

# F. A. S. PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT

Formerly the FAS Newsletter

THIS ISSUE:

Observing The  
World Federation of Scientific Workers

Vol. 29, No. 9

November, 1976

## AFTER THIRTY YEARS: WORLD FEDERATION OF SCIENTIFIC WORKERS REVISITED

As I was shown to my room, my French escort remarked casually that the Russians had not arrived because the British Home Office had not yet authorized their visas. A World Federation of Scientific Workers' (WFSW) conference without the Russians? In the West, the WFSW was considered a Soviet front organization. Later, it appeared that the visa problem had also afflicted the Bulgarians, the Indians, a Vietnamese, some North Koreans living in Japan, and the delegation from the German Democratic Republic. It looked like my effort to investigate the WFSW was going to be a complete bust.

The paths of the WFSW and the FAS had crossed thirty years ago, also in London, on July 20, 1946, when two FAS representatives had attended an organizing meeting of the WFSW. At that time, there was a British Association of Scientific Workers which, in conjunction with a French Association of Scientific Workers, wished to catalyze a WFSW.

An organizing meeting was chaired by Professor (later Lord) Blackett, who was the very respectable senior defense adviser to the British Government and later President of the Royal Society. The Russians were not even in the WFSW at that time, although consultations with them had taken place at the 220th anniversary of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

The notion was to bring together socially conscious scientists in a federation of organizations. These would be trade unions (of scientists, engineers, and technically trained persons) or scientific societies concerned with what we would now call problems of science and society.

### FAS Declined to Join

FAS declined to ratify the Constitution and Articles of Affiliation in 1946. The Cold War had intervened. In the socialist camp, WFSW had been ballyhooed as an organization of considerable weight and importance. But in the West it was almost totally unknown; where it was known, it was considered irrelevant.

In 1973, WFSW inquired, through an FAS member who happened to turn up at its Bulgarian meeting, whether FAS might reconsider its decision. My visit to the 30th anniversary meeting was to function as an invited observer to determine whether or not there was a basis for FAS to do so.

One question was of special interest. The World Federation — halfway between a trade union of scientists and a scientific society — had, as one might imagine, devoted a great deal of time to codifying the rights of scientists. Its Constitution referred to them. Its 1969 Declaration enumerated them. It had worked to persuade UNESCO to adopt Guidelines on the Scientific Worker.

What was it doing to implement freedoms that were increasingly under attack?

For the last ten months, FAS had spark-plugged efforts to defend Soviet dissident scientists and was working also on similar problems in many other countries. If even the Communist parties of Western Europe were complaining about human rights issues in the Soviet Union, could WFSW be far behind? More generally, was there, in the fragmentation of the socialist world, an opportunity arising for WFSW to provide a forum for discussing all scientific issues in a less blatantly biased way than I assumed was the WFSW method?

**Saturday Morning:** At breakfast, I met Dr. Corrado Majani, a nuclear chemist who represented several hundred scientific workers associated with Italian government research institutions. With surprise, I realized that WFSW had no Italian affiliate, that he was an observer. There was a Tunisian professor of engineering, also an observer. And a third observer, Mr. Barry Seager, was investigating the situation on behalf of the British Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers, which contained about 1½ million workers, of which 150,000 are white-collar. So far, it was all observers.

The meeting was opened by the British President of WFSW, Professor Eric Burhop. Observing that "owing to visa difficulties 20 or so of our delegates are unable to attend," he asked the parliamentary question: "Does WFSW have enough representatives to begin a General Assembly?"

It developed that many delegations had waited until the last minute to apply for visas. And this tardiness had been compounded by a change of Home Secretary that left low-level visa officials unsure of what the new Minister wanted. Professor Burhop summarized the situation with great precision and fairness. He felt that the Home Office officials, applying the letter of the law, were "working to rule" — a kind of legalized slowdown.

Some of the delegates whose visas were held up in-

### THIS ISSUE IS A TRIP REPORT

FAS Director Jeremy J. Stone attended the 30th anniversary meeting of the World Federation of Scientific Workers (September 16-25) as an observer in connection with a WFSW invitation to FAS to apply for membership. FAS had declined a similar invitation in 1946. This Report is devoted to Dr. Stone's trip report at the end of which members are asked to express their view on what attitude FAS should take toward WFSW. The Council will review member comments at its annual meeting in December.

cluded the President of the Academy of Sciences of the German Democratic Republic, the Nobel Prize-winning developer of the laser (with FAS's Charles Townes), and a Soviet Academician on the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet.

In order to get the Home Office moving, Professor Burhop was enlisting the help of Members of Parliament whose Labor Party affiliations arose through association with the British affiliate of WFSW. This affiliate was the ASTMS — Association of Scientific, Technical, & Managerial Staffs — a union of about 370,000 workers of which 20,000 are scientists. Thirty-five Members of Parliament, including, I was told, Harold Wilson, are so affiliated with this seventh largest British trade union.

Professor Burhop allowed that he would rule out of order any resolution that specifically attacked the British Government over this issue. Apparently WFSW never attacks its hosts, and also the responsibility for the problem was clouded. It was decided that the British representatives present would call on the Home Secretary first thing Monday morning.

### Mongolians Remembered an FAS Approach

At the coffee break, I approached the Mongolian delegation: Mr. Y. Ganbold, a tall and pleasant interpreter of both English and Russian, and Mrs. Indra, a biochemist. I described earlier FAS efforts in 1972 to get in touch with the Academy of Sciences of the People's Republic of Mongolia. To my surprise, Mrs. Indra said she had seen "in another institution than her own" the multi-volume bibliography on wheat which FAS had sent as a token of our interest in exchanging views. Speaking carefully and gently, she said that the conversation we were having could be considered a "first step" in opening relations between our organizations.

Subsequently, I introduced myself to the only representative present from the East German delegation, a historian, Professor G. Heidorn. He had apparently been a President of the International Congress on the History of the Press. I wondered what on earth would be an East German assessment of the history of the freedom of the press.

I also met two more observers: L. B. Balant, who represented several hundred scientists in the Swiss Association of Young Research Workers; and Dr. Daltaban, who represented the 5,000-member Turkish Student Federation in Great Britain. Later in the meeting, Dr. Daltaban denounced the Turkish Government for (a) 150 political murders in the last 1½ years with the murderers still at large and (b) mistreatment of thousands of political prisoners, including especially eminent translators and scientists. The March 12, 1971 intervention of Turkish generals, he said, had led to hundreds of scientists being arrested. One reactionary MP in parliament had shouted, "in order to stop anarchy, all of the professors and teaching staff must be killed." Scientists were being repressed, prevented from organizing, and forced to immigrate. I made a mental note to try to figure out upon my return what, indeed, was happening in Turkey.

