biology)               |
| George B. Kistiakowsky (Chemistry)  | Jerome B. Wiesner (Engineering)      |
| *Arthur Kornberg (Biochemistry)     | Robert R. Wilson (Physics)           |
| Wassily W. Leontief (Economics)     | Herbert F. York (Physics)            |

**NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS (elected)**

- |                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Harrison Brown (Geochemistry)     | Joel Primack (Physics)                 |
| Nina Byers (Physics)              | John O. Rasmussen (Chemistry)          |
| William M. Capron (Economics)     | George W. Rathjens (Pol. Science)      |
| Barry M. Casper (Physics)         | Leonard S. Rodberg (Physics)           |
| Sidney Drell (Physics)            | Cameron B. Satterthwaite (Physics)     |
| Arthur W. Galston (Biology)       | Joseph L. Sax (Environment)            |
| Michael H. Goldhaber (Physics)    | Herbert Scoville, Jr. (Defense Policy) |
| Morton H. Halperin (Pol. Science) | Eugene B. Skolnikoff (Pol. Science)    |
| Franklin A. Long (Chemistry)      | Jeremy J. Stone (Mathematics)          |
| *S. E. Luria (Biology)            | Vigdor Teplitz (Physics)               |
| Philip Morrison (Physics)         | Victor Weisskopf (Physics)             |
| Laurence I. Moss (Engineering)    | Herbert F. York (Physics)              |
| John R. Platt (Physics)           | Quentin D. Young (Medicine)            |

\*Nobel Prize Laureates

pressed by the caliber of the leaders of the Revolutionary Committees charged with the administration of these institutions.

In Peking, Kuo Mo-Jo, Vice President of the standing committee of the People's Congress and President of the Academy of Sciences, entertained us at dinner in the Great Hall of the People. He was receptive to our suggestions for further exchanges, including visits of Chinese students and scholars to America and extended research visits to China by younger American scholars. We also had the pleasure of an extended and far-ranging conversation with Chiao Kuan-hua, the Vice Foreign Minister, shortly before he left for New York to head the Chinese delegation to the general assembly.

Our professional duties were interspersed with the happily obligatory sightseeing trips, including the Forbidden City, the Great Wall, the Ming Tombs, the Summer Palace, the Sun-Yat-Sen memorial in Nanking, the lakes and temples of Hangchow, and several museums and exhibits. We sampled the Peking opera, watched the finals of the Asian table tennis tournament, and enjoyed a traditional acrobatic show in Shanghai. Everywhere we were received with great hospitality, and we dined exceedingly well.

#### Summary Impressions

It is difficult to summarize our impressions of the Chinese economy, nor would the three of us wholly agree. In spite of the considerable modernization and industrialization achieved since the founding of the People's Republic in 1949, the country is still backward and poor. The vast majority of the people still work with primitive tools and technology, with very little help from non-human sources of power. The vast improvements in medicine and public health and in education and literacy are perhaps more impressive than the gains in material output. Most important, the social disorganization and inequality of old Chinese society, which denied millions of Chinese jobs, homes, and dignity, has been replaced by an order in which every citizen has a secure place and is assured the basic necessities of life.

The Cultural Revolution 1966-69 was a period of confusion and division in the country and its leadership. Probably it slowed down the economy temporarily. But it seems to have ended by bringing new, efficient, dedicated leadership to all Chinese institutions and by inspiring the whole population with high morale and sense of community. Work and production, more work and more production, are the current Maoist keynotes. All the patriotic zeal with which a government that enjoys universal support and commands all media of communication can inspire its citizenry is now channeled to economic development. It will be interesting to see how well and how long this motivation can replace personal economic incentives, now diminished and derogated more than ever as a result of the Cultural Revolution. One cannot escape the impression that the Chinese are a very able and industrious people, kept in misery and ignorance by centuries of incredible misrule, and in the last century also by unconscionable foreign exploitation. Given political stability, a sense of national purpose, and elementary literacy, they are capable of remarkable economic progress for several decades to come. □

#### CHALIDZE, from page 1

town Law School stationery (which he had with him), wrote an invitation to them to visit Georgetown. He thus avoided using the mails. Dr. Chalidze took the invitation to the visa office immediately and an exit visa was granted a month later.

