

F. A. S. PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT

Formerly the FAS Newsletter

THIS ISSUE:

WORKING AT HOME
FOR SCIENTISTS ABROAD

Vol. 29, No. 1

January, 1976

ON THE OBLIGATIONS OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES TO DEFEND SCIENTISTS ABROAD AND ENCOURAGE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AT HOME

The American scientific community contains several hundred thousand scientists. They are organized along narrow professional lines in several hundred disciplinary societies and represented, on an interdisciplinary basis, by three unique and different groups. In order of membership size, the latter are: the 100,000 member American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) (publishing prestigious *Science Magazine* and holding large annual meetings); the 7,000 member Federation of American Scientists (FAS) organized as a civic organization with the right to influence legislation; and the 1,100 member National Academy of Sciences (NAS) with closed honorific membership, quasi-official governmental status, supported by Government contracts, and with a special license to negotiate scientific exchange agreements and do other foreign business.

The American scientific community, organized in this way, has fulfilled some of its responsibilities extremely well but others badly. On the one hand — with regard to the pursuit of pure science and the embodiment of that science in applications — it is the strongest national scientific community in the world. The American standard of living and the extent to which “things work” in our country reflect these achievements.

On the other hand, our community, organized in this way, has a surprisingly poor record in public involvement in science and in public defense of scientific colleagues abroad.

Recently, with the waning of the Cold War, there have been renewed stirrings in the interdisciplinary groups with regard to public involvement. Our own

Federation, devoted to this aspect of science, has quintupled its membership and expanded its activities. The AAAS has engaged in a handful of forays in the science and public policy area, of which the most useful involved herbicides in Vietnam. AAAS is now actively exploring ways in which it, and others, can be useful through a Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility. And the National Academy is being asked to undertake more science and public policy issues. These organizations, because they are rather more in the spotlight, are relatively quicker to respond to the pressures of the day.

With regard to public policy, the real problem children of the scientific community are the traditional strictly professional, disciplinary societies. When the American Physical Society does a reactor study, it is a remarkable exception to an unfortunate general rule.

The attitudes of these societies toward science and public policy activities often range from the arcane to the unenlightened. Staffed by directors of long tenure, their placidity is unruffled by the annual rites of passage of one (more-or-less-honorary) Chairman to another. In some cases, they are unbelievably insensitive to the plight of their colleagues. Last month, two refused even to permit FAS to seek support for the defense of their foreign colleagues, at FAS's own expense, by renting their mailing lists; meanwhile, they rent the same list to microscope manufacturers (see page 10).

—Continued on page 2

Reviewed and Approved by the
FAS National Council

A BAD MONTH FOR AMERICAN SCIENCE

Last month was not the finest hour of American science. Two scientific societies refused to permit the defense of a foreign colleague (Kovalev) to be carried out via appeals to their membership. Another hesitated so long that a similar pretrial appeal to its members in defense of the physicist (Tverdeklebov) seemed impossible.

Meanwhile, the President of the National Academy of Sciences reacted with anger to FAS's report of a complaint about Dr. Handler to FAS by Benjamin Levich.

Because of the intensity of his reaction, the President of the Academy was offered space in a subsequent publication. But members should know that the Academy was offered this opportunity *before* publication of our press report — and through the appropriate channel, its press office.

The Federation has accepted the Academy's offer to provide FAS with a summary of NAS activity on behalf of beleaguered Soviet scientists and, as soon as this report can be conveyed to us, FAS will interview Academy officials, and send to our members a balanced assessment of it along with the Academy's discussion of its support of Levich.

The Academy President was advised by the FAS Executive Committee that, while future Federation commentary might be critical of the Academy's work, such criticism would represent “only our traditional policy of independent analysis and commentary”. FAS members need not be alarmed that any misunderstanding of FAS motivation, or overreaction to our commentary, has deflected our organization from its principled role as the conscience of the scientific community. □

KOVALEV—3; CRIME & PUNISHMENT—5 & 6; RUSSIA REVIEWED—8; FASEB, AIBS—10

Continued from page 1

Typically, these societies understand responsibility to mean the "obligations of restraint" rather than the "demands of conscience". The views of their leading members and higher staff officers on public policy matters are often ill-informed, philosophically vague, and unempathetic.

It is of the greatest importance to construct, within these societies, some kind of social conscience. There are scientists in trouble all over the world who deserve the defense of their colleagues and who can expect a defense from no other quarter than their colleagues. And there are many scientists at home who need encouragement to engage vigorously in public debate on scientific issues.

The founding fathers of the Federation of American Scientists understood very well what needed to be done; and their 30 year old injunctions could be followed, to a very considerable extent, by professional societies organized differently from ourselves. Five of the aims of our Constitution are:

1. To study the implications of any scientific developments which may involve hazards to enduring peace and the safety of mankind.
2. To counter misinformation with scientific fact and, especially, to disseminate those facts necessary for intelligent conclusions concerning the social implications of new knowledge in science.
3. To safeguard the spirit of free inquiry and free interchange of information without which science cannot flourish.
4. To promote those public policies which will secure the benefits of science to the general welfare.
5. To strengthen the international cooperation traditional among scientists and to extend its spirit to a wider field.

Other scientific societies not organized as we are, as a civic organization, would want to refrain from promoting public policies through direct legislative appeals; but, with this proviso, what in the above is not as much a responsibility of the disciplinary professional societies as it is of ours?

The AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and responsibility clearly agrees with all this. It notes that the basic function of the scientific community is the advancement of knowledge, "including its clarification, interpretation, diffusion, and evaluation." It urges scientific societies to fight on behalf of members attempting to defend the public interest. It warns that the societies have too long "remained aloof" and "taken the attitude that the purity of their devotion to the advancement of their respective sciences would somehow be contaminated if they entered the public arena". Also AAAS endorses the importance of struggling for freedom of communication for scientists abroad noting that such freedom is "essential for scientific progress".