The coffee break was extended because the French delegation was still caucusing. When the French were ready, they expressed concern that the visa problem might set a precedent that would restrict meetings of the WFSW to socialist countries. They proposed that the meeting con-



Professor Eric Burhop, F.R.S.  
President, WFSW

## FAS

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

### NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS (elected)

- Ruth S. Adams (Science Policy)
- David Baltimore (Microbiology)
- Lipman Bers (Mathematics)
- Geoffrey Chew (Physics)
- Rose E. Frisch (Human Biology)
- Morton H. Halperin (Pol. Science)
- Garrett Hardin (Human Ecology)
- Denis Hayes (Environ. Policy)
- William A. Higinbotham (Physics)
- John P. Holdren (Energy Policy)
- Daniel Koshland, Jr. (Biochem.)
- Raphael Littauer (Physics)
- Myra Karstadt (Law-Biochemistry)
- Francis E. Low (Physics)
- Victor Rabinowitch (World Devel.)
- Marc J. Roberts (Economics)
- Leonard Rodberg (Pol. Science)
- William Shureliff (Physics)
- George A. Silver (Medicine)
- Jeremy J. Stone (Mathematics)
- Frank Von Hippel (Physics)
- Myron E. Wegman (Medicine)
- Alvin Weinberg (Physics)
- Robert H. Williams (Energy Policy)

\*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.

tinue, but as a "symposium" rather than a "general assembly", until visa situations could be resolved.

Elaborate parliamentary discussion followed by West German, British, Dutch, Hungarian, and Japanese delegates. It was observed by Professor Burhop that the Chair was not certain that a quorum existed in any case. A French voice from the floor advised that it could be a "dangerous precedent" to investigate the question of a quorum. Burhop, who evidently has a sense of humor, advised the delegates that he hoped they would not think the conference was now itself "working to rule." (i.e., engaged in a legalistic slowdown).

The quorum question was indeed a dangerous precedent, because it forced WFSW to focus on the fact that many of its affiliates are really paper chapters. Investigation by Mr. John Dutton, Secretary of Correspondence, showed that 16 delegations were present and 24 were not represented. This was less than the 50% required for a quorum. However, of the 24 not represented: China and Albania had not been in contact for ten years; five Egyptian organizations had not been heard from for three years; a Chilean organization was believed no longer to exist, as was a German organization, whose address was unknown. Mr. Dutton announced that taking note of these considerations would reduce the unrepresented by "eight". (Laughter, as this would exactly produce the quorum). But a voice said accurately, "nine"!

#### **WFSW Faces Up to Organizational Problem**

Burhop announced that all this "does raise the difficult question we have long tried to avoid of how long to keep such organizations on the rolls." But "the time has come" to face up to it and he "hopes the Assembly will decide the question of pseudo-organizations." As an aside he remarked that when he expressed to a Japanese delegate a joking apprehension that losing the Chinese would force WFSW to eliminate the Chinese characters on its letterhead, he was reassured that they read the same way in Japanese and could thus be retained.

After more parliamentary discussion it was decided to prepare a statement by a committee of three representing the Socialist, Capitalist, and Third World. A voice from the floor suggests that Burhop is qualified to represent the capitalist world (laughter). Behind me, a British mutter: "One thing is clear, the British Home Office has bloody well disrupted this meeting."

A message is read from the now ailing and retiring General Secretary of WFSW (for 22 years), Pierre Biquard. A message of regrets is read from North Korean scientists which included a call for support by South Korean professors in opposing the "Park regime." A British mutter: "... go down in history as how not to run a conference."

At lunch time, I opened discussion with Dr. W. A. Wooster, a British crystallographer who had been WFSW's Treasurer from its inception until three years ago. He told me of the original meeting, of their surprise when Paul Doty and the Americans decided not to affiliate and gave no reason, of the 16 organizations present at the time, including representatives of Communist China (Pre People's Republic of China), and of the Russians coming in only in 1952.

The British affiliate, ASTMS, had grown out of a merger involving the founding British Association of Sci-



*Mr. John Dutton  
Secretary for Correspondence, WFSW*

entific Workers, he advised me. Asked about funding, Professor Wooster said that dues were generally 1½% of the subscriptions of members, but representatives of the Third World were often unable to pay their own way, even in travel to conferences. (Indians, for example, are permitted only three pounds when leaving India and must, therefore, be met at airports and assisted). The larger organizations sometimes help in air fares, accommodations, etc. In general, he felt WFSW was growing somewhat in strength at present.

I noted the FAS interest in raising the issue of freedom of expression for Eastern European and Soviet scientists. We discussed the case of Academician Ivan Malek, a most distinguished Czech scientist who had been Vice President of WFSW. Malek had refused to recant after the Dubchek thaw, had been denied the right to enter his own institution and laboratory, and became a non-person with all references to his scientific work deleted. WFSW had been "forced to accept" the fact that it would never see Malek again. Apparently no formal protest or resolution resulted to protect even one of its own. To WFSW it appeared that to protest was to risk losing its Czech affiliate, and this it would not do.

**Saturday Afternoon:** Burhop read his Presidential address. This address turns out — I realize with increasing regret — to sound as if it were drafted in Moscow. (I later learn that it was indeed cleared with certain WFSW vice presidents, one of whom is Soviet, to ensure, among other things, that certain concrete proposals made in it were acceptable to their delegations).

It contains certain standard Soviet chestnuts which can only be described as corny:

"Unfortunately in many Western Countries, the text of the Final Act [of the Helsinki Agreement] has not been widely disseminated. Only 4500 copies of the complete text have been distributed in the United Kingdom and to my knowledge, no newspaper printed it in full. It is a ridiculous situation when almost the only way to get a copy of the complete text is to buy a copy of the English edition of *Moscow-News!*"

(This sort of thing reads great in the Soviet Union where unwary citizens think it means suppression of Helsinki freedoms which, in fact, exist here but not there. It has appeared in every Soviet defense of its Helsinki position.) The speech is also full of double standards; e.g., "The war budget of the United States is the largest of

all time." — no mention of the Soviet military budget, which is certainly also its largest and quite possibly larger than ours. And while the Americans are bailing out the Soviet system with grain sales, it observed: "A grave economic crisis, characterized by the twin evils of inflation and unemployment, afflicts the capitalist world."

The speech also contained a literally anti-American statement apropos U.S. use of agent orange in Vietnam:

"What can we say of the *people* who devised a method of warfare based on the use of substances like this?" (Emphasis added.)

Professor Burhop is exercised about a law in West Germany that denies employment to over one thousand persons, including distinguished academics, for their political views. But, of course, no mention is made of the extraordinarily greater suppression of political expression in the entire Eastern bloc.

The only glint of sunlight appearing through these clouds appeared when Burhop turned to the problem of victimization of scientists. There was "no question" of what to do about such cases as occurred in Chile, Uruguay, and Argentina, involving murder and physical torture — the widest possible publicity should be given. There was, however, another class of cases where "the appropriateness of such action is less clear." Often these complaints involved the right to travel abroad and the right to emigrate. Burhop denied the "absolute applicability" of the right to emigrate as a principle that "sanctifies the brain drain." He did not, I noted, go on to say that scientists should not be denied useful work if denied the right to emigrate. (Questioned about this later, he said that it would have strengthened the speech to have done so).

