

F. A. S. PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT

Formerly the FAS Newsletter

THIS ISSUE:
HELPING COLLEAGUES ABROAD:
A METHOD

Vol. 29, No. 3

March, 1976

ON A METHOD OF HELPING COLLEAGUES ABROAD: "THE AMERICAN REFUSENIK"

In December, we reported on the individual situations of some Soviet scientists in Moscow. In January, we discussed both the general situation and the general obligation of American scientists to assist their colleagues abroad. But what is it that, in fact, American scientists can do? FAS has an obligation to try to answer this question in this last, for the time, report on this issue.

A review of the history of the problem reveals that, for the most part, scientific institutions have left the problem of protest to individuals. But the individuals themselves have not, by and large, hit upon any plausible method. More activity, and more creativity, seems called for by both individuals and institutions. But, in particular, a useful method by which individuals could be effective would take some of the burden off of scientific institutions who could continue to function in support of unalloyed openness in their way.

We begin by asking what conditions a successful method should have. In the first place, such a method should be promulgated in the context of a general desire to increase scientific exchange, to improve cooperation between nations, to advance the cause of peace, and so on.

Second, the method used must be such that it does not exhaust the enthusiasm of the American scientific community for persisting in the face of a problem that is itself certain to be continuing.

Third, the method should be such that the punishment fits the crime. This means that the method

must be flexible, because the different offenses against scientific freedom are themselves numerous and quite different. And it means that the method must focus on resolvable problems, issues which do not require leopards to change their spots.

Fourth, the method must be largely decentralized so that the community at large need not work within or through any particular organization, or organizations, with all that would imply for tapping the energy of only a restricted group.

Fifth, the method should apply to all scientists — not just the Jewish refuseniks, and not just the embattled Soviet scientists in general, but all scientists abroad suffering any problem that is unfairly interfering with their pursuit of science.

The solution we propose does have these characteristics. We propose that American scientists make it a practice, from time to time, to adopt colleagues abroad who need and deserve help in protecting their careers against improper governmental action. The American scientist would then advise the government in question that he intends, as an individual, to refuse to participate in one or more particular kinds of scientific exchange or cooperation until the specified scientific injustice is rectified.

Thus an American scientist might quietly advise a foreign government — or just publicly announce — that he was refusing: 1) to open his laboratory to foreign visitors from a specific state; or 2) to attend

—Continued on page 2

—Approved by The FAS National Council

FAS WILL DO WHAT IT CAN BUT OTHERS MUST HELP

We have come to understand, with surprise and over a period of time, that total strangers who live in distant countries, in situations and cultures alien to one's own, can also help.

—Founders of a Soviet Human Rights Organization

Scientists and intellectuals like to speak, but they do nothing concrete; they make appeals to the Soviet authorities, but later say that the protests and appeals were not serious.

—KGB General to Corresponding Member
Benjamin Levich

To what extent can intellectuals help and how? This is the ultimate question for American scientists, virtually all of whom share a consensus on the desirability of helping colleagues abroad enjoy the scientific and human freedoms which we know here.

It is evident that many different methods will be necessary for any one nation much less for the many different

nations at issue. What we want, in this final report, is to start individuals and organizations thinking along creative lines: to solicit suggestions from our members; to encourage all scientists to participate as individuals and through their organizations in this effort; and to provide readers with information about the international organizations available to which one could complain, (WFSW, ICSU, and UNESCO).

As indicated on page 8, the FAS Council has approved the proposal that FAS extend its work in helping foreign colleagues. We will undertake, about once a year, to look into the plight of foreign colleagues in different areas. But we hope that American scientists and institutions will not adopt a "leave it to FAS" posture. FAS has many issues of concern and is extremely limited in staff time. The scope of our work in this area will be directly proportional to the moral and financial expressions of interest in it by our members and will, in any case, be far more limited than the task requires. □

Continued from page 1

an international conference; or 3) to travel to a specific state; or 4) to participate in an exchange program; until such time as his adopted counterpart in that state was permitted: a) to attend a specific foreign conference; or b) to hold a job befitting his qualifications; or c) to be released from a prison; or whatever. The American scientist could himself decide what punishment suited what crime. But whatever he decided would be not just an empty threat since he was prepared to carry it out. And it would not be an effort to sabotage scientific exchange. Instead, it would be a well-defined inducement to a foreign government to permit a specific foreign scientific effort by threatening — until that scientific activity or cooperation was permitted — to withhold his own cooperation.