In the conclusion of the report AAAS notes eloquently:

"Yet increasingly, for many of us, it is impossible to feel the same delighted fascination with

science that we once did, without also being deeply concerned with the uses and misuses of science that will largely determine the future of mankind. It is in this area that scientists need both the freedom to speak out and the responsibility to speak and influence policy, on the basis of all the knowledge and wisdom they can muster."

May we therefore respectfully suggest, to our fellow scientific societies, that the time has come both to review and invigorate their approach to public policy, and to search their conscience with regard to the problems their colleagues face? What better way for our community to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the founding of our Nation than to review what it is for which American science stands?

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. Corney (Medicine) | Charles E. Osgood (Psychology) |
| *André Cournand (Medicine) | *Linus Pauling (Chemistry) |
| *Max Delbruck (Biology) | George Polya (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 Kayser (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 Dev.) |
| Rose E. Frisch (Human Biology) | George W. Rathjens (Pol. Science) |
| Arthur W. Galston (Biology) | Marc J. Roberts (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.

BIOLOGIST KOVALEV SENTENCED TO 7 YEARS IN STRICT REGIME LABOR CAMP

On December 12, Sergei Adamovich Kovalev received the maximum sentence for anti-Soviet agitation: seven years in a "strict-regime" camp to be followed by three years of internal exile. During the trial, his friend and associate in the civil rights movement, Academician Andrei Sakharov had been denied access to a court room stuffed with a jeering crowd. During the trial, Kovalev abruptly refused to participate because his friends were not permitted to attend and was held in contempt.

Among the many human rights good deeds in which Kovalev had been involved, one was associated with assistance to two American citizens: the Lithuanian Siman Kudirka, and his mother. After the U.S. Coast Guard returned Kudirka to a Soviet ship, he was sentenced to a long term in a Soviet prison camp. His mother sought to establish her American citizenship but was arrested while trying to reach the American Embassy in Moscow. At considerable risk to himself, Kovalev announced that arrest to the Western press, kept in touch with the American Embassy and, when Mrs. Kudirka tried a second time to reach the Embassy, met her at the train station and helped her reach the Embassy safely. He helped the family again when they arrived in Moscow en route to the United States when, in fact, they stayed at his apartment.

Moscow scientists advised a Federation representative that one reason Kovalev was not better known in the West was his modesty and the apolitical quality of biologists in defending their own (they noted that physicist Andrei Tverdeklevov was much better defended by physicists in America than Kovalev by biologists; see page 10 for spectacular confirmation of this quality of American biological societies.)

A Soviet physicist, himself unemployed for asking for the right to leave the Soviet Union, wrote the following about Kovalev at considerable risk to himself. (The author, Yuri Golfand, is a talented physicist of whose theories Andrei Sakharov has spoken with some admiration.)

* * *

"For what reason has Sergei Kovalev been subjected to such harsh persecution? I know Sergei Kovalev well. He is motivated by pure and noble moral beliefs. Kovalev is profoundly convinced of each individual's right to express his thoughts openly and directly and to defend his own opinions. He is always prepared to speak out against injustice, against infringements of human rights, against illegality and arbitrary actions.

Sergei Kovalev has been consistently faithful to these excellent principles in his public activities and has demonstrated exceptional kindness and moral resolution.

It was entirely natural for Sergei Kovalev to join the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights at its inception in 1969. The aim of this group is to inform the general public, both in the Soviet Union and abroad, of the lawlessness and savage reprisals which the KGB metes out to persons who express views not falling within the narrow framework prescribed by the regime. The trials of Ginsburg, Galanskov and Bukovsky and the "cases" of General Grigorenko, of Moroz and of many other freethinkers became publicized only thanks to the activity of the Initiative Group. This publicity provided an unprecedented opportunity for all people of good will in the Soviet Union and abroad to speak out in defense

SAKHAROV ON KOVALEV

"Sergei Kovalev, a scholar and candidate of Biological Sciences, has been arrested. He is my close friend, a man of great spiritual beauty and force, of limitless altruism. Only recently we spoke with him about New Year's appeal for the amnesty of political prisoners. Today already he himself has crossed that line. The formal grounds for his arrest is a charge related to the publication of the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church in Lithuania. This I believe to be a pretext, convenient for the authorities, to conduct his investigation and trial far from his friends and from publicity. The life of Kovalev, an intelligent and talented man, has for many years been dedicated to the defence of human rights and to the struggle for publicity against illegality. He has been a member of the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights since it began its activity, he is a member of the Soviet group of Amnesty International, and is the co-author and author of fundamental documents defining the basic means of struggle for human rights in our country. Without clamour Kovalev has done many good and difficult deeds. For example, it was no accident that precisely he was able to make the contact between Simas Kudirka's mother and the USA's embassy which led ultimately to Kudirka's liberation. In May of this year Kovalev together with T. Velikanova and T. Khodorovich announced the recommencement of publication of the Chronicle of Current Events and their responsibility for distributing it. This was a courageous historical step, but at the same time it was a challenge to those who called the Chronicle slanderous and anti-Soviet, who fear truth and publicity. □

—December 22, 1974

of prisoners of conscience.

A less well known but equally important aspect of Kovalev's activity has been his direct assistance to specific individuals: to the families of political prisoners and to political prisoners themselves. Thanks to Kovalev's energetic persistence, Simas Kudirka was released. Kovalev has rendered substantial help to believers (Pentecostals, Lithuanian Catholics) persecuted for their religious convictions by the Soviet authorities. Sergei Kovalev, together with Tatyana Velikanova and Tatyana Khodorovich, issued a statement in 1974 in which they took the responsibility for circulating the *Chronicle of Current Events*. This was an exceptionally courageous and unprecedented act. While the KGB was making new arrests for possession of the Chronicles, after this publication had been declared libelous and anti-Soviet, the statement of Kovalev, Velikanova and Khodorovich was a bombshell. It was a direct protest against the accusation of libel and against the continuing arrests.