#### Professor Burhop Proposed A Committee

He went on to charge that "large sums of money" and the resources of the mass media are used to orchestrate a strident campaign "far more concerned with achieving a certain political aim than in helping the plight of individual scientists." But in a turnabout, he argued that "for all these reasons", WFSW should devise a method for handling such cases. Reading out the UNESCO guidelines on the defense of the scientific worker, he proposed that WFSW construct a subcommittee of its Standing Committee on Social and Economic Problems.

"This Sub-Committee, in cooperation with our affiliated organizations would study the extent to which the instrument is being implemented in different countries. It could organize meetings and small symposia on these questions in various countries. Cases of alleged victimization of scientists which are referred to us, and where the action to be taken is not clear, will be referred to this subcommittee which will be asked, after consultation with an appropriate affiliated organization, to make recommendations of action to the Executive Council on the basis of the principles set out in the UNESCO Instrument."

(Later, I asked Burhop why he had settled on the UNESCO guidelines, since the WFSW's own Declaration of the Rights of Scientific Workers is much more explicit. He understands very well that this is so but felt that governments, including the Russians, had accepted the UNESCO guidelines, making them a better base for this committee).

At the break for coffee, I try to penetrate the morass of French scientific politics. Evidently LeGuen, the Chair-

man of the Socio-Economic Committee, represents the engineers (Union Generale des Ingenieurs, Cadres et Techniciens-UGICT); the higher teachers (Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Superior-SNESUP) are represented by Allan Roux; and the researchers (Syndicat National des Chercheurs Scientifiques de France-SNCSF) by Mme. Jeannine Rogalski. I make a mental note to attempt a voyage of discovery to France without which full understanding is obviously going to be impossible.\*

If Professor Burhop's speech unveiled an immense double standard, the new Secretary-General's speech seemed to attack the fundamental notions of scientific freedom! It boggled my mind. Scribbling rapidly as the words came through translation from the French, I hear him say:

"What has been the result of the 'free-movement of men and ideas' between Chile and the U.S.A., if not the economic ravage of Chile and the institution of a fascist regime? What has been the result in the old Europe, if not the domination by multinational firms (of which 70% are of American origin)?"

In a break, I advised a French-English translator that Dr. LeGay had made a "pretty hard-line speech" and asked if I could get a translation. She translated it within a day and a half, but I then met a number of difficulties getting a copy. The Xerox was said to be broken during a period when my Japanese colleague seemed to have no problems copying items that he wanted me to have from his speech. Perhaps LeGay wanted to check the translation — or to preclude an attack from me. By the end of the meeting I received it. I now saw that his statement began with: "We are also in favor of an open world . . . But we are at the same time perfectly aware that the stages of this opening are related to a reduction of internal contradictions . . ."

It was French relativism put in the service of qualifying the principles which were deeply imbedded not only in FAS thinking but also in the pronouncements of WFSW's Constitution and 1969 Declaration of Rights of Scientific Workers.

#### Socialist Bias Evident

Later, examining an article of LeGay's in the WFSW publication, *Scientific World*, I found this kind of thing: "Socialist societies have the means whereby they can find positive answers to such problems; in capitalist societies they lead to ecological crises which are, in themselves, an aspect of the general crisis of capitalism."

LeGay does not speak English but, I was told, reads it. I was not alone in asking for a text of LeGay's speech; the General Secretary of the Association of Scientists in Rumania, Professor C. Pensecu, did also. The Rumanians seem to play a vigilant and independent role.

A resolution on the visa problem was discussed. Although it had been decided that the visa problem was a combination of circumstances, the draft resolution hinted strongly that the British were at fault and that its "actions" had reflected badly on the Helsinki agreement.

\*FAS asked the U.S. Labor Department its opinion of the political character of these unions and information it supplied suggests that they are dominated by French communists. SNESUP is an affiliate of the non-communist Federation of National Education (FEN) but is believed to have come under communist control in 1968. SNCSF is also part of FEN but believed to have come under communist control in 1970. UGICT is an affiliate of the communist controlled Confederation General du Travail (CGT).

The Dutch representative, Dr. J. Moll, proposed — deftly I thought — that the word “actions” be replaced by “conditions which prevented the visas.” This was promptly accepted by Burhop.

Impressed by Dr. Moll’s alertness and skill, I invited him to dinner. The Dutch left the World Federation in about 1951 and became observers, because of its overly left-wing nature. Subsequently, in 1961, they decided to join again. They were still ambivalent. Professor Moll is president of the affiliate, the Dutch Association of Scientific Workers (VWO). His Secretary for International Affairs had supplied an excellent report criticizing WFSW papers for superficial analysis and a lack of specificity.

Dr. Moll confirmed that WFSW tended to look for unanimous documents. The preliminary conferences had emasculated the preparatory documents. There were no affiliates or observers from Denmark, Sweden, or Norway.

After dinner in the bar, I learned that the English version of WFSW’s publication “Scientific World” was prepared in England, the Russian version printed in Moscow, the German edition in the German Democratic Republic, the French version in Romania, and Bulgaria was undertaking the duties of preparing an Esperanto version! The Constitution, which I was then studying, gave the smallest nations five votes and largest nations only eight. Individuals could join the Federation, if they were from nations without affiliates, as Corresponding Members. In this case, they could speak at the meetings but could not vote.

**Sunday Morning:** I joined the Hungarian delegate, Professor Lengyel, at breakfast. He represented a Federation of Scientific and Technical Societies in Hungary that included 31 organizations and represented 150,000 scientists. Walking to the meeting, I made another abortive attempt to understand whom the French unions represented. M. Roux made a valiant effort, punctuated by observations that such-and-such was “completely clear.” He said that his union, SNESUP, was one of the first to call for the release of Leonid Pluysch. (Pluysch, the most celebrated of the political dissidents incarcerated in Soviet psychiatric institutions, was later championed by the French Communist Party and released. FAS also assisted in this case, perhaps decisively; see our FAS Report of March, 1976).

At the meeting, the Indian delegate, Dr. Gupta, representing the Association of Scientific Workers of India, observed to the General Assembly:

“Some of us think there is no difference between biological research into war and DNA research into cancer. Only time will tell whether it will be misused.”

He called “tirage” an American doctrine (overlooking the fact that the word and concept are certainly French, and that very few Americans have supported this notion). He was inclined to needle the socialist countries also and suggested there is “alienation” among socialist scientists. He urged socialist delegates to describe their problems.

In response, a Romanian delegate said he would be “frank”; they did have problems. He seemed to have in mind that they were not developing fast enough. A Polish delegate said that the reform of universities to make them “public service institutions” was such a problem, as was coping with two million graduates by 1990.

The French intervened to defend fast breeder nuclear

### AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN WFSW THUS FAR

WFSW records show that Linus Pauling was Vice President of WFSW in 1953 and that a biologist, T. Rosebury, was on its Executive Committee.

WFSW has claimed an American Affiliate since the early fifties called the American Association of Scientific Workers. WFSW rolls suggest that this organization has had, since that time continuously, 250 members. At one time it evidently had 1200 members and 12 chapters. It started before World War II and suffered large losses of membership when the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed before Germany attacked Russia. It has, however, had no publication for at least five years, collects no dues from members and has no elections. Its Secretary General is a veterinarian, R. J. Rutman, in Philadelphia. This affiliate has no representation on the WFSW Executive Council and was not represented at the London General Assembly. Its activities seem limited to circulating the WFSW publication to a list of about 100 persons. □

reactors, which they are building. The delegate observed that one could not:

“... discuss safety apart from the social and political context in which fast breeders are built.”

