Supporting and expanding on Frank von Hippel’s cogent and exciting narrative of some of the great accomplishments of the Federation of American Scientists, I detail below two endeavors, at least one of which may have had far-reaching impact.

**LEADERSHIP OF SCIENTIFIC EXCHANGE WITH THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA**

The first was the initiative of FAS Director (and later President) Jeremy J. Stone who, in 1971, wrote the president of the Chinese Academy of Sciences to introduce FAS and to begin some kind of dialogue. The story is well told in Stone’s memoir:

---

**Improving US Relations with China**

A. Catalyzing Scientific Exchange; …

In the Spring of 1971, I wrote Chinese Academy of Sciences president Guo Moruo about sending a delegation to China. My wife, B. J., had already been learning Chinese. Guo Moruo said our request was being considered “positively.” Two months later, President Nixon went to China—a momentous breakthrough. We wrote again and, within eight days, received a visa. It turned out that “positively” did not mean affirmatively! But when Premier Zhou Enlai found out we had been inadvertently misled, he ordered our entry.

---

Thus, weeks after the Nixon visit to China, Jeremy and his wife BJ were in China with Jerome A. Cohen, who has persisted for the last four decades in a dedicated campaign for legal rights in China. As Chairman of FAS, Marvin S. (Murph) Goldberger and his wife Mildred were there, too. Murph was a leading theoretical particle physicist in the 1950s, a member of the President’s Science Advisory Committee and of its Strategic Military Panel; in 1971 he was professor of Physics at Princeton and was later to head Caltech and then the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study.

At the time, I was a member of the (National Academy of Sciences’) Committee on Scholarly Communications with the People’s Republic of China. We soon learned of the world travels of a delegation of Chinese scientists who were investigating environmental affairs and remediation in other countries, and both NAS and FAS worked vigorously and enthusiastically to bring the delegation to the United States. After reasonably favorable responses were received, there was a vigorous competition between the two organizations as to which one would be the formal host of the visit. As an official of both, I helped to settle this competition by being more involved than I normally would have been in the visit, which included meeting the delegation in Washington and encouraging IBM to host its week in New York, with visits to academic institutions, as well as industrial research centers.

Jeremy writes:

"Five months after our visit, the first Chinese delegation arrived—after two decades of isolation from America. It announced at each stop that it was visiting at the invitation of NAS and FAS. We gave the farewell banquet in San Francisco. The Chinese called us the “pioneers.” So this was successful."

Those involved in hosting the Chinese Scientists delegation were invited by the PRC to make a return visit to China, and “leading members” of the delegation could bring their spouse. My colleagues decided that a leading member was the president of some organization, which I was not, so I wrote to those issuing the invitation that I would be delighted to visit China at a later time when I could bring my wife. Early in 1974, the invitation came from the China Electronics Society and Chinese People’s Association for Peace and Disarmament, co-sponsors of our one month visit, which involved my speaking many times on computers and on experiments to detect gravitational radiations, and once on nuclear weapons and arms control.
The March/April 1994 PIR leads with the story, “Arms Control in South Asia -- Four Civilizations Gently Collide at Arms Control Conference.” The meeting was first proposed in mid-1993 at the initiative of Frank von Hippel, Chairman of the FAS Fund, the policy research and education arm of FAS. Frank had been told by Indian colleagues that they were interested in meeting with the Chinese; they were explicitly not interested in getting together with the Pakistanis, but Frank felt that it was essential to bring together representatives from China, India, and also Pakistan.

When Frank entered the Clinton Administration as Assistant Director for National Security Affairs in OSTP, FAS President Jeremy J. Stone assumed the responsibility of planning the conference with the essential involvement of Shen Dingli, Professor at Fudan University, who had trained at Princeton under von Hippel. So the conference went forward with five participants each from the United States, China, India, and Pakistan.

By the time the conference took place, I was FAS Vice Chairman and Chairman of the FAS Fund; the delegation consisted of Jeremy J. Stone and Jerome Holton representing FAS, myself, Frank von Hippel, and Stephen P. Cohen – an expert on both India and Pakistan and who was also a former member of the State Department Policy Planning staff.

The cited PIR has a full description of the conference, which was arduous, substantive, record breaking, and of uncertain impact. Frank von Hippel calls it “a great disappointment,” but Shen Dingli points out that “after the Shanghai round of the four-nation talk, three more rounds were held in Goa (1995), Rawalpindi (1996), and Virginia (1998). Though these dialogues did not succeeded in preventing India and Pakistan from testing nuclear weapons in 1998, they started a culture of addressing the control of nuclear weapons and their spread among concerned Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, and American people. They have also helped develop Chinese communities of nuclear arms control and nonproliferation to engage with their Indian and Pakistani counterparts.” Other initiatives were surely involved, such as that of the Committee on International Security and Arms Control (CISAC) of the National Academy of Sciences, which has met regularly with a counterpart group of Chinese Scientists since 1988.

Neither the 1971-72 FAS initiative nor the 1994 Shanghai conference was simple, but they both illustrated what an inspired, independent organization with long involvement in the field can do with the aid of networking.

Perhaps such approaches are more difficult now, with increasing bureaucracy on all sides and with increasing efforts to limit communication and free expression, but that is good reason to increase the effort to make progress on the control and elimination of the most destructive weapons in the world, and the protection of civilization against conflict.

2 http://fas.org/faspir/pir0494.html.