

letters

modified to that as shown associated with my signature below.

References

1. D. Orcutt, *Wallace Clement Sabine: A Biography*, Plympton, Norwood, Mass. (1933).
2. M. D. Fagen, ed. *A History of Engineering and Science in the Bell System: The Early Years, 1875-1925*. Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc, 1975, p. 38; p. 54.

FLOYD K. HARVEY, RETIRED
AT&T Bell Laboratories
Murray Hill, New Jersey

4/85

US-USSR scientific exchanges

I favor US-USSR scientific exchanges as a small but direct way to lessen East-West tensions. Within this context I question both the accuracy and the relevance of G. Truman Hunter's statement (December, page 15) that "Any Russian physicist allowed to come to the United States, or allowed to communicate with Americans, can be assumed to be completely dominated by the Russian government..." If loyalty to one's government is meant, then the statement lacks significant content. If something more is meant—such as government briefing and debriefing, special indoctrination, and so on—then before sinister implications are drawn concerning the USSR only, I think one should first distinguish Soviet practice from that of the US.

However, the question of government domination of an individual is irrelevant. If scientific exchange is accepted as desirable, then the most important question is whether those participating are bona fide scientists—and even here there is no reason not to accept the sending country's criteria. When a visiting scientist lives and works in a host scientific community for a period of months, there are many opportunities for social and cultural interaction. The positive (as well as the negative) aspects of the host community can become apparent to the visiting scholar. A deeply ideological individual is as susceptible to enlightenment as anyone else—it's a matter of degree. Consequently, if an American is convinced his own culture is in some sense superior, then I should think he would be eager to let a visitor view it at close hand.

My own experience with Soviet exchange scientists at SLAC has been uniformly positive, and I believe that these visitors have returned to the Soviet Union with a much improved perception of what the American people are like and that this experience

will have some small influence for good in improving US-USSR relations.

JAMES E. CLENDENIN
SLAC

1/85

Stanford, California

THE AUTHOR COMMENTS: Clendenin questions my statement that any Russian scientist in close contact with the US is completely dominated by the Soviet government. Why does the KGB closely supervise all culture groups and all Soviet citizens who work for the United Nations? Arkady N. Shevchenko's recently published *Breaking with Moscow* tells¹ in considerable detail how the KGB watches and controls every Soviet person.

I do not doubt that a scientist in another country has some opportunities for social and cultural interaction. But they are far fewer in Soviet-dominated countries than in America. I don't mind letting a visitor view American culture at close hand. What I object to is that visitor stealing everything he or she can get away with, and leaving as little as he or she has to. If Clendenin doesn't think that is the situation between the closed society of the Soviet Union and the open society of America, he is badly mistaken. I object to our giving the Soviets one iota of physics information that will help them to shoot down airliners faster, to improve the high-tech level of the infamous German slave wall, or to increase the jamming ability of radio and television broadcasts.

Techno-bandits, by Linda Melvern, David Hebditch and Nick Anning, details² only a few of the recent cases of Soviet spying and stealing of Western technology. The three-volume *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, 1917 to 1965*, by Antony Sutton, details³ how the Soviets got much of their technology, including a fair amount by expulsion and expropriation. I do not deny that there are some excellent scientists and engineers in Russia, but they won't admit how much they have stolen. The way the Soviets rewrite history, they will soon be claiming to have invented French fries and Brussels sprouts!

Clendenin says, "Government domination of an individual is irrelevant." That is ridiculous! *Psychiatric Terror*, by Bloch and Reddaway, will give the reader a pretty good idea of how much dissent and change any Soviet scientist can make. One statement that the United States is good at anything, and the individual is done for. Clendenin should also read Valentin Turchin's letter (April 1985, page 104) titled "Fellow travelers"; Turchin is more eloquent than I.

PHYSICS TODAY has published more than two dozen letters in the past three years that further document the monstrous inhumanity of the Soviets and

the selfishness of the few Americans who just want to enjoy their own pleasures and ignore murder, slavery, torture, deceit and anti-Semitism—all of which are the normal operations of Soviets, when needed for their purposes, and carefully hidden when they visit the US and try to get something they want for free.

Clendenin believes that Soviet exchange scientists will go back and have a small influence on improving US-USSR relations. What influence did Andrei Sakharov have when he simply wanted the Soviets to abide by the Helsinki document they signed? Ask the hundreds of other scientists and engineers who have voiced any criticism of Soviet government how nicely they have been treated by the Soviets.

Can Clendenin get any one of his Soviet visitors to sign a statement to be published in PHYSICS TODAY that the Soviet Union should allow more freedom of expression, information and travel without KGB supervision? The poor victim would never be heard from again! As to the small influence his returning visitors will have, I can quantify it for him. It is 10^{-99} in any units he wants to use.

References

1. A. N. Shevchenko, *Breaking with Moscow*, Knopf, New York (1985).
2. L. Melvern, D. Hebditch, N. Anning, *Techno-bandits*, Houghton Mifflin, New York (1984).
3. A. Sutton, *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, 1917 to 1965*, Vols. 1-3, Hoover Institution P. of Stanford Univ., Stanford, Calif. (1973).
4. Bloch, Reddaway, *Psychiatric Terror*, Basic (1977).

TRUMAN HUNTER
Oxford, Ohio

5/85

Science at GE

Your interesting article on Science at GE (December, page 61) contains a photograph of Nobel laureates Percy W. Bridgman, Harold Urey and Irving Langmuir (from left) at the opening of the GE Research Laboratory in 1950.

If I am not mistaken the author has missed another Nobel laureate in the picture; the man fourth from the left appears to be W. Lawrence Bragg.

Who is the gentleman on the right, I wonder?

JOHN G. JENKIN
La Trobe University
Bundoora, Australia

2/85

Correction

June, page 89—The story on the recent ASP awards should have stated that Dale P. Cruickshank joined the Institute for Astronomy of the University of Hawaii in 1970. □