Evidently, fast breeders were safe enough for the French but not, I presumed, for our country. The multinationals were charged with being behind the widespread concern over fast breeders because it was “in their interest” to spread this misapprehension. The speaker concluded that “France must undergo profound political change.”

Professor Burhop intervened from the floor to say that he agreed “99.9%” with the French view but wanted to correct a technical point — the assertion that there was no difference between fast-breeders and light-water reactors. His precise summary of the differences — while elementary enough in any reasonable conference — shone out here as a model of clarity and common sense. He considered it imprudent to proceed with them until certain questions were resolved; did not preclude the possibility that an accident could cause a nuclear explosion; wondered if they were consistent with a democratic society; and thought them very bad with regard to problems of terrorism. To general amusement, he was chided in friendly fashion for having said he agreed 99.9% and then so clearly opposed the French point of view.

The Egyptian delegate, Dr. Abouzeid, blew everyone’s mind by rising to say that one “must distinguish between the criminal and the terrorist,” that the “ends justify the means,” and that the use of nuclear weapons by terrorists has to be expected. (A Dutch delegate, quoting an aphorism that “he who keeps silent agrees” later demurred.) As I was walking back with Dr. Abouzeid, she said she had been misunderstood. She was not advocating nuclear terrorism but only predicting it. In fact, her explanations appeared to confirm that her position fell between advocating and predicting and was, rather, one of justifying.

In the coffee break, the Finnish delegate, Dr. Risto Erasaari, a sociologist representing the Association for Research Policies with 1,000 members, said he had joined because there was no other international federation to join.



*Dr. Joseph Needham  
Master, Caius College*

When the meeting resumed, a gentle, aged doctor from Madagascar rose to appeal for help in extending life expectancy in the Third World. He read his statement in English that had been prepared, he said with quiet pride, by his daughter, who had studied earlier in London and who had insisted that he not give his statement in his native French.

#### **Japan Scientists Association Growing Rapidly**

Professor S. Kawasaki of Japan rose to inform the Assembly that his organization had three principles: Independence — scientists should not suffer political interference; Democracy — science should be managed democratically by qualified scientists; and Openness — research should be open. His speech criticized, in passing, the American JASON group and the threats of first use in Korea.

Later, at lunch, he told me he represented the Japan Scientists' Association (JSA) which, after only about seven years, has grown to 10,000 members. It is an organization of very considerable power, since fully one-third of the 120 scientists in the Japanese National Science Council support the program of JSA. JSA has socialists, communists, and some liberals. Their ratio of natural scientists to other scientists is 6:4. They come to the meetings for information and because there is no other channel.

JSA's biggest concern about WFSW is that it seems to them to be a basically a "European" Federation. While their problems are more like those of the developed world than those of the underdeveloped, they do not want to become isolated and want contact with Asian countries. They have no hesitation about criticizing Soviet practices (the left wing in Japan is not pro-Soviet). In fact, to allay concern about their identification with the left-wing WFSW, they often refer to the consultative status, A, which WFSW received from the UN as an adviser to ECOSOC. Professor Kawasaki, who is Deputy Secretary General of JSA, said that, being influential, JSA had to be prudent and responsible.

The Assembly set up working groups of about three persons each to prepare documents on disarmament, socio-economic issues, and science policy. These were later to be discussed and amended on the floor. But the WFSW treasurer, French geographer M. Jaglé, became concerned at the prospect that items might be put in the documents which had not been in the preparatory papers. He intervened to say that if the final documents went much beyond the preparatory ones, the Executive Committee

would feel "they were incapable" and would "have doubts about their effectiveness." After all, working groups set up a year ago "had the responsibility of preparing this General Assembly." Perhaps questions could be asked about one or another point, but the document should not go beyond that. This seemed so nervous and authoritarian that I could not help laughing out loud and others seemed amused as well.

At lunch, Mr. Barry Seager explained the potential interest of his union in WFSW. It was, he felt, a question of "effectiveness," dollars and cents. His group would affiliate only if WFSW seemed to be doing something. I asked what on earth they could be considered to be doing which would be helpful to a British trade union. He said, for example, they were opposing proliferation and this was important to everyone. He was amused at my being subjected to so much left-wing rhetoric and thought it very useful for me to realize how far to the left of U.S. politics was the politics of Great Britain, let alone WFSW!

**Sunday Afternoon:** Dr. Wooster, WFSW's ex-treasurer, apparently decided to try to balance the discussion. He referred to the "events of 1968 in Central Europe" and to the statements of Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn as having a profound effect in creating fear of the Eastern bloc. He said that, while these statements might not be "entirely correct," they were certainly "partly correct." He went on to say that, the British were concerned about personal liberty and feared countries in which it was absent. Moreover, the treatment of mutinationals so far has been one-sided; they had good aspects also. They should be guided, and WFSW could try to create a code of conduct for them.

Later, with dignity, the Mongolian interpreter rose to say that the Mongolians did not think that Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn represented the real situation.

The Romanians spoke up for the right to use nuclear weapons for peaceful purposes; for nuclear free zones; for withdrawal of troops; and all in the context of general and complete disarmament. Some one from Brazil, a Corresponding Member of WFSW, denounced torture there and the prejudice shown scientists in Brazil who had studied in socialist countries.

At the break, I was pleased to meet a pleasant representative of the trade association of those research personnel who work for the Spanish National Research Council. Dr. J. M. Orza represented about 1,000 such persons. Somehow he had made contact with WFSW during the final period of Franco. He acknowledged that, for most in Spain, WFSW was too progressive.

Also at the break, I learned the most dramatic — perhaps the only — new scientific fact of the week. An observer from the Council of International Organizations of Medical Sciences advised me that leprosy has been found in the wild armadillo on the east bank of the Mississippi. A Polish delegate discussed certain Polish problems, during which he referred to the "Soviet scientist" Leontieff — in fact, W. Leontieff is one of our sponsors, an American, not a Soviet scientist. A professor from Mexico spoke about the terrible repression underway in his native Uruguay. In the cities, 3% of the population are in the security apparatus. Uruguay has the largest percentage of political prisoners in the world. (FAS had already begun expressing concern about this, but it was useful for me to hear this).

A national council member of the British Society for

Social Responsibility, Mr. Crowl, spoke as secretary of the WFSW Science Policy Commission. (His participation in this way was an anomaly, since he is neither a corresponding member nor the delegate of an affiliate). He urged that no nuclear reactors be sold anywhere until global inequalities are resolved through a new International Economic Order.

**Sunday Evening:** Entering the subway, I had a chance to chat briefly with the Indian, Dr. Gupta. He urged FAS to affiliate and wanted the Chinese to come back also. He had been present in 1965 at the meeting just before the Cultural Revolution. The Chinese had behaved in such a way as to disrupt meetings. He had, he said, used his knowledge of parliamentary methods to "isolate" them. He seemed to feel that he had personally "thrown them out."