Shortly after his arrival, the Soviet Foreign Ministry issued a statement indicating that Dr. Chalidze would be permitted back if he did not consort with "anti-Soviet" elements while in the West. However, on December 13, two Soviet consular officials visited him at his residence (the Hotel Volney in New York City) and asked to see his passport so that they could "identify" him. They then proceeded to pocket the passport and advised him that the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet had passed a decree stripping him of his citizenship, for "acts discrediting a Soviet citizen." (It is amusing to note that the kind of Soviet ruse used to secure the passport was also used by U.S. officials during the 1950's to pick up the passports of persons who had traveled to countries which the State Department viewed as off-limits to Americans. Due to a series of legal battles by lawyer Leonard Boudin, the right of American citizens to travel to any country was affirmed by the Supreme Court and, since that time, these problems have not arisen here.)

#### Charges Extremely Weak

It is significant that the Soviet decree referred to "acts discrediting a Soviet citizen" and not something much stronger. In effect, Dr. Chalidze lost his citizenship for throwing discredit upon himself! As he has noted, even convicted murderers and rapists in the Soviet Union are not deprived of citizenship though they have obviously discredited themselves. Dr. Chalidze was not accused of anti-Soviet remarks, or consorting with anti-Soviet groups, and he certainly was not accused of treason. Indeed, it was evident that he was most careful to avoid remarks which would lay him open to any of these charges. The Soviet Novosti Press was reduced to saying: "Chalidze, judging by the sensation he created abroad, lied a great deal about his country."

An FAS official who witnessed his speech to the Georgetown University Law School, commented upon the skill with which Dr. Chalidze parried dangerous questions. Typically, he avoids all speculation and responds, in lawyer-like fashion, only to what he knows. Wherever relevant, he balances his criticisms of Soviet legal procedures with analogies that show the problem is not restricted to the Soviet Union only. He tends also to play down the obvious difficulties under which his work went forward in the Soviet Union.

Although the Soviet Committee on Human Rights seeks only to advise both individual Soviet citizens and Soviet Government agencies concerning Soviet law, the handful of Human Rights Committee members were under frequent surveillance by the KGB, the Soviet secret police. (At one point in his talk, Dr. Chalidze remarked sardonically that his activities had provided him with the pleasure of meeting with "highly intelligent and sophisticated" members of that organization.) Asked whether he had ever feared arrest, he said simply, "yes."

Dr. Chalidze has the style of the physicist-turned-lawyer that he is. After examining one "question" submitted to the rostrum, he commented: "The question submitted has

no question-mark. Therefore it is not a question. Therefore it is an assertion. Therefore, I shall not read it. But I would like to say that I agree with it."

It was evident to FAS observers who had read the documents of the Soviet Committee on Human Rights that Dr. Chalidze was a careful, tenacious and cautious man of unusual integrity and courage. The documents showed a full awareness of the real difficulties to be faced in the light of traditional Russian practices and attitudes. They emphasized the importance of patience and of—as one might phrase it here—"picking ones fights." Nevertheless, the Committee did not content itself, for example, with the relatively easier-to-sustain arguments against imprisoning dissidents and scientists in insane asylums. It went on to argue a much hotter issue inside the Soviet Union that Zionism was not anti-Soviet, anti-communist or reactionary. Indeed, after his passport was lifted, Dr. Chalidze released a statement which said, among other things, that if Jews were to be given a bill for education before they could leave, he asked that he should also be given such a bill so that he would not be in a better position than they. (In ethnic terms, Dr. Chalidze is half Georgian and half Pole.)

FAS Director Stone chatted with the Chalidze's both before and after the loss of his citizenship. Dr. Chalidze combines the personal qualities one anticipated from his writings with a romantic daring (and bearing) that suggests one of the three musketeers. It is evident now why he responded to threats of prosecution under an archaic law (as reported in the FAS newsletter of March 1972) by saying that it would be "alluring" to test the matter in court. He has the unusually independent personality necessary to resist the pressures continually unleashed in the Soviet Union against dissension.

Mrs. Vera Chalidze, twenty-five years old, is charming, determined to be herself, and quiet fluent in English. She retains her Soviet citizenship but seems to be planning to stay with her husband, for whom she translates.

#### Detente Is Hard On Dissidents

American Sovietologists speak of an invariable rule that seems to govern the size of the democratic movement inside the Soviet Union. When relations between the West and the Soviet Union improve, the democratic movement shrinks. The improved state relations increase the nervousness of Soviet officials that dissidence may spread, infected by Western ideas. The result is tighter controls and surveillance. Moreover, in this period of warm relations, the Soviet Government seems to be following a policy of permitting activists to leave the USSR in order to take some of the steam out of the democratic movement and to avoid incidents.