There are few states indeed that do not want the cooperation of American scientists. Most would worry, to some degree at least, about the low level probability that, when some exchange became indicated, some of the scientists involved might be unwilling to cooperate. And since all scientists will not be up-in-arms with regard to any particular country at any particular time, scientific exchange with all countries can go forward under this system. Further, nations are provided with the means to reduce the level by which cooperation has been impaired by satisfying the precise and limited complaints of the aroused American scientists.

Is The Method Suitable?

Does this method fit our conditions? The American scientist does threaten to withdraw scientific cooperation (his) — but he only does so in an effort to increase scientific production and cooperation (his colleagues').

The method does not exhaust the enthusiasm of our community because it focuses on individuals doing whatever their conscience impells, and doing so only for such periods as they wish.

The method will fit the crime as precisely as the individual American scientist can make it do so, and thus taps the ingenuity of individual American scientists.

The method is largely decentralized and the American scientist needs not act through any specific organization, or even learn about the case from them.

Finally, the method does apply to all scientists everywhere, not only Soviet scientists or Soviet refuseniks. It is true, and we recognize, that the effectiveness of this method for achieving any specific goal will vary when confronted with nations of different personalities and with different objective needs for American science. To this extent the method is necessarily somewhat tentative and experimental and individual scientists will be "playing it by ear" at the outset.

We also recognize that certain kinds of very fundamental cooperation probably should not be abridged — the sending of reprints, for example, or published material. But other kinds of cooperation might very clearly be abridged: such as the cooperation with politically chosen delegations of irrelevant scientists

who sometimes replace the desired invitees to an international conference.

Above all, we think that our method should be combined with vigorous efforts to expand organized scientific exchange, to support international conferences, to seek all feasible ways to spread scientific knowledge in traditional ways. This complements — and even underlies — the success of the method.

But what should the method be called? Observing the fashion in which FAS's attention has been drawn to this problem, and noting that the American scientist would be "refusing" certain cooperation in an effort to secure other cooperation, we think it appropriate to dub the participating American scientists of conscience: "The American Refuseniks". □

FAS

Chairman: PHILIP MORRISON

Vice Chairman: JEROME D. FRANK

Secretary: HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.

Treasurer: HERBERT F. YORK

Director: JEREMY J. STONE

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

SPONSORS (partial list)

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

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS (elected)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Ruth S. Adams (Science Policy) | Franklin A. Long (Chemistry) |
| David Baltimore (Microbiology) | Francis E. Low (Physics) |
| Nina Byers (Physics) | Victor Rabinowitch (World Devel.) |
| Rose E. Frisch (Human Biology) | George W. Rathjens (Pol. Science) |
| Arthur W. Galston (Biology) | 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.

WORLD FEDERATION OF SCIENTIFIC WORKERS (WFSW) HAS ADOPTED ALL THE RIGHT PRINCIPLES

In April, 1969, the World Federation of Scientific Workers adopted a Declaration on the Rights of Scientific Workers which included:

3.2 Right to Employment

"Scientific Workers should have the right to work in accordance with their scientific capabilities and Government should endeavor to ensure this right."

This would certainly seem to apply to the Jewish refuseniks. The work should be "commensurate with his qualifications and knowledge . . ." And "the circumstances under which a scientific worker may be dismissed should be defined by law."

With regard to the right to communicate, in its basic Charter for Scientist Workers, WFSW's observes:

" . . . the scientific worker to be fully effective, must be enabled to communicate with and visit his colleagues throughout the world without hindrance."

It calls for:

(5.36) "Freedom to discuss work freely with other scientists and to join and participate in the activities of scientific societies at home and abroad without restriction or prohibitive expenditure."

With regard to the public defender scientists like Tverdokhlebov, Kovalev and Turchin, the WFSW Constitution observes that WFSW has as an objective: (h) To encourage scientific workers to take an active part in public affairs . . ."

World Federation Not Well Known Here

The World Federation is not well known in America partly because, in 1946, FAS declined to become its American affiliate, a decision that was confirmed, at least for the moment, in 1973. It claims an American affiliate called the American Association of Scientific Workers but this affiliate, with no dues for members, only claims 250 persons on a kind of list of one-time interested parties.*

The World Federation is a federation of groups of scientists in a good many countries, especially in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union. One of its Soviet affiliates has seven and one half million members. The President of the World Federation, Dr. E. H. S. Burhop, is an urbane man dedicated to maintaining scientific communication and holding the World Federation together.