We parted at the subway and I began a search for 16 Oxfield Road. An FAS member living in London was celebrating the birth of a son with a ceremony known as the "Redemption of the First Born." Walking for 30 minutes toward what turned out to be the wrong Oxfield Road (there are 14 of them in London, I later learned), I meditated upon the possibilities of redemption of WFSW. It was in very bad repair. But FAS had been in disarray in 1970 also and had survived and been rejuvenated. Could an American presence in WFSW do anything to bring in others, to balance the rhetoric? I was at this time intrigued with the possibilities. Finding my way belatedly, I missed the ceremony, but not by too much.

**Monday Morning:** By next morning I was more pessimistic. An American from a highly obscure college had shown up — he was the only American besides myself — and was criticizing American politics without any reference to those of anyone else. He was on his way to participate in the ceremonies kicking off the new Stockholm Appeal. It was all distasteful.

The British representative of ASTM rose to say that ASTM could support the documents being submitted to the Conference, and that he thought the entire British Trade Union could also. The working class was struggling for a reorganization of society. Scientists were in a privileged position because the ruling sectors needed scientists. But changes were beginning to appear that were bringing the scientists closer to the working class. I felt that his claims that the British Trade Union could be in line with the positions being worked up was said defensively, but I could not be sure of this.

The Assembly broke into three working groups, and I decided to attend the group on disarmament, chaired by Dr. Moll. There was no substance there either. I was urged to speak but declined on the grounds that I was an observer and not authorized to do so by my organization — only to investigate.

The afternoon being taken up with working sessions to which I was not privy, and the evening being dedicated to a reception for heads of delegations only, I went off to have a late lunch with a British friend.

**Tuesday Morning:** While talking to the Japanese delegate at breakfast, I saw a Vietnamese approach and ask my colleague how to enter and pass through the breakfast line. They were having English problems and I intervened. Explaining in a mixture of English and broken French, I urged him to come and sit with us after passing through the line. It was Professor Tran Tri, President of

## HOW WFSW OPERATES CONSTITUTIONALLY

Basic policy is decided by a General Assembly that meets every three years. Nations may send three delegates and receive from five to eight votes depending upon the size of affiliates — which votes are divided up among the nation's affiliates if there are more than one.

An Executive Council meets each year and contains a representative from most affiliates, so that it contains perhaps 30 persons.

A Bureau meets between Executive Committee meetings and contains the elected officers: President; five Vice Presidents; Treasurer; Chairman and Vice Chairman of Executive Council; Heads of Regional Centres; Chairman of the Editorial Board and Chairman of the Socio-Economic Committee, the Science Policy Committee and the Disarmament Committee.

Between such meetings affairs are largely in the hands of the President, Secretary General and Treasurer.

The organization seeks to act by consensus although nothing in the Constitution requires it to do so. In practice it does not make public statements concerning a nation's policy unless the affiliate of that nation supports the policy. Here again the Constitution does not so require, but such actions are viewed as likely simply to drive the affiliate in question out.

Membership, according to the Constitution, is open to any body of scientific workers that "supports the objectives and abides by the Constitution" of WFSW. In countries without affiliates, individuals may be accepted as "Corresponding Members" if nominated by the Executive Council and approved by the General Assembly. Corresponding Members are part of the General Assembly and may speak at it but not vote.

An organization like FAS could expect to have a member on the Executive Council, would probably be asked to nominate an American Vice President, and in such case, would be entitled to send two people to Bureau and Executive Council Meetings. Three delegates (and the Vice President) could attend General Assembly meetings. □

the Association for the Advancement of Science and Technology of Vietnam. In answer to my question, he said that a Vietnamese professor of mathematics might attend the October International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) meeting in Washington.

After breakfast, I chatted in French with Academician Bratanov, President of the Association of Scientific Workers in Bulgaria. He was startled to hear that I had lectured on disarmament in Moscow and seemed to grow more friendly. Later, he declined to respond to a "bonjour" but, still later, at the end, was quite friendly. It seemed that, at this stage, a number of delegates were uncertain about "the American" — one who had, after all, staged a boycott of their WFSW Moscow meetings. (See FAS Report Sept. 1975).

This was the day I had set aside to travel to Cambridge to meet with Fellows of the Royal Society who had shown

sympathy with FAS's concern for foreign colleagues. Leaving a British friend to take careful notes of the proceedings, I caught a 9:30 a.m. train. At different meetings in Cambridge, I met with such distinguished British scientists as the Nobel Laureates Max Perutz (Chairman of the Medical Research Council) and Frederick Sanger, and with the chairman of the Department of Theoretical Physics, George Batchelor.

I later dined in great elegance as the guest of the Master of Caius College, Joseph Needham. Dr. Needham gave up biochemistry thirty-five years ago to become the world's greatest authority on science in Chinese antiquity, upon which he has already turned out seven famous volumes. About to retire as the 38th Master of the 640-year old college he was busy moving his enormous and unique Asian library. We discussed China and WFSW.

On return, I discovered from the notes prepared on the day before that the Russians had arrived, that the symposium had been turned (back) into a General Assembly, and that, for the first time, the ICSU had sent a message recognizing the WFSW General Assembly.

Votes had been apportioned by the credentials committee (the USSR, the U.K., France, and Hungary had 8; Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, and Poland had 7; Japan, Netherlands, Romania, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, and the FRG had 6; and the rest had 5). It all seemed somewhat irrelevant since WFSW rarely seems to take votes and, when it does, it quickly relents to arrange some kind of compromise to protect the minority. Nevertheless, the Romanians were urging a change in the constitution to provide for greater equality in voting rights.

A small Mexican group of 28 had been accepted. The Portuguese Corresponding Member had conceded that his group was no longer active. The Russians had brought written contributions to the working sessions set up in their absence. The Secretary General had admitted, in a fit of organizational self-criticism, that WFSW had "weak" representation in America. Professor Burhop had noted that WFSW was not fully exploiting its UN consultative status. The International Students' Union had refused to send a representative. Moscow television was planning to televise the proceedings tomorrow.

#### **FAS Seemed to Be Snubbed**

At breakfast, Mr. Dutton advised me, in response to my query, that I might most enjoy observing the "future activities" Commission. Arriving early, I found the Vietnamese delegate, the Dutch delegate, the head of the Japanese delegation, the Chairman of the Commission (Dr. LeGay) and some Russians. Ten minutes later, when Dr. LeGay opened the meeting, I was startled to hear him intone expressionlessly that observers would not be permitted. I asked for a confirmatory translation, and a Russian interpreter seemed to smirk when commenting: "What does it matter? There are no observers here."

Mr. Dutton, who was passing by, admitted that he had misinformed me about the openness of the meeting; he probably thought nobody would notice or care. What startled me most was that it seemed simply a rude and pointless show of force by LeGay. The results of the meeting were to be announced later anyway. LeGay had not tried to warn me that the meeting was to be closed. He had earlier snubbed a "bonjour," and I now decided that he was decidedly uneager for an American presence in WFSW. It was the only real contretemps of the meeting.