Soviet observers in the United States expressed the hope and expectation that Dr. Chalidze would soon be forgotten. They felt that he had "betrayed" his country. Inside the Soviet Union, the dissident movement seems to be on the point of collapse. One leading activist, Pyotr Yakir, is evidently providing information on others. It is entirely possible that only the leading and eminent scientists associated with the Human Rights Committee will be able to withstand the pressure.

In general, most nations will accord their scientists special perogatives to raise their voices. This only confirms the special obligation that scientists have to protect

#### FIRST DELEGATION, from page 1

Great Britain, Canada and the United States on a trip lasting almost three months. Under his leadership, and consistent with Chinese practice, the delegates behaved with utmost courtesy, disciplined correctness, and great consideration for their hosts, for State Department security men, for hotel managers, etc.

In his final toast at the Federation's farewell reception in San Francisco, Professor Pei referred to widespread surprise over his willingness to undertake the rigors of the trip despite his advanced age. He said he would "gladly give his life" to improve relations between American and Chinese scientists; it was apparent that he meant it. For the Chinese who have been struggling for two decades to build a scientific community, the visit was far more meaningful than most Americans could imagine or appreciate.

The Deputy Head of the Delegation, Mr. Pai Chieh-Fu, is an administrator with the Peking Municipal Bureau of Science and Technology as well as a member of the Presidium of the Scientific and Technical Association. He was visibly relieved to find the American press friendly and the many press conferences survivable. Indeed, insofar as FAS could tell, there was no unfriendly incident of any kind during the three weeks the delegation spent in the U.S. When one American host remarked that 99% of the American people were well disposed towards China and their visit, a Chinese member responded with conviction, "This is our view."

Three of the delegation members had studied or taught in the United States: Chang Wen-Yu, Vice President of the Institute of Atomic Energy of the Chinese Academy of Sciences; Chien Wei-Chang, a Professor of Tsinghua University; and Chien Jen-Yuan, a Research Fellow of the Institute of Chemistry of the Academy of Sciences. All spoke English.

Other members of the delegation were Hu Shih-Chuan of the Shanghai Institute of Biochemistry, famous for his work on the synthesis of insulin, and Li Fu-Sheng, Deputy Director of Research, Shenyang Institute of Computing Technology.

Professor Hu had welcomed the FAS delegation to Shanghai last June; according to a pleasant Chinese custom, this made him an "old" friend of those same FAS members who received him here. Another "old" friend of FAS was the delegation's interpreter, Li Ming-Teh, 32 years old, who guided and arranged the FAS delegation's tour in 1972. "Young Li," as he is known to his colleagues, has the skills of an accomplished diplomat and a great capacity for work; this is combined with a remarkable purity of spirit that reflects the sheltered environment in which PRC youth grow up. Young Li married late, according to the current Chinese practice, and has a one-year-old daughter.

Another interpreter, Wang Li, was loaned to the delegation from the Chinese Foreign Ministry where he follows American events. The secretary of the delegation, Hsu Tsao-Hsiang, also served as "bare-foot doctor." Although he had not taken the course for that degree, he

---

their own rights, the rights of others, and the just application of law. □

had grown up in a family of medical doctors and was qualified to perform simple tests and diagnosis.

The purpose of the Chinese delegation's visit was, of course, rather more diplomatic than scientific—to assess the situation and explore possibilities for further scientific contacts. The tour took them to Washington, Stony Brook, New York City, Princeton, Boston, Chicago, and San Francisco; they visited, in all, nine universities.

As the tour proceeded, the atmosphere became warmer and warmer. At the airport reception in Washington, the Chinese thanked FAS and the CSCPRC for inviting them. Peking radio announced the arrival of the delegation and noted the presence of Emil Smith from the CSCPRC, Chairman Marvin L. Goldberger from the FAS, and National Academy of Sciences Foreign Secretary, Harrison Brown.

On November 21st, the CSCPRC held a banquet for about one hundred persons including Senator J. W. Fulbright, Science Adviser Edward David, and an assortment of Academy members, FAS officers, and State Department officials. Welcoming toasts were made by FAS Chairman Marvin Goldberger and CSCPRC Chairman Emil Smith. Professor Smith's toast acknowledged CSCPRC's debt to FAS for helping to make the visit possible.