Soviet scientists often appeal injustices to the World Federation but there are sharp limits upon what WFSW can do with them. The journal, "Scientific World", is published in English, French, German and Russian and does not carry material that would give offense to World Federation affiliates. And the WFSW has made it a practice not to make public statements concerning the affairs of any particular country, in which it has an affiliated organization, without the approval of that organization. Complaints by scientists or affiliated organizations about injustices inside the Soviet Union would be

*Affiliated organizations are said to exist in: Albania, Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany (East and West), Hungary, India, Japan, North Korea, Malagasy Republic, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Egypt, United Kingdom, Vietnam (North), Yugoslavia. It also claims People's Republic of China but, during the FAS visit to Peking in 1972, we learned that this membership was exceedingly dormant. The affiliates range from fourteen trade unions, to professional associations, to organizations devoted to popularization of science.

referred to the Soviet affiliate for comment; if the complainants pressed for action, the Executive Committee could in theory act. Normally however, the World Federation tries to act by consensus and, while its Constitution does not provide vetoes, it would be very slow to act formally over the objections of the Soviet affiliates.

The address of the World Federation of Scientific Workers is: Professor E. H. S. Burhop, President, WFSW, 40 Goodge Street, London W1P, 1FH, England. □

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS (ICSU)

ICSU is an international non-governmental scientific organization composed of 17 international scientific unions (e.g. International Astronomical Union), 64 National Members (e.g. U.S. National Academy of Sciences) and some other associates.

The fundamental principal of ICSU is to preclude discrimination among scientists in international activities. The relevant amendment is:

"5 . . . the Council shall observe the basic policy of non-discrimination and affirm the rights of scientists throughout the world to adhere to or to associate with international scientific activity without regard to race, religion, political philosophy, ethnic origin, citizenship, language or sex. The Council shall recognize and respect the independence of the internal scientific planning of its National Members."

In short, ICSU follows the proper principal in international matters but, as the last sentence of the quotation makes clear, feels bound to avoid intervention in internal discrimination. For example, the Russians can discriminate, evidently, against Russians with regard to conferences scheduled inside the Soviet Union.

In order to protect against international discrimination, ICSU maintains a Committee on Free Circulation of Scientists whose Chairman is now maintaining a record of cases involving problems of free circulation to which ICSU bodies may refer. (ICSU could be encouraged to make this material public.) The present Chairman is Professor T. Caspersson, Institute for Medical Cell Research, Karolinska Institutet, S-104 01 Stockholm 60, Sweden.

At its 15th General Assembly, ICSU adopted a resolution recommending that ICSU bodies get an assurance in writing from conference organizers that "visas will be granted to bonafide scientists if proper applications are made". The resolution commended to other unions a rule that had recently been adopted by one of them — International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry, (IUPAC). This rule asked that applications for visas be made three months before the date of the symposium and that, if they are neither granted nor promised in writing one month before the date of the event, sponsorship should be withdrawn by the international sponsoring body and future arrangements for meetings in that country suspended.

Because ICSU's mandate does not encompass internal political questions, at its 14th annual meeting it resolved reluctantly that the question of scientific migration was outside its mandate but still "a serious challenge to the world scientific community". It resolved to discuss this at the next meeting.

In 1966, an ICSU resolution cautioned its bodies that scientific meetings were not to be disturbed by "political statements or by any activities of a political nature". □

NAS: SHOULD IT'S REPRESENTATIONS BE PRIVATE ONLY?

A number of members have asked whether the National Academy of Sciences' effectiveness in helping foreign colleagues might be improved without serious danger to its other goals. While Academy officials must make such determinations, the case that this is possible reads something like this.

It is not personal opinion or speculation but only common sense that suggests NAS private representations would be more effective if combined, from time to time, with public representations. Otherwise, private representations have little force and simply constitute a warning by NAS that pressures originating elsewhere are rising. In a sense, a policy of private representations limits NAS to the role of a private broker between the Soviets and the pressures of others when the NAS itself is potentially the main source of pressure.