Burhop, lunching with me, observed that Secretary General LeGay had no "executive power." No one seemed to know much about LeGay. I got the impression that he was the hand-picked successor of the former Secretary General, Biquard, and that — the WFSW President, being English — the French had simply filled the seat of the Secretary Generalship. It was, Burhop advised me, hard to find a person willing to undertake the Secretary General's duties.

Burhop is strongly and unequivocally interested in having us affiliate or associate in some other fashion. Our talk confirmed my earlier impressions of him through correspondence, short meetings, and inquiries to people who know him well. He is a man of integrity, stamina, considerable candor, and well-developed diplomatic and parliamentary skills. A very respectable physicist, he is a Fellow of the Royal Society. An Australian by birth, he writes and speaks well, in the British fashion, with precision and care. In his politics, he is on the extreme left of the British socialist party, what they call an "international" socialist rather than a national one; viz., one devoted to international solidarity among communist and socialist nations, not simply to domestic socialist practices.

These views and his devotion to maintaining WFSW (and the communication between scientists it represents) make him entirely willing to overlook what he knows very well is often a double standard of pronouncement and activity in which the socialist world belabors the non-socialist world.

In his view, much of this double standard arises from the absence of delegations like ours. Recognizing that our presence would "infinitely" complicate his duties, he nevertheless sets his priorities on a more lively and universal WFSW. Calling the FAS refusal to affiliate in 1946 "painful" but "understandable," he felt it had handicapped WFSW "right from the start," and he considered our upcoming decision to be "extremely important" for WFSW.

It seems that WFSW interest in having the Americans affiliate has been redoubled by a strong Soviet interest in having the Chinese return. The Chinese, I had earlier learned, seem to have advised WFSW that they are not planning to participate in organizations dominated by the Soviets without American participation. I observed that some of our officials would surely be more inclined to participate if the Chinese were there. A three-cornered struggle would be easier for us than a minority voice in a bilateral exchange.

**Wednesday Afternoon:** By Wednesday afternoon, either my mind was beginning to flag or the discussion was intensely boring. I left at 3:00 to meet with the executive secretary of the Royal Society, Sir David Martin. We

#### **ISRAELI EMBASSY RESPONDS**

An Embassy Press Officer advised FAS, after the publication date of the October Report that the quotation attributed to Yerucham Amitai could not be confirmed or denied since Mr. Amitai had died in an automobile crash. The quotation concerning catalytic war did not, however, reflect in any way the policies of the State of Israel and Mr. Amitai, though a Colonel in the Israeli Air Force, was never at any time its Deputy Commander.





Lord Todd of Trumpington  
President, Royal Society

had met first in Peking in 1972. Sir David heard me out politely for more than two hours on the various activities going on in America in defense of the rights of foreign colleagues. It is evident that the new president of the Royal Society, Lord Todd, is more sympathetic to these concerns than the past president, Sir Alan Hodgkin. A change in foreign secretaries is impending also. And the forthcoming speech of Lord Todd on November 30 seems important. Meanwhile, "the Royal" seems to have decided not to adopt the case of individuals in a corporate fashion. I advanced a number of methods by which the Royal Society could be effective within those constraints. Securing a copy of the 1663 charter from Sir David, I later found in it what I was seeking:

"In order therefore that . . . the whole world of letters may always recognize us not only as the Defender of the Faith, but also as the universal lover and patron of every kind of truth . . ."

Since "patron" means not only "supporter" but "defender," the Charter does justify and demand that the Royal Society act in such a way as to be seen on a worldwide basis as a defender of the international scientific community.

In the evening, WFSW sponsored a lecture by Nobel Laureate M. H. F. Wilkins, who is also the figurehead president of the British Society for Social Responsibility. Before it started, the International Union of Teachers' Unions (of which the Soviet WFSW affiliate is a member) presented Burhop with a medal.

#### Who Started Pugwash?

Burhop's acceptance address noted, as seems to be a standard WFSW refrain, the WFSW role in establishing Pugwash. This is evidently a standing bone of contention between Pugwash's long-time General Secretary, the now-retired Prof. J. Roblat, and Eric Burhop. Pugwash is and has always been very nervous about any link to WFSW, or to any other organization for that matter.

An American FAS member had turned up by this time, and he leaned over and said: "Pugwash is the House of Lords; WFSW is the House of Commons."

Wilkins speech was hard to follow. He observed that the "dogma that science can explain everything" had replaced religion. Asked whether science was not the "anti-thesis of dogma", he agreed but said that, nevertheless, the study of it produced dogma. I wished that I could have read the speech. The evening was like a college seminar in the philosophy of abstract socialist idealism.

The President of ASTMS, the British affiliate, presided.

That evening, in the bar, I found myself speaking to the president of the British National Union of Students, whose uninformed and extreme pro-socialist and anti-American ideas jolted me. When I expressed my surprise later to Mr. Seager, he laughed jovially and said, "And he's a moderate." He was still enjoying what he conceived to be my education. Later the Yugoslav delegate, on hearing of my fears for Yugoslavia after the passing of Tito, reassured me. He was very friendly.

**Thursday breakfast:** I joined Professor Tri of Vietnam for breakfast and conversed in my broken French; a Soviet English interpreter who had sat down nearby turned out subsequently to be fluent also in French. For the Vietnamese's sake, I wished the Chinese were also in WFSW.

In the meeting, the Romanian wanted to raise the issue of foreign bases; this issue, traditionally one of opposition to American bases, was certainly, in this case, an effort to restrain the Russians. Professor Burhop, who was trying to avoid the more clearly political and relatively non-scientific issues, discouraged raising the matter on the floor without preparation, although he observed that if it came recommended by the disarmament committee, there would be no objection to adopting it.

The Dutch delegate sought to revise a document in ways which, for reasons of time, had not been circulated to the delegates. After this was decisively opposed on grounds that delegates had not reviewed the changes, Burhop suggested that the Dutch prepare a few paragraphs to insert in *Scientific World*, at the end of the document in question. The offer seemed quite generous. The treasurer, M. Jaglé, intervened to say that he hoped this would "not become a practice." Burhop, with his usual aplomb, said he agreed that it should not become a practice but would not like to say that it would never happen again. He quoted, for the second time, from St. Augustine as his guiding view of how WFSW should function:

"In things essential, unity, in things doubtful, liberty, in all things, charity."

#### FAS A Key to WFSW Rejuvenation?

In the corridors, Croll strongly urged our participation in WFSW, saying that his group, and other groups that were more modern in concept, would come to meetings if we did but probably not otherwise. He considered FAS affiliation to be the key to WFSW rejuvenation.

At lunch, I teased the Mongolian, Mr. Ganbold, asking if he noticed that the Italian delegate was afraid of him because of the unfortunate experience Rome had had with Atilla the Hun. He answered quite seriously, doubting that such a phenomenon could exist. I must stop applying my sense of humor to far-off corners of the world.

