

in prison in 1958, because he was making a pastel drawing of Moskva river, with bridges, - objects of military importance !-. He stayed in prison no more than a day, happily!

Anonymous : The 1958 GA re-established the close cooperation between the Pulkovo Observatory and the U.S. Naval Observatory and resulted in the international cooperation on the Southern Reference Stars (SRS) transit circle programme; with Pulkovo Observatory establishing a station in Chile and the U.S. Naval Observatory in Argentina.

D. DeVorkin : What were the reasons for the cancellation of the 1951 IAU at Leningrad ?

A. Gurshtein : Many reasons - Korean war, cosmopolitan movement, I have documents on this.

Anonymous : When was the official reopening of Pulkovo Observatory, to which many foreign astronomers came ? How did this relate to the planned 1951 IAU General Assembly in Leningrad?

A. Gurshtein : At first it was planned that the opening would be in 1951 but really it took place in 1954. It was after Stalin's death and many prominent foreign astronomers arrived. It was a good prologue for the Moscow GA.

F.K. Edmondson asked for a show of hands of those who attended the 1958 Moscow GA.

(Quite a number of people)

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY, CHINA AND THE IAU : LEO GOLDBERG'S MEMOIRS

Owen Gingerich, *Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge, USA*

Shortly before his death, Leo Goldberg wrote out an extensive memoir based on Documents and his own memory, of the difficult question that faced the IAU in 1958-61 concerning the membership of China in the IAU.

The IAU faced a difficult period during the Cold War when the Leningrad meeting was abruptly canceled and moved instead to Dublin. Struve felt that two successive meetings, in the USSR and the USA, were essential, but the problem was guaranteeing that all members could attend, and this was rendered very problematic for the Americans whose government was determined to keep Chinese communists from entering the country. Goldberg describes his negotiations with the State Department in Washington over this issue. Problems arose because of contrary factions within the State Department, so that conflicting reports reached the IAU officers about whether the invitation for the Berkeley meeting would actually go ahead. The Far Eastern Department, which strongly supported Chiang Kai-shek, was determined to get a representation from Taiwan admitted to the IAU, because they knew this would automatically cause the "Red China" membership to be withdrawn. They spread rumors that the Berkeley invitation would be canceled if Taiwan were not admitted to the IAU at the Moscow General Assembly in 1958. (Goldberg gives rich details of the personalities involved, and explains how at one point he offered his resignation as chairman of the US National Committee). Action was postponed, which averted the threat of the USSR leaving the Union, but in fact Taiwan was admitted the following year, and the People's Republic of China then withdrew. While Goldberg deplored this consequence, he believed that the IAU by its own statutes had no alternative but to accept Taiwan's application.

Discussion

F.K. Edmondson : I was a member of the US National Committee, and this paper brought back vivid memories. I was at the Madison meeting, and will not repeat in this room the words that we used to describe Wallace Brode.

J.-C. Pecker : It is interesting to note the importance, in the admission of Germany and later in the Chinese affair, of *individual membership*, which characterizes the IAU (to my knowledge, the only scientific union to have individual membership). In the 60's, J. Oort was in favour of suppressing the individual membership ; but the EC disagreed (rightly in my opinion) with such an eventuality.

D. DeVorkin : Leo Goldberg found it just as difficult to get documents out of the State Department when he worked on the history at the National Air and Space Museum as it had to deal with the State Department at the time.

ASTRONOMERS: WRITERS OF THE HISTORY OF ASTRONOMY

Jerzy Dobrzycki, *History of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*

The object I found myself confronted with, opens some doubts as to its main issue: If astronomers' writers of history, why not historians writers of astronomy? After all, history is far removed from astronomy in what concerns subject, methods, tools of research and criteria of competent work. Much devoted effort can be lost due to lack adequate correspondence of scientific and historical apparatus. The value of field work (as in archaeological work) can be nullified without adequate documentation enabling its repetition and verification. The quotations, even by the highest authorities, must be checked at their source. All this notwithstanding, there is the history of astronomy. In a very high degree it is thanks to the fact that to-day's scholars stand on the shoulders of giants of the past. Not a few of those were astronomers writing history.

History of science in modern times is the daughter of the Enlightenment. That epoch found the confirmation of its optimistic program in the principles of scientific reasoning and of progressive scientific development. Jean B. Delambre followed this program in the realm of astronomy, in six volumes of his "Histoire de l'astronomie" (1817-1827). This grand work of a scholar-scientist is still acclaimed as a masterpiece thanks to its scope and thanks to its thorough discussion of the geometrical and numerical contents in the works of past generations. Following Delambre, the XIX century authors expanded the story of science in which the past was leading more or less linearly to its present. There is no place here to list all important and influential works. To name but a few: Robert E. Grant's "History of Physical Astronomy" (1852), extended up to the beginning of the twentieth century by Agnes M. Clerke, a renowned pioneer lady writer on astronomy and its history. Widely known on the European continent was the "Geschichte der Astronomie" (1877) by the Zürich solar astronomer Rudolf Wolf. Some in-depth monographic studies from this period are far from antiquated, as R. Small's of Edinburgh on Kepler's planetary theory (1804) and the "Geschichte der Bahnbestimmung" (1867-94) by the Viennese astronomer, Norbert Herz.

A marked breakthrough was realized thanks to philological studies of ancient scientific texts. The history of astronomy became a common field of scientists and philologists. Even a most brief list of the scholars involved must include Johann Louis Emil Dreyer, Johan Ludwig Heiberg, Axel Anthon Bjoernbo (all from Denmark), G.V. Schiaparelli and Carlo Alfonso Nallino, Karl Manitius. This process was of primary importance in making the history