Need an NAS policy of mixing public and private representations do serious damage to the NAS goal of expanding exchange? Soviet interest in Western technology is centuries old and will not change in the absence of changes so dramatic as to dwarf NAF policy. The NAS representations need not divulge private confidences, hence the slogan "one cannot have it both ways" is questionable.

There is no real evidence that the Administration controls NAS policy in this regard; State Department officials deny it and Foreign Secretary George Hammond observes "Our policies are our own". There is nothing concrete that the Department of State could do in any case. And the Department of State engages itself in public representations when it wants — as it did recently with regard to Chile and South Africa.

What Role Pluralism

Can NAS rely upon "Pluralism" to justify a policy of private representations only? Unfortunately, Amnesty International works only with scientists in prison — not with scientists denied the right to work as scientists, the usual case for our community. And FAS has neither the official standing, the official status, or the operational staff to carry on this work for the entire community.

The 1973 NAS statement on Sakharov — splendidly drafted when read in retrospect — reveals that public

THE EXISTING STATE OF PLAY

"Were Sakharov to be deprived of his opportunity to serve the Soviet people and humanity, it would be extremely difficult to imagine fulfillment of American pledges of binational scientific cooperation, the implementation of which is entirely dependent on our voluntary effort and good will of our individual scientists and scientific institutions".

—Dr. Philip Handler,
President of the NAS to Mstislav Keldysh

"We stand for an extensive development of scientific cooperation provided that the traditions and way of life of every country are mutually respected and observed."

—Mstislav Keldysh, then President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences to Philip Handler,
President of the NAS

representations are not inconsistent with Academy policy. (It began simply: "I have been asked to report to you both privately and publicly the concern of the Council of the National Academy of Sciences . . .") All experienced observers agree that it had a startling and useful effect in defending the scientific life of a single eminent individual. Why not such a statement in defense of the scientific lives of the three hundred or so scientist refuseniks caught in a scientific limbo?

What seems required is a degree of political acumen. There are, for example, a large number of ways to draw attention to the plight of our scientific colleagues abroad. NAS could send a representative to Moscow charged to report to the NAS membership. It could offer to serve

—Continued on page 5

SECURITY REQUIRES IDEOLOGICAL DETENTE

"It was particularly gratifying for me to note the Committee's citation, which emphasizes the defense of human rights as the only sure basis for genuine and lasting international cooperation. I consider that this idea is very important; I am convinced that international confidence, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live. I am likewise convinced that freedom of conscience, together with the other civic rights, provides the basis for scientific progress and constitutes a guarantee that scientific advance will not be used to despoil mankind, providing the basis for economic and social progress, which in turn is a political guarantee for the possibility of an effective defense of social rights . . ."

"The success of detente can only be assured if from the very outset it goes hand in hand with continual observation of openness on the part of all countries, an aroused sense of public opinion, free exchange of information, absolute respect in all countries for civic and political rights. In short: in addition to detente in the material sphere, with disarmament and trade, detente should take place in the intellectual and ideological sphere." □

—Andrei Sakharov: Nobel Peace Prize Lecture,
1975 December 11.
Copyright the Nobel Foundation, Stockholm.

NAS PHYSICISTS SUPPORT TVERDOKHLEBOV

During the month of January, and FAS petition in defense of physicist (and former Moscow Amnesty Chairman) Andrei Tverdokhlebov sponsored by Hans A. Bethe and Owen Chamberlain captured the support of 62 physicist-members of the National Academy of Sciences — 50% of the total NAS physicist membership — and was relayed to the Soviet Ambassador.

The date for the Tverdokhlebov trial appears now to have been set for March 15. Tverdokhlebov and the recently imprisoned Sergei Kovalev are among the closest associates of Andrei Sakharov in the Soviet human rights movement. □

NAS MEMBERS SUPPORT FOUR SCIENTIFIC FREEDOMS

In the fall of 1972, 489 NAS scientists, more than half of the then 950 members, endorsed a letter to the President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, which said in part:

"... scientists must be free to:

1. pursue scientific investigations,
2. publish the results of their investigations,
3. travel to scientific congresses,
4. emigrate from their country of residence when the above rights are encumbered.

