

ended with the passing of the McMahon Bill and the creation of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Choosing their issues studiously, and maintaining scientific responsibility as well as public respectability, FAS is now working to ensure Senate ratification of the partial test ban treaty. The basis of this policy position is the technical judgment that the risks of nuclear destruction are greater than the risks of a test ban.

In pursuing the political approach, the behavioral sciences, now blossoming in the U.S., have a doubly hard battle. They must develop channels of communication with legislative or executive circles, but they must also overcome the stereotype of "those crazy psychologists," and educate the public and their own profession to the political relevance of behavioral studies.

Psychologists Active

Psychologists, mainly through the American Psychological Association's Committee on Psychology in National and International Affairs, Washington, D. C., seem to be more active than anthropologists and sociologists in the political sphere.

Dr. Lawrence Solomon, executive director of the Committee, has testified in congressional hearings, reporting, for example, the psychological studies relating to fallout shelters. A congressional fellowship program is underway. Instituted by the APA in cooperation with the American Political Science Association, its purpose is to acquaint psychologists with the political process and politicians with the usefulness of psychology.

Since the APA membership numbers some 20,000 psychologists of varying views, the Committee makes no sweeping policy statements, but speaks only in its area of expertness. Like the other scientist groups, the APA Committee is wary of being labeled "a peace action group." Basically, however, it wants to ensure that psychologists' knowledge of men's minds be turned to peaceful, "tension-reducing" purposes.

There are several other organizations working to influence the course of national and international events. The words and letters of their titles are downright poetical, but their aims are, by and large, practical.

Scientific Responsibility

Here are some of the groups:

Society for Social Responsibility in Science (SSRS), Gambier, Ohio, founded in 1947, states its purpose as: "to induce scientists to recognize a personal responsibility for the anticipated consequences of their work and to exercise their profession always for the benefit of humanity." They reject participation in scientific activity that has military applications.

Council for a Livable World, Washington, D. C., under a board of scientists, grew out of a suggestion by Dr. Leo Szilard, winner of the Atoms for Peace Award in 1959. Dr. Szilard, who helped develop the A-bomb and petitioned against its use on Japan, proposed a distinctly political organization to work toward disarmament agreements and abolishing war. One of the operations of the Council, founded in June 1962, is making contributions to congress-

sional candidates "who are concerned about the course of events," who have "insight into what needs to be done" and who will "press for improvements."

Universities Committee on the Problems of War and Peace, based at Wayne State University, Detroit, recently got off the ground with a full-page newspaper ad on the test ban. Organized in January 1963, the Committee has participants on 243 college campuses. It plans a definitely political project on Capitol Hill in which, ideally, every member of Congress will have a number of academic experts at his beck and call to advise him on special issues and problems. A "speaker's bureau" and special college courses on war and peace have been started.

Scientists' Institute for Public Information, New York, founded last June, deals strictly in facts. Its aim is to spread accurate and understandable data on scientific problems through scientists speaking on the local level. According to the guiding principles of the Institute, such information is to be presented "unencumbered by political or moral judgments."

Peace Research Institute, Washington, D. C.; Center for the Study of Conflict Resolution, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and Committee on Research in International Conflict, Washington University, St. Louis, are among the few organizations established specifically to do or to support peace research. Such research may involve scientists from all disciplines and is generally dedicated to finding workable alternatives to nuclear annihilation.

The strongest voices of the scientific community—the National Academy of Sciences and the American Association for the Ad-

vancement of Science—have had comparatively little to say on the war-peace issue.

In representing the scientific community, the Washington, D. C., organizations speak for men whose views range the whole spectrum of political opinion and who can make these views known through other channels. Thus the National Academy through its Committee on Public Policy, and the American Association through its Committee on Science in the Promotion of Human Welfare rarely make policy statements, but confine themselves to setting forth the technical considerations and policy problems of broad issues, leaving final judgment to the individual.

Search for Peace

Although the National Academy has formally acknowledged that the search for lasting peace is the world's most urgent problem, it has no plans to get involved in any crusade for peace or disarmament.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science in December 1961 made a formal statement on science and human survival, explaining that the weapons of modern war are so devastating that an acceptable alternative to war is needed. Scientists were urged to "serve the social need for peace and find a means of protecting society that does not run the risk of destroying it." No new statement is planned.

No matter how their concern is expressed, however, it is to the continuing credit of the scientists that they persist in answering "Yes," to the biblical question: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

• Science News Letter, 84:117 Aug. 24, 1963

GENERAL SCIENCE

Nobelists Support Treaty

► THIRTY-FIVE out of 56 U.S. Nobel Prize winners have joined to support the test ban treaty, now pending Senate ratification.

The Nobelists urge approval of the treaty believing that it "marks a significant if minimal first step in reducing the tensions of a continued nuclear arms race," and that it will enhance, rather than endanger, the security of the U. S. They called on the Senate to accept it as a "concrete expression of our country's desire for peace."

All U. S. Nobel Prize winners in all fields who could be reached were asked to sign. Five, whose names are being withheld, declined to sign on personal grounds.

The signers are winners of Nobel Prizes in Physics, Chemistry and Medicine and Physiology.

The statement and list of names were sent to the President of the Senate, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and to the Senate Majority and Minority Leaders.

The poll of the Nobelists, inspired by President Kennedy's address to the nation on the test ban treaty, was started in the beginning of August.

Dr. I. I. Rabi of Columbia University,

often described as an "elder statesman of the scientific community," spoke for the distinguished group at a news conference in Washington, D. C. Dr. Rabi, who won the 1944 Nobel Prize in Physics, has been a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee since 1957 and is a member of the General Advisory Council of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Nobelists Dr. Edward M. Purcell, Harvard University physics professor, and Dr. James D. Watson, Harvard University biology professor, were also present to speak in favor of the treaty for the signers.

The signers to date are: Carl D. Anderson, Walter H. Brattain, Felix Bloch, Owen Chamberlain, Andre F. Cournand, John F. Enders, Joseph Erlanger, Edward A. Doisy, James Franck, Donald A. Glaser, Robert Hofstadter, Arthur Kornberg, Polykarp Kusch, Willis E. Lamb Jr., Tsung-Dao Lee, Fritz A. Lipmann, Hermann J. Muller, William P. Murphy, Severo Ochoa, Linus C. Pauling, Edward M. Purcell, Isidor I. Rabi, Dickinson W. Richards, Glenn T. Seaborg, Emilio Segre, William B. Shockley, Wendell M. Stanley, Otto Stern, Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, Edward L. Tatum, Harold C. Urey, Georg von Beckesy, Selman A. Waksman, James D. Watson, George H. Whipple.

• Science News Letter, 84:118 Aug. 24, 1963