When a Soviet group of Amnesty International was organized in 1973, Sergei Kovalev was an active participant in its work. Kovalev shares completely the ideals of this lawful organization which struggles throughout the world against the persecution of individuals for their convictions.

—Continued on page 4

Continued from page 3

It is difficult to enumerate in a short statement all of Kovalev's good and useful deeds — they are not known in full even to his closest friends. Kovalev never advertised himself, never sought to attract attention to himself, gave no thought whatsoever to popularity. Kovalev's brave course of action is the only possible way of life for him, stemming naturally from his character and moral principles.

The combination of reasoning and daring evidenced by Kovalev's humanitarian activity is also characteristic of his scientific work.

Sergei Kovalev is a talented research biologist. His articles on the physiology of excitable tissues and on intercellular impulse transmissions are well known to specialists around the world.

Kovalev's work (1959-1965) on the electrophysiology of myocardial tissue was pioneering — it is of great significance for cardiology. He was the first to understand the role of the geometric structure formed by myocardial cells in determining many specific characteristics of the heart. Conducting subtle experiments and using the general theory of branched networks, Kovalev was the first person to construct adequate models of the electric structure of different parts of the myocardium. These models were used to elucidate the details of the interaction of myocardial cells in establishing the general heart rhythm.

The "geometrical" approach, worked out by Kovalev for the heart, was applied by him to analyze the functioning of nerve tissue. In a series of articles (1964-1966) Kovalev formulated the hypothesis — new in principle — concerning logical operations and the branched dendrite structure of neurons. These articles are of major theoretical significance for neurophysiology.

In articles (1969-1971) on the electrophysiology of the synaptic membrane, Kovalev formulated the hypothesis of the "transitional processes" of the ionic canals of the activated post-synaptic membrane. This hypothesis was confirmed by experiment and opened a new path for the analysis of the kinetics of the interaction of receptors of acetylcholine with mediators and specific hormones.

Kovalev was among the first biologists in the world to work (from 1966) on new directions in the study of cellular interaction and its role in the behavior of nonexcitable cellular systems. Kovalev's work demonstrated the variability in the electrical contact between epithelial cells during different stages of cellular differentiation and after malignant degeneration. The results obtained have major significance for general biology.

Sergei Kovalev was forced to leave Moscow University in 1969 because of his activity with the Initiative Group. After 1969 he worked at an experimental fish hatchery. He worked out, together with colleagues, a method to use chemical mutation agents in the breeding of fish in order to solve problems of selection. His articles were the first ones to state the conditions under which mutation agents stimulate the growth and development of fish.

Sergei Kovalev has published more than sixty scientific works. His articles are distinguished by remarkable scientific talent and boldness in defining and solving theoretical problems. Kovalev has many disciples and students. Kovalev is known by reputation to his colleagues in biology and his articles have received international recognition". □

CYNICISM REPLACES FEAR AS THE CONTROL ELEMENT

"There is unbelievable cynicism among people. The honest man makes the silent ones feel guilty for not having spoken out. They cannot understand how he had the courage to do what they could not bring themselves to do. So they feel impelled to speak out against him to protect their consciences. In the second place, they feel that everyone everywhere is deceiving everyone else, based on their own experience. Homo Sovieticus is like the prostitute who believes all women are whores because she is. Soviet man believes that the whole world is divided into parties and that every man is a member of one party or another, and there is no real honesty. No one stands for the truth. And if anyone says he is above Party and is trying to speak the truth alone, he is lying. This cynicism greatly helps the authorities keep the intelligentsia in line and exclude the 'wild dissidents' from society. People can travel to the West and hear Western radio broadcasts and it makes no difference, so long as there is this pervasive cynicism that it is just the other side speaking. This cynicism provides the stability of the totalitarian state today in place of the fear of the Stalinist years." □

*V. F. Turchin to Hedrick Smith;
The Russians, pg. 453*

SAKHAROV ON RUSSIA

A short monograph on "My Country and the World" (Vintage Press, 1975, \$1.65 paper) was painfully and revealingly written by Sakharov over a considerable period of time and contains his observations, more or less jumbled together, on such problems as: the large number of Russian unfortunates whose lives have insurmountable difficulties; the short vacations; long work week; low pensions; weekend working days; poor housing; low quality education; poor medical care; restrictions on freedom of movement; alcoholism; the absence of social justice; political corruption; and "monstrous ideological pressures".

He notes:

"Many people, usually young, often from the working class or the provincial intelligentsia, whose first timid doubts are combined with disarming illusions about the Soviet regime, go straight to prison or a camp."

Concerning the Chronicles of Current Events, he observes:

"One judicial investigator recently stated that the Chronicle is a libelous publication if 10 percent of its information is false. But no one has yet cited examples of mistakes amounting to even 1 percent . . ."

Sakharov defends Sergei Kovalev, Yuri Orlov, Valentin Turchin and Andrei Tverdeklevov and suggests that their troubles are in substantial measure caused by their relationship with him. He urges that to help him, Westerners should help his friends.