We, the undersigned individuals, members of the United States National Academy of Sciences, uphold these rights of all scientists. We are deeply concerned that a number of Soviet scientists are currently being denied these rights and their freedom as scientists . . ." □

FAS APPEALED ON BEHALF OF PLYUSHCH

On November 28, 1975, FAS wrote the wife of mathematician Leonid Plyushch, then interned in a psychiatric prison hospital in Dnepropetrovsk, that FAS was deeply disturbed over his treatment. We noted that a report on his situation would be sent to our 7,000 scientists and, subsequently, "to every American mathematician by mail".

Plyushch had been interned since 1972 and, during the three intervening years, very substantial public outcry had occurred on a world wide basis. His was the most celebrated case of psychiatric internment of its period. An international committee of mathematicians had protested upon his behalf and even the French Communist Party had protested as well. The failure of these protests to have any effect had persuaded some of the protestors that the KGB wanted to make an example of Plyushch to show that international protest would not be successful.

It was, therefore, with some surprise that FAS observed rumors two weeks later in mid-December that Plyushch might be released. With the immediate cooperation of the American Mathematical Society, (AMS), FAS was able to inform the Soviet Ambassador, in a polite note of December 18, that the proposed mailing would not be sent if we could receive some assurance that Plyushch would be released. A copy of the proposed FAS letter to AMS members was attached.

On December 26, Mrs. Plyushch was advised that she could hand in an application for an exit visa, and on January 4 Soviet authorities said he would be released which did, in fact, occur on January 8. On the same day it was announced in Moscow that Plyushch would be released, the President of the Soviet Academy of Science sent a kind telegram to FAS Chairman Philip Morrison thanking FAS for its congratulation on his becoming President.

One FAS observers considers it conceivable that the Soviet authorities, while prepared to continue enduring European-based complaints, were not prepared, during the U.S. debate over detente, to permit the Plyushch case to become an issue among *American* scientists. In this event, the FAS intervention may have been the last straw in his case. Of course, the timing may have been coincidental. □

UNESCO GUIDELINES: STATUS OF THE SCIENTIFIC WORKER

Training

- 11A. Member States should ensure that all citizens enjoy equal opportunities for the initial education and training needed to qualify for scientific research work, as well as ensuring that all citizens who succeed in so qualifying enjoy equal access to available employment in scientific research;

To Work and To Work Freely

14. Member States should seek to encourage conditions in which scientific researchers, with the support of the public authorities, have the responsibility and the right:
- (a) to work in a spirit of intellectual freedom to pursue, expound and defend the scientific truth as they see it;
 - (b) to express themselves freely on the human, social or ecological value of certain projects and in the last resort withdraw from those projects if their conscience so dictates;
 - (c) to contribute positively and constructively to the fabric of science, culture and education in their own country, . . . and the furtherance of the international ideals and objectives of the United Nations;

Keeping Up To Date

- 22a. Member States should seek to encourage that:
- (a) like other categories of workers facing similar problems, scientific researchers enjoy opportunities for keeping themselves up to date in their own and in related subjects, by attendance at conferences, by free access to libraries and other sources of information . . .

Travel

26. Member States . . . should take all measures necessary to ensure that scientific researchers are enabled, throughout their careers, to participate in international scientific and technological gatherings and to travel abroad.
- 34a. Member States should seek to ensure that scientific researchers may:
- (a) receive without hindrance the questions, criticisms and suggestions addressed to them by their colleagues throughout the world . . .

—“*Recommendation on the Status of Scientific Researchers*”, Adopted by the General Conference, UNESCO, November 20, 1974 The Director of the UNESCO Science Policy Division is Y. de Hempinne, UNESCO, 7 Place de Fontenoy, Paris 75700, France.

Continued from page 4

formally as a transmission belt for the complaints of its members or other organizations. It could report to Congress on the situation and could even make an annual report on the world-wide state of scientific injustice. It could poll its members on their attitudes, asking at what point outcry should be made. Above all, it could look upon the efforts of groups like FAS as efforts that strengthened its hand in private representations. □

IN COOPERATION WITH AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

In cooperation with Amnesty International, FAS has adopted the cases of eight scientists in prison and is briefly describing their situations so as to secure FAS members who would like to write to various authorities on behalf of their release. FAS members writing to the National Office will be sent further background on their plight:

ANTONYUK, Zinovy: (USSR) Master of Chemical science, serving a ten year sentence for circulating Ukrainian samizdat publications.

BOLONKIN, Alexander: (USSR) Lecturer in Aviation Technology; serving six year sentence for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda".