Accustomed to frank dealings, Americans tend to take expressions of friendship at face value. The Chinese, however, are far more conscious of gradations in warmth: a cordial reception, a warm reception, a very warm reception, and so on. Toasts become an important stylized method of communicating that warmth. For example, at a reception at the PRC Mission to the UN, in New York, Director Stone responded to a toast of Ambassador Huang Hua by invoking the Chinese diplomatic principle of "friendship first." He remarked that the Scientific and Technical Association of China had treated FAS visitors according to that (Chinese) principle, and asserted that FAS would treat the Association members according to the same principle. The next day, an especially cordial reception was held at Princeton at a friendly luncheon jointly hosted by Carl Kaysen, President of the Institute for Advanced Study and Chairman Goldberger. In a toast, Professor Pai remarked on the "special atmosphere" of the day and said it showed that the delegation "was indeed being treated according to the principle of friendship first, mentioned in the toast given by Dr. Stone in answer to Ambassador Huang Hua."

One is constantly startled to recognize how carefully the Chinese overlook no act of kindness and reciprocate. On another occasion, a Chinese visitor said he was "uneasy" over the attention being paid to the delegation. The interpreter made haste to explain that this was a polite formulation which alluded to the sense of obligation that one feels when (presumably undeserved) attention is being paid to one.

For the bemused American scientists, the construction of appropriate toasts has become something of a new parlor game. At a Boston reception, MIT President Jerome Wiesner allowed as how all the members of the audience were probably "eager to repay the Chinese visit." Harvard Dean Harvey Brooks, also the President of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, noted that both

the organizations for which he spoke were older than the country itself; his toast provided a short proof of the desirability of exchanges, e.g. "hybrid strains were healthier than pure ones."

FAS Vice Chairman, Philip Morrison, then rose to the occasion by noting that while FAS and MIT might be younger than Harvard and the American Academy, the "old and the new" made a useful combination. For example, China was the oldest civilization but the People's Republic of China was the newest of Nations. Morrison went on to relate the tale, oft-told today in China, of the old man and the mountain—the moral of which is that man can move mountains if sufficiently determined. Suggesting that a mountain had arisen between China and America during the last quarter century, he argued that we would move it promptly because one billion people wanted it moved and they contained two communities of scientists.

Toast construction is spiritually akin to anagrams since, to serve the purpose of improving relations, the same thing has to please an American audience, and at the same time, still be translatable into the frame of reference of a People's Daily editorial. It also has to be sincere and felt, since the Chinese are used to discounting such rhetoric. (One Chinese official enthusiastically told an FAS official, "all American scientists are saying that they want to improve relations, and they *are not only saying it but they mean it!*" (italics added))

At the farewell banquet, an FAS toast suggested that, after this first exploratory delegation, the time had come for true scientific cooperation—future delegations should add to the principle of "friendship first" the principle of "help one another." It is remarkable how much meaning such PRC clichés begin to carry after one is repeatedly exposed to them.

It is evident, from observing and talking to the Chinese delegation, that the Chinese rightly think of themselves as "very easy to get along with." They want to be friendly with all nations. From their point of view, if the Soviet Union will stop trying to bully them, they would like to be friendly to the Soviet Union as well. But between America and China, something quite unusual and striking is happening. One American host remarked, after the FAS banquet, that it seemed like an emerging love affair between Chinese and American scientists. A Chinese scientist said "that is exactly what I was thinking."

How can this be explained? Mutual affection is based partly on the historic good feeling between China and America. There is the traditional bias toward international cooperation common among scientists. Also, the Chinese are emphasizing thrift, hard work, friendship, action according to principle, and service to the community—all esteemed American virtues or ideals. The Americans view the Chinese as an "underdog" which further elicits their sympathy. But over and beyond these factors, there is simply some kind of "chemistry." The emotions the Chinese evoked from Americans during this historic visit are being reported by many other sources, from all parts of the U.S. political spectrum. This phenomenon cannot help but have a great—and presumably wholly beneficial—effect on future world affairs. □

## FAS COUNCIL CHARGES PRESIDENT IS PLAYING RUSSIAN ROULETTE WITH HANOI

(What follows is most of the text of the FAS statement released on December 28 subsequent to the 27th annual Council meeting. Further reports on the meeting will appear in the February issue.)

"The President is playing Russian Roulette with the City of Hanoi. With each bombing raid, he knowingly takes the chance that B-52 carpet bombing will destroy large sections of the city, whether these sections are targeted or not. The purpose is to spread panic—not to destroy military targets. American strategists have long called this technique "the threat that leaves something to chance."