In a kind of stream of concerned consciousness, he touches upon a number of other issues. This book is well worth reading and reveals the man himself. Of special interest is Sakharov's discussion of Western intellectuals whom he much admires, almost envies, for many qualities, but who he cautions against "leftist-liberal faddishness". □

CIRCULATING THE CHRONICLES: THE CRIME OF PUBLIC-DEFENDER SCIENTISTS

What makes the Chronicle so impressive is its utter lack of melodrama.
—the New York Times

By the end of 1973, the Chronicle of Current Events — Journal of the Human Rights Movement in the USSR — was in its eighth year of publication, interrupted for about a year in 1972 by KGB threats. The Chronicle's anonymous editors explained the break in this fashion:

"The reason for the break in the Chronicle's publication was the KGB's repeated and unequivocal threats to respond to each new issue of the Chronicle with new arrests — arrests of people suspected by the KGB of publishing or distributing new or past issues. People faced with the terrible necessity of making decisions which will affect not only themselves are placed in an ethical situation the nature of which requires no comment. But to remain silent would mean to facilitate — even though indirectly and passively — the use of a "tactic of hostages" which is incompatible with justice, morality and human dignity. Therefore the Chronicle is resuming publication and will strive to preserve both the principles and the style of previous issues."

What had sparked the pressure? On December 30, 1971, the Central Committee of the Communist Party had adopted a special decree on the necessity for halting the Chronicle; immediately thereafter searches, interrogations and arrests had taken place simultaneously at many apartments.

Scientists In The Chronicles

The Chronicles often involve scientists. In Chronicle 28 we find, for example, the case of the Ph.D. astronomer K. A. Lyubarsky, author of two books and 35 articles in scientific journals. Tried for anti-Soviet agitation, because he had given samizdat material to his friends and for oral statements, Lyubarsky denied any anti-Soviet intent but was denied witnesses he desired to help him prove it. Lyubarsky gets five years at strict term. In later editions of the Chronicle of Human Rights, we see his attempt to continue his interest in Mars while in prison. Later still, he is engaged in a hunger strike to protest official violations of prisoners rights to correspond. (May-June, 1974).

We see the case of the psychiatrist, Semyon Gluzman. Gluzman had answered a female colleague who asked why he was working in Zhitomir, rather than in Kiev, by saying, "Because I am a Jew." He was charged with Zionist propaganda and given seven years of strict regime and three years of exile. The real reason for the trial, however, seems to be the KGB suspicion that he had helped author "An *In Absentia* Psychiatric Report on the Case of P. G. Grigorenko" — a view supported by Sakharov on November 20, 1974 in appealing for support for Gluzman from psychiatrists. Later Gluzman reports from prison that:

"Do you realize that when we are marched from one place to another, stopping or taking one step to the side is considered an attempt to escape? (I know this from personal experience.) Or that when the temperature was — 58 degrees F., I was forced to lie down in the snow at night, guarded by a German shepherd straining at the leash, "just in case"?"

In the Chronicle of Human Events, we see the case of Alexander Bolonkin, professor at the Moscow Energy Institute, who was accused of using a homemade duplicating machine to prepare leaflets and distributing them. Later

we read of his sentence: four years at strict term and two of exile.

Reports are given of activities of the Moscow Human Rights Committee; mathematician Shafarevich analyses the rules on religious activity. We see the Moscow mathematician and friend of Sakharov, Yury Shikanovich declared mentally ill on the testimony of a psychiatrist who apparently had never seen Shikhanovich. (When the defense asked whether the psychiatrist had ever seen Shikhanovich, the Judge ruled the question irrelevant!)

We find the appeal of a dozen Jewish scientists ending with the sentence:

"We hope that our colleagues who are asked to participate in the planning of cooperative scientific programs with Soviet scientists will remember that they are being invited to cooperate with a system which regards the scientist not as a person but as its property."

Using Humans As Bribes

A letter from the biologist Sergei Kovalev and two associates describes the unique bribery offered them by the KGB. They could designate a person in jail or in a psychiatric ward. The police would then improve the lot of that person or release him; however both they and that person each of them had designated would have to purchase this improvement with future silence.

In Chronicle of Human Rights Number 8, we see the story of the exile of physicist Pavel Litvinov, grandson of the first Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinov.

The Chronicles overflow with examples of the abuse of the science of psychiatry. The parents of political prisoner Igor Ogurtsov are told by the admitting doctor, and by the chief of the psychiatric service, that their son is mentally healthy. But the latter refuses to guarantee that this would be stated in the finding, "citing certain special instructions with respect to state criminals."

In the January-February, 1975 issue, the Chronicle of Human Rights contains a long samizdat explanation of how best to cope with renegade psychiatrists determined to find an excuse for commitment. All in all, the Chronicles are absorbing, if chilling, reading. □

SUBSCRIBING TO THE CHRONICLES

Khronika Press in New York is now publishing every two months a series entitled "A Chronicle of Human Rights in the USSR" which can be secured for \$15 for individual subscriptions at: Khronika Press, 505 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10018. These interesting compilations of human rights information are edited by Valery Chalidze, one of the founders of the Soviet Human Rights Committee and contain much of the same material and more that appear in the Chronicles of Current Events, i.e. in the Soviet samizdat original.

In addition, Amnesty International has published many of the Chronicles of Current Events in English translation. For example, Chronicles 28-31 appear as a 150-page paperback for \$2.50 at Amnesty International, 200 E. 72nd Street, N. Y., N. Y. 10023. Numbers 16-27 were published earlier by Amnesty and most are still in print. Numbers 32 and 33 were published this fall and number 34 has already reached the West in translation. □

PUNISHMENT FOR SOVIET PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

What follows is drawn from an excellent newly released paperback "Prisoners of Conscience in the Soviet Union" which Amnesty International sells for \$2.00.

The 1960 code, of which Soviet jurists are very proud, contains only criminal offenses, requires trials in courts of law, precludes ex post facto applications of law and, among other things, prohibits night time interrogations and limits the Committee of State Security (KGB) mostly to "especially dangerous crimes against the State".