CH'EN Chung-t'ung: (Taiwan) Specialist in Cancer Research; arrested while visiting sick father on honeymoon and charged with subversive activities on behalf of Taiwan Independence Movement; serving ten year sentence.

GIMPU, Grigory Teodorovich: (USSR) Researcher in Biological Physics; serving six year term for "creating an organization dedicated to fighting dictatorship".

LADYZHENSKY, Lev Aleksandrovich: (USSR) Professor of Mathematics and Logistics serving six year term for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda".

LIN Shu-ts'ung: (Taiwan), Dentist; serving an eight year sentence for "advocating violent overthrow".

LYUBARSKY, Kronid: (USSR), Astrophysicist; serving five year term for anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda. (This man is both very eloquent and very ill).

MASSERA, Jose Luis: (Uruguay), Eminent Mathematician and Engineer; arrested because of leading role played in Uruguayan Communist Party and as a former deputy in the Uruguayan Congress now banned since the military takeover. □

SCIENTIFIC EXCHANGE & CONSCIENCE ARE THERE QUIET U.S. GROUND RULES?

U.S. participants must insist that their freedom to attend the Sunday seminar and meet freely with all Soviet scientists is necessary to their participation in official exchanges.

—Letter to N.Y. Times,
Herman Cummins and Peter Pershan,
July 26, 1975

Complaints in Moscow from dissident scientists raised the question of whether American scientists on exchange programs were being coerced by either their own Government or the Soviet Government from meeting with Soviet scientists who were in difficulties with the regime.

FAS wrote to each of eleven Government agencies and the NAS to determine what American participants were being told in this regard; in a few cases, FAS resorted to the Freedom of information Act and requested briefing papers.

Here are some responses:

Department of Commerce (NOAA): "There has been no pressure to control U.S. scientists involved with this bilateral agreement in the past nor do we anticipate any such pressure in the future".

Federal Energy Administration: "If members of U.S.

delegations have free time during their visits to the USSR, they are free to use that time as they wish. As the U.S. chairman, I rely on the judgement of our delegation members under such circumstances".

Environmental Protection Agency: "I can assure you that in briefing our delegations to the Soviet Union nothing is said to discourage them from meeting with individual Soviet scientists as their interests and common sense may dictate. At the same time, in briefing our delegations — all of which are considered official — we advise them not to inject politics into the workings of this Agreement which is formal and intergovernmental. We also attempt to inform them as fully as we can of the significance of the Agreement in U.S.-Soviet relations, and of those local Soviet conditions, as well as Soviet laws, regulations, and procedures, which are relevant to their officials visits, so that our participants will not inadvertently undertake activities inconsistent with the purposes of the Agreement. As far as I am aware, our participants agree wholeheartedly with this approach. Certainly no one has complained of pressure being exerted to compromise his or her personal conscience in this matter".

National Academy of Sciences: NAS distributes a two page "Do's and Don'ts" to scientists visiting the Soviet Union. None of these touch upon this issue.

Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA): "You can rest assured that ERDA will not attempt to dissuade private American scientists from engaging in unclassified intellectual exchanges with their counterparts in any nation".

HEW: "While the Department of HEW has no policy to either encourage or discourage U.S. exchange scientists who may wish to meet with Soviet scientists of any political or ethnic minority group, we must be assured that their primary objective in participating in the Program is productive scientific work".

NASA: "... if U.S. scientists were in the Soviet Union at NASA expense to pursue this Government's cooperative objectives, we would expect them to dedicate themselves to that task. This would seem to imply avoidance of actions which might prejudice accomplishment of their mission. If this consideration leaves sufficient latitude for the kind of meetings discussed in your letter, they would not become a matter of concern to us".

Department of Transportation: "We would certainly not discourage such contacts in principle as we feel that they are largely a matter of personal choice and judgment. Obviously, however, contacts of this type can vary widely in nature and impact. . . . we believe we have the obligation to inform (the scientists) fully lest they inadvertently engage in activities inimical to the objectives of the cooperative effort or the purpose of their visit to the Soviet Union".

National Science Foundation: "... we have no desire to exert pressure. However, we do feel we have an obligation to inform American participants of relevant Soviet laws and conditions. This reduces the risk that they might engage in activities which would unintentionally adversely affect the cooperative program and personal objectives". □

FAS REQUESTS MEMBER ADVICE RE DNA RECOMBINANTS

On the 9th and 10th of February, NIH's Director, Donald Frederickson convened a beefed up NIH Advisory Committee to review the guidelines proposed by his Committee on Recombinant DNA Molecules. The meeting was open and, in a refreshing initiative, seventeen public interest groups were specifically invited and sent an informative and useful two inch packet of background material illuminating the proposed guidelines.