I had decided that, although it could easily be misconstrued, I should approach the most senior member of the Russian delegation and solicit his opinion on FAS participation in WFSW. Academician I. I. Artobolevsky turned out to be a professor of the late Academician M. Millionshikov, former Vice President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences; Millionshikov was well known to many American disarmament specialists and well liked.

After a joke and some reminiscences, I asked Academician Artobolevsky his view, warning him that FAS was not "socialist", and that if we participated, we would raise a number of difficult questions about the treatment

of scientists by the Russians. He said it was "difficult to discuss scientific problems without the American scientists and their great contribution to world science." Our political views "should not be an obstacle" — Bernal [WFSW's guiding philosopher of science] had said that WFSW should be a broad organization of different views and should permit the competition of ideas. From his point of view, it would be best if FAS affiliated, but in any case, perhaps some other kind of association would be possible, perhaps just writing an article for *Scientific World* on, of course, some "non-political" subject.

As for criticizing the "Russians," they did not believe in criticizing "nationalities" but only general phenomena, such as "multinational corporations," and they would not approach the problem from the point of view of "race." He also suggested that issues involving laws and regulations would be inappropriate. I said "and traditions?" and he immediately agreed, like a prompted student.

I said we agreed with the WFSW point of view that communists should be allowed to teach in West Germany but thought, similarly, that those criticizing socialism should be allowed to teach in the Soviet Union. In West Germany, I observed, it was "traditional" to mistreat communists. There were, he quickly rejoined, "good" traditions and "bad" traditions. I observed wryly that, if FAS participated in WFSW, this conversation might go on "forever." He said, "No, as scientists, our views would eventually converge." He ended with the absolutely standard Soviet cliché, "After all, I am an optimist." He handed me a token gift, some Soviet cigarettes, and, upon leaving the conference next day, said farewell in friendly fashion. (Later Professor Burhop showed surprise on hearing how friendly this reception had been; remembering our boycott of the Moscow meeting, he had expected more Soviet reticence.)

The meeting was essentially over. The next morning at breakfast the treasurer, M. Jaglé, rushed up, asking if I was the "General Secretary" of my organization, and I allowed as how I was. With barely suppressed eagerness, he asked what I had thought of the meeting. I said it was hard to explain in French, but he shifted his feet impatiently and said "well then in English." I promised him our newsletter and gave him a brochure.

Two Russians standing nearby asked for one also and, on impulse, I pulled from my pocket our March Report describing FAS ideas for defending foreign colleagues and offered it to one of them. Hearing me describe it as critical of the Soviet Union, he dropped his hands. I quickly explained that both the Soviet Government and his superior in Moscow had copies but he continued to decline. The interpreter, more mature and experienced, accepted not only the document but my sincere explanation of our point of view and motivation; he even had the resilience afterwards to advise me on a problem of extending my stay a day in London.

This exchange seemed to punctuate the meeting. As I swung past a busload of delegates, I found myself whistling. I must have been relieved.

#### Some Observations and Conclusions

My own feelings are mixed. In the first place, this meeting makes it clear that there is virtually nothing whatsoever that the scientists of the world, convened in this fashion, can agree upon. U.S.-Soviet disarmament nego-

tiations are the main consensual position in WFSW, and the Chinese would oppose them were they to rejoin. The French support the fast-breeder reactor, and the Egyptian talks sympathetically of nuclear terrorism. Perhaps all delegations would support documents declaring the rights of scientists. But since most governments in the world are far from free, it is an act of clear hypocrisy — by most of the socialist world and most of the developing world — to suggest that scientists are being accorded rights of free expression much less the right to meaningful unions.

On the other hand, there ought to be places where scientists can convene to express different views. While Pugwash provides a framework for some individuals, WFSW provides a framework for organizations, and this has some advantages. Pugwash, which operates largely without rules and has no Constitution, does not lend itself to expressions of view that antagonize the socialist or developing world. In effect, the socialist world can force out whomever it does not like. WFSW is a much more stable forum for the confrontation of ideas, because affiliates have a seat that cannot easily be denied. Up until now, however, no one has sought to use this constitutional framework on behalf of Western ideas and points of view.

#### What Might Happen If We Spoke?

Were FAS to be effective in expressing its point of view on such questions as freedom of expression for foreign colleagues in the Eastern camp, it could, however, easily be ostracized. Indeed, the smaller communist nations (Vietnam, Mongolia, etc.) might become afraid of dealing with us there, lest they offend Moscow. And, much as Moynihan was upended by the British Ambassador's suggestion that his style was not productive, so also could friendly delegations move to discourage FAS from even the style of courteous but straight discussion to which we aspire.

Certainly none of our sentiments are likely to be carried in the journal *Scientific World*. Published in Russian, and widely circulated, any views which would be considered "offensive" in the Soviet Union would simply never see the light of day. It is important to understand that, while we may think of WFSW activities and pronouncements as virtually irrelevant to Western political life, they are considered highly important in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, which have given them much publicity for decades. There, the comments of delegates, and the WFSW activities, are closely reviewed by the organizations at issue and assorted vigilant ideologues.

In short, FAS views would probably be tolerated at the WFSW conferences and would, in any case, be hard to suppress. They would reach various new circles through the delegates but not otherwise. One quite likely result, however, would be some toning down of anti-Western rhetoric by WFSW officials, and no important resolutions attacking U.S. policy would be adopted unless we agreed. There would be extreme reluctance to our leaving WFSW; President Burhop would protect our position with even more vigor than he protects the interests of virtually everyone else involved.

In any case, the question of affiliation is not really at issue at the moment, since, above all, FAS should not tack its policies around like a PT boat and does not yet, despite this week-long investigation, understand WFSW

enough to take such a step. What intermediate alternatives are available?

At the other extreme from affiliation is simply "observing," as FAS did on this occasion. This could be done at another such meeting three years hence, to gather further data. Conceivably we could continue to observe by invitation indefinitely as a permanent solution to the problem. The latter would require a special decision by WFSW. But, from WFSW's point of view, our willingness even to attend would greatly enhance WFSW's chances of attracting other affiliates. Notwithstanding the bias toward socialism in this organization, the American approach to life and free expression, embodied even by a single participant, is obviously a breath of fresh air for this group.

The observer status does not permit FAS to express its view during proceedings. In particular, it does not permit FAS to determine what the results of such expression would be. A solution to this problem could be imagined if the Council wanted to instruct its Director to apply for membership as a "Corresponding Member." Armored with the right to speak, if not vote, FAS could determine what the traffic of free expression of ideas would bear at WFSW. Corresponding members can ask to be invited to attend annual Executive Council meetings between the tri-annual General Assemblies.

#### Other Options

There are certainly other options. To take one example, the WFSW tradition of trying to adopt consensual statements is obviously worthless and outmoded. Worse, in terms of attracting affiliates like the Chinese, it is counterproductive. We could ask WFSW to revise its Constitution and revamp its procedures. Or FAS could determine that the advantages of participation, mainly raising our voice and keeping in touch with scientists in less accessible countries, could be accomplished in quite other ways. Finally, a number of FAS members will feel that this entire question of scientists' rights, and contacts with colleagues abroad, is not so important as the same amount of time spent on other domestic affairs.