Samizdat is not proscribed per se; instead, it must be shown to be "anti-Soviet" or "false and slanderous". Unfortunately, the Soviet courts often, if not always, ignore this problem and consider the circulation of the material to be *ipso facto* evidence that any critical remarks in them are slanderous and "anti-Soviet."

There are elaborate regulations governing procedures for search, arrest and detention. Unfortunately, they are often ignored. Nine months is the limit on pre-trial detention (unless the Supreme Soviet itself agrees to more) but this often stretches to 12 or even 14 months without explanation. Often internees are not permitted to see either their wives or defense counsel during this period.

Lawyers in political cases require special "clearances". Sixty percent of the Soviet lawyers are candidate members of the Party; all can suffer from being over-zealous in these cases. For example, one lawyer who energetically defended his client was deprived of his right to work as a defense lawyer for "adopting a non-party non-Soviet line in his defense"; apparently he could not even be charged with an "anti"-Soviet line!

Political Crimes Inside the Soviet Union

The statutes in the adjoining box are the central statutes proscribing political activity in the Russian Republic (RSFSR) Criminal Code and they have counterparts, with different numbers, in the other republics.

The weaker of the two statutes is 190-1 with its three year term. This statute proscribes even "oral" circulation of specific information; but the information must be "fabrications known to be false". According to the official commentaries, these fabrications must be about "purportedly true facts and circumstances which the culprit already knows do not correspond to reality when he disseminates such fabrications". The commentary goes on to say:

"The dissemination of fabrications which the person who disseminates them does not know to be untrue, and equally the expression of mistaken evaluations, judgments or suppositions, do not constitute the crime treated in Article 190-1."

The commentary specifically notes that the preparation or dissemination of works which express the "negative attitude of the person who has prepared them toward Soviet reality" but which do not "contain fabrications which are known to be false" are not actionable under this statute. Another commentary emphasizes that the crime under this statute must be "deliberate" and the culprit must have recognized that he was indeed disseminating false information that defamed the Soviet state and social structure. Incidentally, storing works containing false fabrications, without intention to disseminate them, is not actionable under this article.)

The much more serious crime of "anti-Soviet Agita-

Article 70

Anti-Soviet Agitation and Propaganda. Agitation or propaganda carried on for the purpose of subverting or weakening Soviet authority or of committing particular especially dangerous crimes against the state, or the [verbal] spreading for the same purpose of slanderous fabrications which defame the Soviet political and social system, or the circulation or preparation or keeping, for the same purpose, of literature of such content, shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term of 6 months to 7 years, with or without additional exile for a term of 2 to 5 years, or by exile for a term of 2 to 5 years.

Article 190-1

Dissemination of Fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet political and social system. The systematic dissemination by word of mouth of deliberate fabrications which defame the Soviet political and social system, or the manufacture or dissemination in written, printed or other form of works of the same content, shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term not exceeding 3 years, or by corrective labour for a term not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding 100 rubles. □

tion and Propaganda" is discussed under Article 70. Basically, agitation means dissemination to a large circle (while propaganda refers to dissemination to a smaller circle) of opinions or ideas which are "not only hostile to the Soviet regime and the Soviet people but which are also conceived for the purpose of undermining or weakening the Soviet regime or of committing particular, especially dangerous crimes against the state." Examples are encouraging espionage, flight across the border, wrecking, sabotage, etc.

The scientists with whom FAS has spoken are in no danger of being charged with those particular violations; what they fear is the charge of circulating slanderous fabrications. But, to be actionable under this statute, the circulation of such slanderous fabrications must have been done with intention to undermine the regime, or with the aim of discrediting the Soviet regime to the advantage of anti-socialist forces. The situation is slightly analogous with the problems that the U. S. Government had in prosecuting Daniel Ellsberg for espionage when he released the top secret Pentagon papers; the espionage statute required that the Government show that Ellsberg's intent was to harm the country.

Amnesty International does not know of any single case in which a political defendant was ever acquitted in the Soviet Union on substantive grounds or on grounds of procedural violations. This contrasts with a significant incidence of acquittal in criminal cases. Nor is there any known case where a Soviet newspaper has protested a court decision in a political case.

The Constitution requires that all court cases be open but, in fact, on one pretext or another, proceedings are often effectively in camera. Court meeting places are changed, galleries are stacked and filled.

Corrective Labor

The official purpose of corrective labor is to reform prisoners and the 1969 law on Fundamentals of Correc-

—Continued on page 7

Continued from page 6

tive Labor Legislation specifically notes:

"The execution of a sentence shall not *aim at* inflicting physical suffering or degrading human dignity." (italics added)

However, neither code nor practice preclude regularized inflicting of physical suffering. A USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) textbook notes that:

"The everyday material maintenance of convicted persons *who observe the demands of the regime* is carried out within the physiologically necessary limits . . ." (italics added) (regime means here physical regime)

It goes on to say that:

"Soviet corrective labor legislation to a certain extent utilizes the daily material maintenance of prisoners as a means of gaining the goals established in Article 20 . . ."

Thus to refuse to work in a camp, or to violate discipline (the "regime") leads to reductions in food rations. Prison inmates receive less than those in corrective labor colonies (camps).

The present code recognizes that political prisoners can be reformed (where the previous code did not) but it calls for more rigorous measures against "especially dangerous state criminals" which is the referent for political prisoners.

The goal of reforming prisoners provides special problems for prisoners of conscience since it can be used to demand that they give up the convictions for which they were sent to prison in the first place; thus this goal of Soviet law can contravene Article 1 of the code that precludes "degrading the human dignity" of prisoners. They can be, in effect, blackmailed by various pressures into statements of real or pretended repentance.

Corrective labor colonies have four grades of colony regime: ordinary, intensified, strict and special. In fact, though not in law, diet is strikingly different between the regime as are privileges of all kinds.