As in our case, the information probably did more to focus the attention of these groups on this problem than to elicit testimony; only one of the seventeen groups prepared a statement (Environmental Defense Fund). But 150 people attended the meeting. As the issue seems certain to grow in future in the public eye, it seems probable that this meeting was the first of many on this subject in which the public will be involved.

The twenty person Advisory Committee presided over a scene which — after one got used to the rather youthful appearance of the major scientists — would have done credit to a well-cast film. The chief expert witnesses, Dr. Paul Berg of Stanford and Dr. Maxine Singer gave brief, and on the whole lucid, lectures on the substance of DNA recombinant problems — but these lectures were necessarily either too elementary for the initiated or too technical for the completely uninitiated. The drafting committee was then symmetrically represented in presentations by a member of its "liberal" wing (Dr. David Hogness) and its "conservative" wing (Dr. Roy Curtis III).

Some slides showing different levels of containment (P1, P2, P3 and P4) indicate that P1 was to be ordinary procedures, P2 was later cynically represented as P1 with a sign put up to keep out the unauthorized. P3 was a laboratory with inward air flow and precautions of some significance, while P4 was a Fort Detrick-like installation.

The focus of interest was, however, on biological containment — the use of vectors and hosts for the experiments that would, if they escaped from the laboratory, promptly die. A consensus of the Advisory Committee had early decided that enfeeblement of the comprehensively studied *E. Coli* would best combine the benefits of using something well understood with the benefits of using something that would not survive if it escaped. But enfeebling *E. Coli* in such a way that only one organism in 100,000,000 would survive turned out to be more difficult than expected: Dr. Curtis had succeeded just a few weeks before, after 18 months of effort, but his work was yet to be confirmed by others.

The main attack on the guidelines came from a Boston DNA Recombinant Group related somehow to Science For the People (SESPA). It argued that the issue was not "freedom of inquiry" but "freedom of manufacture", noting that it admired "tremendously" the work that had gone into the guidelines, but wanting them tightened up. The benefits of the research — which all admitted would be very significant in time — would be with us forever. Why hurry in the first few years? In particular, would it be better to develop a comparable body of knowledge about some substitute for *E. Coli* that would permit working with a host that did not live in man.

Some biologists admitted privately that, in a few years, during a moratorium, such a preferred host might indeed be created albeit with a sense of frustration and marking

time by the scientists. But it was generally argued that the level of advantage might be relatively slight; the real safeguards in biological containment were in precise and significant enfeeblement — the turning of the hosts into "basket cases".

A central contribution of the Advisory's Committee's public performance came from an impressive performance by lawyer Peter Barton Hutt, former legal counsel to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). He leaned toward pressures upon the biomedical community to develop the enfeebled strains and pointed out certain legal and substantive omissions in the document. But not even he or the NIH General Counsel had considered the possibility (which FAS observed to them) that the National Environmental Policy Act with its environmental impact statements probably covered the experiments — requiring an already designated procedure for balancing risks and benefits which was *not* the one being used, at least at the moment, by NIH. (In other words, DNA recombinant experiments would seem to be Federally funded projects with environmental implications, requiring Government wide circulation of impact statements.)

The biomedical scientists want, quite naturally, to get started again on research that could not be technically sweeter or more promising. Many feel, as Nobel Prize Winner David Baltimore testified: "I wish to support the proposed guidelines very strongly and urge that they be issued as official NIH policy as soon as possible." But there is some concern among them. Advisory Committee member Robert Sinsheimer, Chairman of the Division of Biology at Cal Tech, seems to have tried as hard as anyone to pierce the social and technological mists that hide the future. His writings show concern about the human ability to absorb the revolutions that this research will bring.

For science and public policy, this issue seems of transcendent importance — one that will confront both the public and the biomedical scientists for decades in ever shifting forms. FAS urges its members to send preliminary comments on this subject, with a view to FAS developing the options in a subsequent Public Interest Report. What is the significance of this research, its danger and promise? And, in the short and medium run, what are the central options which FAS should analyse and put before its membership? □

PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD TO BERNARD FELD

At the annual meeting, the FAS National Council provided its annual public service award to Professor Bernard Feld of MIT with a citation that began, "In arms control, all roads lead to Bernard Feld". Calling Feld the modern lynchpin of the arms control community, it noted his singular role in a number of different dimensions of that community.