Speaking personally, I do not fear the taint of association with WFSW. The FAS record of calling our shots as we see them is well-anchored in our history, especially our recent history. And whatever decision we took could always be reversed. The choice involves a strain, I feel, between the pragmatic and the idealistic elements in FAS thought. From one point of view, we ought not to fear difficulty, and spying an opportunity to spread our views into new circles, we should simply seize upon it. Caution is not what we want to be known for. And we are being welcomed by almost all circles in WFSW, not only as an equal but as a *sine qua non* of its desire to become a podium of expression for all points of view.

On the other hand, members may find some aspects of WFSW's extremely left political history and its high degree of influence by Moscow (and states under Soviet

domination) to be too repugnant to justify using it as a window on the East, much less as a platform for expression of our view.

If members will be so kind as to write describing their views, these letters will be summarized and made available to Council members attending the December meeting, at which time some decision will be made. Please give this matter serious consideration. FAS made a decision of this kind a generation ago and, presumably, might not find occasion to review it again in this thorough a fashion for another generation. □

### FAS RECEIVES COMPILATION OF INJUSTICES

*Increasingly FAS receives important documents concerning scientific freedom abroad in its mail. This compilation of injustices in the Soviet Union was signed by virtually every leading Soviet scientific dissident out of prison. FAS translated and released the letter on Oct. 15.*

To the President of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Academician A. P. Alexandrov.

To the Chairman of the Government Committee for Scientific and Technical Affairs, Academician A. A. Kirilin.

Science has become one of the determining factors of contemporary life. It is impossible to separate science from the people who create science. For this reason, systematic infringements of fundamental civil and professional rights of scientists do damage far removed from the bounds of the narrow professional interests of the scientists themselves. In the past, in their most extreme and ugliest manifestations, infringements on the rights of scientists have repeatedly developed into a direct struggle with science. For a long period in the Soviet Union, the theory of relativity and quantum mechanics was regarded with suspicion; cybernetics was opposed; and genetics and contemporary biology were violently persecuted.

At the present time, the infringement of the rights of scientists continues, although not in such an extreme form. This circle of questions has a direct relationship to you, and through your authority you could in large measure contribute to the normalization of the situation. We consider it our duty to draw your attention to the most important infringements, in our opinion, of professional and civil rights of scientists.

#### PROFESSIONAL RIGHTS OF SCIENTISTS

##### 1) The right to publication of one's works.

Not one scientific work can be published without the approval of the so-called "expert committee" attesting to the absence of any so-called secret information in the work. These committees will consider only the results of researchers at the institutions in which they function. As a result, there is a wide category of individuals not in institutions with such committees, who are thus, for all practical purposes, deprived of any possibility to publish their scientific results. These extremely inconvenient and humiliating rules were introduced in that special period in the history of the Soviet Union in the early fifties. Unfortunately, in contrast with many other statutes of that period, these rules remain in force even now.

##### 2) Scientific Meetings and Lectures.

Scientists located outside the borders of selected institutions and not receiving special permissions are de-

#### FAS INTERESTED IN LASERS

FAS is concerned that laser technology may lend itself to future weapons dilemmas and asks interested members to write expressing opinions or conveying information with a view to a future FAS analysis and report.

prived of the opportunity to deliver scientific lectures and reports in public, or to lead public scientific discussions. Scientists not working in specialized scientific establishments are denied the opportunity to participate in scientific conferences in as much as presentation of a lecture demands official registration, and related publications, although attendance itself at such conferences, as a rule, does receive official permission.

### 3) Migration of Scientists and Scientific Contacts.

Participation in international scientific conferences and trips of scientists abroad are not regulated by published rules. A necessary precondition for departure is the endorsement of a specialized scientific institute. As a result, a significant fraction of scientists have no possibility to cultivate the personal contacts so necessary for the development of contemporary science. Scientists receiving invitations from foreign scientific institutions cannot accept them at their own discretion. Nor can they, by their own decision, contract to perform temporary work in foreign scientific establishments.

## CIVIL RIGHTS OF SCIENTISTS

### 1) Concerning the Right of Scientists to Possess and Express their Convictions.

Creative scientific work is incompatible with automatic adherence to official doctrine. Scientists must be permitted freedom of convictions and conscience as proclaimed in many declarations ratified by the Soviet Union. No purely secular government has the right to dismiss scientists from professional activity and teaching for their religious and ideological views and convictions. The modern world places on scientists a responsibility extending far beyond the defense of their professional and personal rights. Those scientists who, in response to conscience, engage in social activism on their own time, often find themselves, under the conditions in our country, in an especially difficult, and sometimes tragic situation. We call attention to the fate of scientists, who have suffered for their humanitarian and enlightened social activity. There are the biologist Sergei Kovalev; the psychiatrist Semyon Glusman; the astrophysicist Kronid Lyubarsky; the mathematician Alexander Bolonkin; the physicist Andrei Tverdokhlebov; the philosopher Vasily Lisovoy; the historian Gabriel Superfin; and others.

### 2) The Right of Choice of one's country of residence.

The Universal Declaration of Rights of Man establishes the equal right "of every man freely to abandon any country, including his own. . ." However, any scientist announcing such a desire is severely discriminated against. Under the pretext of possession of secret information, he is refused for years the right of exit. Meanwhile: a) in order to attract scientists to work in classified matters, no effort is made to obtain the consent of scientists to such a restriction of their civil rights; b) in general there do not exist established and publicly known limits to the period of restriction; c) unknown individuals, in the absence of interested parties, determine whether secret information is possessed. The decision is announced verbally without any kind of concrete substantiation. As a result, there is no real possibility to question or appeal groundless assertions with regard to possession of secrets. All this fully precludes any control by competent interested scientific institutions and opens up broad possibilities for arbitrariness.

### 3) About Repressions in the Treatment of Scientists.

All scientists dismissed by instructions of the authorities are ostracized, are deprived of the possibility to receive work in their specialty elsewhere, and are forced to seek unskilled labor. The latter is rendered most difficult by the fact that individuals with a higher education are not accepted for unskilled work. In addition, unskilled, badly paid work becomes compulsory under threats of persecution "for parasitism." Some actually are victims of such persecution and related threats on the part of the police. All of the above clearly contradicts the many international obligations of the Soviet Union. It is unprecedented in the history of science to deprive scientists of their scientific degrees and ranks for political assertions inseparable from their essence and thought.

The solution of the problems posed cannot be delayed, and we await your answer as soon as possible.

SIGNED: A. Sakharov, V. Levich, N. Meyman, A. Lerner, D. Azbel, V. Brailovsky, E. Trifonov, S. Alter, Yu. Orlov, A. Korchak, N. Salansky, G. Rosenstein, I. Goldstein, Yu. Gaslev, V. Turchin, Ye. Finkelstein, I. Brailovskaya, Yu. Gelfond, G. Goldstein, V. Kislik, B. Gurfel, M. Shepelev, T. Khodorovich, Ye. Kosterina.

**FAS PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT (202) 546-3300**  
307 Mass. Ave., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002  
November 1976, Vol. 29, No. 9

- 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