Prisons have ordinary and strict regimes. Thus, on ordinary regime, prisoners can spend three rubles per month on supplementary food packages, have two short visits per year, and send one letter per month; but on strict regime, these privileges are reduced.

There seem to be on the order of two million Soviet prisoners of whom at least 10,000 are political and religious prisoners.

DIET OF PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

According to international standards, the work done by prisoners in Soviet strict regime corrective labor colonies can be described as "very active". The energy needed for a man working "very actively" for eight hours a day is 3,100-3,900 calories and for a woman 2,400-2,700 calories. The . . . strict regime diet contains 2,600 calories. Thus, even on normal diet, prisoners on strict regime receive an insufficient calorie ration. Prisoners on the PKT (punishment block special regime) receive 2,100 calories, even if they are required to do normal prisoners' work, while prisoners in SHIZO (special regime cells) are reduced to 1,300 calories. □

—Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR:
Their Treatment and Conditions,
Amnesty International, page 56

SCIENTISTS IN PRISON DYING SCIENTIFICALLY

. . . I should like merely to call your attention to the conditions under which those scientists who are political prisoners are being kept in the Soviet camps, and to the effect these conditions have on their professional skills. Among us are physicists and mathematicians, biologists and engineers, philologists and philosophers, and many others. I myself am an astronomer — a specialist in meteor astronomy and astrobiology. Each of us, whatever his political convictions, remains a scientist as before, and tries to preserve his professional skills under any condition.

But the conditions under which we are kept in the camps are so arranged as to prevent that to a maximum degree. [He goes on to note that no foreign publications whatsoever are permitted; that special-ized Soviet literature is unobtainable; that even relatives cannot send any literature, even Soviet newspaper clippings]. It is clear to any scientist that under such restrictions — especially with the present information explosion — a scientist very rapidly falls behind contemporary science and rapidly loses his skills . . . We are not merely being deprived of freedom temporarily, we are being deprived forever of a cherished thing — our profession." □

—K. A. Lyubarsky, October, 1974

Psychiatric Internment

Re the abuse of psychiatry, Amnesty concludes:

"Public pronouncements by leading representatives of Soviet psychiatry reveal the dominance in their work of criteria for mental illness which are so loosely formulated as to bring into the province of psychiatry any manifestation of dissent on public issues."

"On the basis of the available documentary evidence, Amnesty International accepts as fact the general allegation that numerous Soviet citizens have been confined to psychiatric hospitals as a direct result of their political or religious beliefs and with no medical justification." (pg. 104)

In fact, Amnesty knows in some detail of 120 such cases since January 1969 interned for either political or religious reasons. On the other hand, and typically, Academician A. V. Snezhnevsky of Moscow's Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry has asserted that "in 50 years of work in the Soviet public health service I know of no case in which a healthy man was put in a psychiatric hospital" (Izvestiya, August 31, 1973). General Pyotr Grigorenko, interned in Serbsky, often saw the head of the department in which he was committed, Professor Lunts, coming to work in the uniform of a KGB Colonel.

These political cases are then tortured with unnecessary treatments. Injections of sulphazin are used which cause the temperature to rise sharply and makes it painful for the patient to stir for three days. "Roll-up" in wet canvas, which dries out and squeezes the body in a vicelike way, causes intense pain. Depressant drugs such as haloperidol, aminazin and triftazin are administered which have very unpleasant side effects. The deterioration of the patients after these "treatments" is painfully clear when they later have trouble recognizing their family on rare visits, maintaining conversations, and the like. □

RUSSIA TWICE REVIEWED

Robert Kaiser and Hedrick Smith were in Moscow at the same time covering the Soviet Union for the Washington Post and New York Times respectively. They conceived the absolutely correct idea that the thing to do was to describe what Soviet life was really like and thus to convey, in particular, some of the immutable aspects of Russian existence. Neither of them forces any conclusions upon the reader; this is quite unnecessary in any case, since their books let the reader do it for himself. Mr. Smith believes one important conclusion of his observations is the undesirability of justifying a detente policy on any assumption that the Russians will quickly change. Mr. Kaiser goes further and believes that his observations reveal a much overrated superpower that concerns the West overmuch. Both books are absolutely first-rate, well-written, absorbing and studded with gems. It is unfortunate for the authors that both should be brought out at the same time. Personally, if I had to choose between them, I would prefer the Smith version. But buy whichever is nearest at hand.

THE RUSSIANS, Hedrick Smith, Quadrangle Press

Hedrick Smith does not think Russian society is going to change. *The Russians* is a compilation of verbal pictures worth a thousand words of abstract reasons. There is the diplomat whose career was ruined for failing to mind his own business by poking his nose into a Moscow hotel for foreign guests. Special health spas for the elite. Tickets to interesting events "allocated" rather than sold; the Central Committee took 3,000 tickets to a Soviet-Canadian hockey game (one-fourth of all available tickets). Sons and daughters of the highest officials getting that most desired boon: the trip to the West. An economic system so contorted that people buy — not what they need — but whatever they see that is worth having; some use can always be made of such things. Fantastically prevalent corruption, in small things especially, to overcome red tape. (One Russian notes "Everyone in the Soviet retail trade is a thief and you can't put them all in jail.")