The electioneering arm of the arms control community — Council for a Livable World — had been maintained after Leo Szilard's death in large part through devoted efforts by Feld.

The Pugwash movement, desperate for a Secretary-General that all could trust to replace its first and only Secretary-General, could find no other substitute and actually reorganized its secretariat to permit Feld to take

—Continued on page 8

Continued from page 7
and continue the job.

The educational arm of the arms control community, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, looked for some length for an editor-in-chief. It had finally to ask Bernard Feld to take on this duty as well.

In earlier years, Dr. Feld had played an active role in the political action arms of the arms control community, our own Federation of American Scientists.

Humorously calling this situation an "effective violation" of any plausible anti-trust policy, the citation noted that this overlap in roles sprang from "real necessity" since no one else had such a supply of trust and confidence of others in this community.

Calling Feld "invariably constructive, often creative, and always, above all, dedicated", the citation summarized his efforts by calling him, in arms control, "the indispensable man."

Scientists in Trouble for Reasons of Conscience

The Council approved the proposal that FAS cooperate freely and creatively with Amnesty International in helping political prisoners in any country, who happen to be scientists, in securing their freedom. Scientists not in prison but whose capacity to do science has been impaired as a direct result of human rights activities would be assisted as well. Special attention would be given to scientists whose political difficulties arose from activities closely analogous to the activities in which FAS itself engages in America.

This decision was taken with the view that FAS efforts in this field would have to grow gradually and experimentally under the supervision of the Executive Committee and Council.

The FAS Director asked the Council to adopt flexible, but suggestive, guidelines that would permit him to determine when cases of whistle-blowing should be permitted to consume significant amounts of his time. The guidelines adopted urged him to consider: (a) the importance of the legal issue; (b) the extent to which the whistle-blowing was not part of a feud, or in the narrow interests of the whistle-blower; (c) the extent to which the whistle-blower was not already being helped; (d) the extent to which there was a remedy; and (e) the extent to which the issue accorded with general FAS positions.

FAS PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT (202) 546-3300
307 Mass. Ave., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002
March 1976, Vol. 29, No. 3

- 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 _____
 ADDRESS _____
 CITY AND STATE _____ Zip _____
 PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE: _____

NOMINATIONS FOR APRIL '76 ELECTIONS

The FAS Nominating Committee has proposed the following candidates for the April election. For Chairman, Dr. George W. Rathjens of the MIT Political Science Department and Dr. Frank Von Hippel of the Princeton Center for Environmental Studies.

Dr. Rathjens is one of the Nation's most experienced systems analysts of military, civilian and arms control issues. Dr. Von Hippel is one of the foremost American authorities on the inter-relations between science and public policy. (The Vice Chairman's term has another year to run and hence no nominations were put forward for that position.)

The Nominating Committee put forward the required nine names for the six positions on the Council that will be open in June: Dr. Lipman Bers, President of the American Mathematical Society and a highly experienced defender of the rights of foreign scientists; Dr. Geoffrey Chew, Chairman of the Berkeley Department of Physics and former Chairman of a FAS Committee on rights of scientists; Dr. Myra Karstadt, biochemist and lawyer, specialist on environmental law; Mr. Laurence I. Moss, engineer, former President of the Sierra Club, specialist and worker on problems of the environment and high technology; Dr. Franklin A. Neva, FAS Sponsor and Chief of the Laboratory of Parasitic Disease at the National Institutes of Health; Dr. David Robinson, Vice President of the Carnegie Foundation, with long experience in the White House science office; Dr. William Shurcliff, physicist, organizer of the anti-SST grass roots effort and champion of home solar power; Dr. Alvin Weinberg, former Director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory and specialist on peaceful nuclear power; Dr. Robert Williams, physicist, of the Princeton Center for Environmental Studies and a leading author of the Ford Energy Study.

FAS members desirous of nominating other candidates by petition should send the signature of ten FAS members for a candidacy for Council Member and twenty for a candidacy for Chairman.

Second Class Postage

Paid at

Washington, D. C.

Return Postage
Guaranteed