Needless to say, official spokesmen continue to assert that their bombing has military purposes. But no observer in Washington, of whatever political persuasion, doubts that this bombing is being done to frighten the North Vietnamese. The underlying plan may well be to empty the city as a prelude to its total destruction—destruction Hanoi has long anticipated and discounted.

After all, it is obvious that there are few targets in Hanoi of any military significance. Yet raids have been mounted against that city which included 100 B-52s, each carrying about 100 bombs of about 500 pounds each. These bombs are dropped in a pattern half a mile wide and a mile and a half long! In a week or so, the planes drop the explosive force of the Hiroshima bomb. Indeed, each day, the surface area destroyed by such bombardment can exceed that destroyed by a Hiroshima bomb. The ground may tremble all day during such bombing. Ear-splitting roars, flying steel fragments, and home destroying concussions occur for long distances around each area attacked.

According to press reports, the bombing has already resulted in the destruction of a hospital, the destruction of sizeable residential sections of the city, damage to embassies, mistaken attacks on a civilian airport, and so on. When these attacks kill civilians, it represents wanton murder. We consider this bombing immoral and inexcusable and we oppose it without reservation.

That these bombing raids have resulted from a breakdown in secret negotiations is, in itself, sufficient reason to require that the negotiations be revealed to the Amer-

ican public. We call upon the U.S. Government to disclose the nature of the October agreement that was to have been signed and to describe the differences that led to a breakdown in that agreement. If the raids continue, and the United States Government will not disclose the nature of the disagreements, we believe that the Hanoi Government should do so.

As things stand, now, our most experienced political analysts and many news commentators believe that the United States has given up its long-proclaimed desire to return to the 1954 Geneva accords. Rather than admitting a provisional boundary line between the two Vietnams, and seeking primarily an honorable withdrawal from the war, President Nixon seems to be trying to end, once and for all, the civil war between the North and South. He is trying to negotiate two permanent sovereignties in Vietnam. North Vietnam is most unlikely to agree to this notion and sure not to abide by it.

Whatever is going on in the negotiations, however, it is now clear beyond doubt that Hanoi is prepared to release all American POWs and to ensure the safe withdrawal of Americans from Vietnam without requiring that we overthrow the Saigon Government. And the American people have long since indicated their belief that the United States should withdraw from Vietnam subject only to the release of American POWs and the safe withdrawal of the remaining Americans in the South. Polls show this to be the overwhelming public sentiment and they show that the American public voted for Richard Nixon believing this to be his policy. The Congress of the United States has proclaimed this to be the national policy of the country in passing the Mansfield Resolution. The President has rested his authority to engage in military operations in Indochina on the need to protect the remaining forces and secure the release of POWs. With the Hanoi offer of October, that power permits the President only to sign the agreement to withdraw.

We urge the Congress to hold hearings on the October agreements. But, above all, we urge the Congress to cut off funds for the war, subject only to the release of prisoners of war. □

January 1973, Vol. 26, No. 1

### FAS NEWSLETTER

Published monthly except during July, August and September

203 C Street, N.E., Washington, D. C. 20002

Published monthly except during July, August and September by the Federation of American Scientists. FAS is a national organization of natural and social scientists, engineers and non-scientists concerned with issues of science and society.

<input type="checkbox"/> I am a member but wish to renew my membership and enclose \$_____ I wish to support FAS and receive the newsletter by becoming a:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Student or Retired Member and I enclose \$7.50	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">         Enclosed is \$_____ as a contribution to the FAS Fund Development Campaign       </div>
<input type="checkbox"/> Member and I enclose \$15.00	
<input type="checkbox"/> Supporting Member and I enclose \$50.00	
<input type="checkbox"/> Patron Member and I enclose \$100.00	
<input type="checkbox"/> Life Member and I enclose \$500.00	
<input type="checkbox"/> TACTIC Participant and I enclose \$5.00 additional Congressman or Congressional District _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Please send me information on FAS group life insurance.	
NAME _____	
ADDRESS _____	
CITY & STATE _____ ZIP _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> I wish to be a full Member — Primary Professional Discipline: _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> I am not a natural or social scientist or engineer but wish to be an associate member. Contributions over \$15.00 membership dues will be assigned to the Federation Fund and are tax-deductible.	

Second Class Postage

Paid at

Washington, D. C.

Return Postage  
Guaranteed