People generally satisfied with their lives, preferring a few close friendships in our adolescent fashion. Students getting through schools because a quota exists and most have to be passed. Children encouraged to inform on each other. Young people blowing all their hard earned money on Western cultural affectations: flared slacks, wigs, knee-boots, platform shoes, levis. A Komsomol (Communist youth organization) inhabited by careerists. Tremendous living gaps between the cities and countryside. A country larger than our own with only one-tenth as many phones. Consumers refusing to buy those consumer goods marked as having been produced after the 20th of the month; end of month production is done so sloppily — in a desperate effort to meet the monthly plan — that such goods would not work. Hoarding in industrial enterprises to protect against shortages. The systematic stamping out of initiative in industry. The commonplace authoritarian frame of mind shared not only by the authorities but also by many dissidents. The reliance on custom rather than law. Russia as an "information vacuum" in which TASS puts out three editions, two of them secret but the most secret being more or less what the average Westerner can read. Officials acting out of "sheer bloody-mindedness

TALENTED SCIENTISTS CONSTRAINED BY UNNECESSARY SECRECY

"Internationally, Soviet science has a reputation for some of the world's most brilliant theoreticians in physics and mathematics, but only spotty strengths elsewhere, and general weakness in experimental work. Privately, top scientists blame this on bad management, rigid bureaucracy, political interference and second rate equipment. These problems hamper experimenters more than theorists. "We can read about experiments in American scientific journals that we cannot even repeat because we do not have the equipment, the computers," a dejected Soviet physicist told an American friend of mine. Others say Soviet science inevitably lags behind America in spite of talented individual scientists because information on new developments in world science or Soviet science circulates so slowly. . . .

"Soviet science is hurt, they said, by poor communications among Soviet scientists who are terribly compartmentalized. Normally it takes a year or two for new findings to get into scholarly journals, a process that in the West can be cut to weeks or days for important breakthroughs and thus speed scientific progress. The ferment and fast moving exchange of ideas prevalent in Western science, I was told, is largely absent in Soviet science. A rising young physicist complained that even at Novosibirsk's Akademgorodak (Academic City), set up in the early sixties to promote cross-fertilization of ideas among scientists in different fields, this did not go on any more. Nor do Soviet researchers share ideas informally by phone the way Westerners do. "No one talks about technical matters on the phone," a Moscow science writer told me. "People have the habit of not talking about anything that relates to secrecy." And Russians treat most science as falling in that category for scientific papers require a special security clearance (known as the *akt ekspertisa*) to be published." □

—*The Russians*, pg. 363-4, Hedrick Smith

or an ingrained, habitual arrogant Soviet disdain for 'the little man' ". Travelers stuck in airports for six days. A librarian getting nervous when a specially authorized Russian looks at Life Magazine because ". . . with you, The New York Times is permitted, but not Life Magazine". Soviet journalists following the motto "criticize but don't generalize". A writer complaining "we are an atomized society" with no one really knowing what his compatriots think. Perhaps the best summary of Soviet life lies in this sentence:

"Russians are quietly engaged in coaxing, cajoling, compromising, corrupting and colluding with each other to achieve some modest relaxation of the stern order of public life."

The Russians is an absolutely marvelous summary of what Soviet life is really like and, quite in addition, it permits the reader to make up his own mind on the fundamental cultural question: Why is Russia the way that it is now and is it going to change?

RUSSIA: THE PEOPLE AND THE POWER

ROBERT G. KAISER; Atheneum, New York, 1976

Robert Kaiser feels that it is the Russians "who would prefer that no one discover who they really are and how they really live". Using his stint in Moscow, interviews with emigres, and descriptions by dissidents of areas to which he was not permitted to go, he has produced a splendid compilation of vignettes.

There is a doctor found guilty of slander for accusing a pseudo-scientist of forging medical records; because the pseudo-scientist was defended by the Party, the doctor was found guilty despite the fact that 250 falsified records attested to by 30 witnesses lay on the table before the presiding judge. There is the Moscow box office that will not sell tickets to foreigners that are back in the balcony because they are not "good enough for foreigners." There is the editor who explains that they cannot sell western newspapers in the Soviet Union "because people believe whatever they read". A host of other examples attest also to Russian defensiveness, insecurity, suspicion and feelings of inferiority.

Military vs. Civilians

There is the Soviet military delegate to the SALT talks telling American delegates not to tell his Soviet civilian counterparts so much about Soviet military details; that was not their business, he explained. Numerous examples show how the system stamps out initiative and produces rule by reliable, steady, undistinctive people who take no chances and do what they are told.

Kaiser notes that the Soviet bureaucracy and the U. S. Army have many similarities; in particular, how they cover up embarrassments. The My Lai massacre was handled in the way that Russians cover up Stalin's crimes; ("thorough investigation", mild punishment for a few senior officers, severe punishment for some junior men, and hints that the guilty are already dead).

The Party is left with no genuinely popular leaders, none close to the masses and not even any serious theoreticians. He quotes Roy Medvedev who concludes that "Neo-Stalinism springs essentially from a conviction that socialism is so weak that it cannot defend itself except by totally suppressing all forces supposedly antagonistic to it." Thus Russian insecurity and lack of self-confidence combines with a wealth of real problems to suppress the criticism that might begin to solve the difficulties. But the red tape of Soviet life is so extensive that citizens usually do not have the time to reflect about the larger aspects of the dilemmas in which they find themselves; dissidence takes energy that is not really available.

Lying To Foreigners

The capacity of Russians to lie to foreigners in defense of their country — blithely and with every sign of sincerity — appears in numerous anecdotes. This phenomenon is matched by their readiness to disbelieve their own leaders unless the facts are confirmed by "the West."

What will become of Russia? Kaiser sees the dissidents as an important tiny minority very unlikely ever to win over their countrymen. He plots the decline in their visible numbers since the thaw under Khrushchev in 1958 and thereafter. A peak of outpourings of complaints occurred during the Sinyavesky and Daniel trials of February, 1966, followed by complaints about the treatment

of those who defended Sinyavesky and Daniel. By 1975, Kaiser sees the KGB crackdown as complete and the petition signers numbering a few dozen, at most, rather than a few hundred. The dissident thinking is still there; but the hope that inspires the courage to sign petitions is not.

The dissidents are themselves split among: religious dissidents; Russian nationalists; sincere communists rebelling against Soviet reality; socialist democratizers comprising the Sakharov group; bearers of non-ideological outrage at one thing or another; Jews who want to leave; and drop outs (akin to hippies).

Anti-Semitism Continues

Kaiser describes the limited success of the Soviet struggle against Russian anti-Semitism. Even in the sixties, Jews were excluded from the Central Committee apparatus and were being turned down for important embassy posts. He believes that Jews will be permitted to leave in a trickle for years to come simply because it will be easier to let them go than to try to keep them in.

He does not believe that any "civilizing value of education" will enhance respect for liberal ideals.

Here is Kaiser's conclusion:

"Russian society is authoritarian; it has been cruel to its members for hundreds of years, and has never tolerated non-conformists for long. Outsiders may shame the Russians into hiding or even curtailing their harshest impulses, but this is far easier than shaming them into virtue. . . .

"Inertia opposes change, even if a new generation should want to liberalize the country. The autocracy may be trapped by history. Mistrust of the people is now automatic. The communist autocrats have fed them invented history and invented information for nearly half a century. Dictatorship is the expected norm throughout a huge and diverse country. Can there be any hope for serious change?

"There is hope but it may not be justified."

He would like us to abandon the image of the USSR as a bristling, powerful and aggressive nation and to replace it with the image of a country with a siege mentality, manned by persons deeply conscious of their own gaping weaknesses and their adversaries' great strength. They are not less aggressive or expansionist but crave recognition, status and influence and are *less* prone than ourselves to take risks and misjudge their true interests. They are deeply dependent upon foreign technology and foreign projects. They are on the defensive in Eastern Europe, worried about rebellions, but capable of reacting with an aggressive streak to maintain the security buffer they feel they need. Kaiser even suspects that the Soviet leaders may not want communist regimes in the advanced western countries because they are neither imaginative nor tough, and have no appetite for great conquests or unpredictable upheavals. But they sincerely want relaxation of tension, not as a tactic, but as a long term solution to their problems.

In a way, Kaiser's conclusion is summed up in the comment of an American professor he quotes earlier:

"I used to get worried. They were training more people, spending more money, their scientists had more prestige [than scientists in the United States] but I said that 10 years ago. Somehow that potential never seems to flower." □

FASEB AND AIBS TURN BACK ON BIOLOGIST COLLEAGUE KOVALEV

On November 13, FAS asked the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB) and the American Institute of Biological Sciences (AIBS) for permission to rent the list of their members in the normal way and on a commercial basis (i.e. the society provides a printout of labels in zip code order for one time use). Each society requires that the purpose of the mailing be made clear and FAS explained the case of biologist Sergei Adamovich Kovalev and the urgency (the trial was imminent and, indeed, took place 5 weeks later.) FASEB Executive Director Eugene L. Hess first agreed, and then declined with regret, enclosing ground rules of the society which stated, "Any material of a legislative or political nature will be disapproved". The ground rules went on to permit rentals that "emphasized instruments, products or services for use in teaching . . ." The Executive Director of AIBS Richard Trumbull wrote still more negatively:

"Although the AIBS does sell its mailing list on a selective basis, all requests for the list are carefully screened for appropriateness so that AIBS members do not become a target audience for all concerns seeking their attention."

IRS Sees No Problem

FASEB's guidelines about political and legislative materials are quite unnecessary, from a legal point of view. To make the point absolutely clear, FAS wrote to IRS and received this response on December 8:

"In response to your letter of November 26, 1975, an exempt 501 (c) (3) [the category of all the disciplinary scientific societies] will not be adversely affected if the list is then used by the purchasing organization to mail material tending to promote legislative activity, unless the seller endorses or lends its name to the material or otherwise takes an active part in the campaign to encourage member participation in the legislative activity. The passive sale of a mailing list does not in itself cause the seller to be responsible for the content of material mailed as a result of the sale."

In short, FASEB has gratuitously decided, for no legal (or even expressed) reason, to discriminate against the concerns of politically active scientists in favor of microscope manufacturers. And it was willing to do so even

when the issue in question was the defense of a Soviet colleague. This struck FAS officials as bizarre and contemptible.

The AIBS Executive Director's response is even more arcane. The fear that AIBS members might become a "target audience for all concerns seeking their attention" is the kind of bureaucratic rhetoric worthy of Pravda. No one mails to any list unless they believe some of those receiving the material wish to get it; otherwise why undertake the expense? Why should AIBS decide to deny, to those of its members who are interested, material of interest to them?

Trumbull: The Moral Conscience of AIBS?

Dr. Trumbull's letter revealed the way in which he viewed the situation: one of scientists misusing their credentials. Dr. Trumbull explained that AIBS felt it had no obligation to Kovalev because he was not acting as a scientist in his activities in the Soviet Union and referred to the problem of "the use of ones credentials as a scientist to influence action in non-scientific areas". This was an inaccurate and gratuitous insult.

FAS has sent both societies a resolution it passed some years ago explaining why it was in the best interest of all concerned for societies to stop trying to decide what should and should not be mailed to their members.* They are acting as censors over what their members will or will not read, and doing so at the cost of denying themselves revenue! It is crystal clear that the scientists inside these organizations with animus toward FAS have quietly moved to make our contact with their scientists more difficult.

The FAS Director wrote each society explaining that we believed the right of scientists to petition one another was at stake, and that we would urge biologists to separate themselves from these decisions of the two societies, in whatever way they could, until their guidelines were changed. □

*Societies normally forbid use of their catalogues for mailing purposes and their use is often economically infeasible anyway.

FAS PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT (202) 546-3300
307 Mass. Ave., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002
January 1976, Vol. 29, No. 1

- 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: _____

Second Class Postage

Paid at

Washington, D. C.

Return Postage
Guaranteed