

PSYCHOLOGY

Peace Parley Success

To gain peace, the objective of the talks, U. S. delegates should thoroughly understand the psychology of conference, of agreement, and of compromise.

➤ WAR ON Heartbreak Ridge and the other battlefields of Korea is over, it is hoped. However, from around the conference tables, not on any battlefield, will come the determination of whether the world is to have a real peace or a world war with its tragic destruction.

No chief of staff of a major world power would think of going into battle today armed only with bow and arrow, or even rifles. He wants the best in modern weapons, even if it is decided not to make use of the atom bomb.

Those entering the peace conference rooms, where the outcome is even more vital to survival, should be adequately armed to insure satisfactory results of the deliberations.

Here, however, the armament must be psychological, not military. And it must be designed to produce good will and cooperation, not humiliation or defeat.

The only way to reduce the frictions at such meetings, the frequent and protracted walk-outs, the bitter invective, the hatching of situations from which there can be no amicable escape, is by greater understanding of the psychology of conference, of agreement, and of compromise.

Naturally, at any such meeting there are conflicting interests. Otherwise there would be no need for the meeting. The purpose of the meeting is usually, or at least it should be, to arrive at some sort of compromise that will be the closest approximation of the interests of all those taking part or the majority of them.

This inevitably involves some sacrifices of

the interest of each nation for the sake of the common interests of all.

Yet it is the almost universal custom to select as delegates to the meeting persons who are psychologically unsuited to any kind of compromise. To represent us at the council table, we select a good fighter, not a peacemaker. We pick a "tough negotiator." And we expect him to drive a hard bargain, to use a show of force or implications of threats instead of sincere concern with the problems of others in his attempts to contribute toward the group decisions.

If he is not a hard-hitter, a tough talker, a shrewd bargainer the public tends to be dissatisfied with him as a representative. This is doubtless true in Russia and in China as in America.

What is needed at the conference table is more sound psychological advice. We need greater understanding of the people we are meeting with, not just the language they speak, but their deeper motives, their aspirations and urgent needs.

We need to understand their symbols and figures of speech. Otherwise what seems to one nation a symbol of peace may present to others a flagrant flaunting of a strange ideology. And what is meant as conciliation may produce only anger.

Even traditions of parliamentary practice differ in different parts of the world. Some representatives might be offended by such seemingly inoffensive rules as those putting limits on time for discussion because they are contrary to their own customs although common with us.

Science News Letter, August 8, 1953

GENERAL SCIENCE

Free Scientific Inquiry

➤ TOO MUCH designing and control of research and too little freedom for scientists to do what they want to do are likely to ruin the chances of new discoveries in the future.

This is what Dr. Curt P. Richter, Johns Hopkins psychobiologist, argued in a committee of the National Research Council a few months ago. Now *Science* (July 24) has presented his plea for free research instead of design research.

There are too many committees that have the say-so on whether investigations are financially supported largely today by government funds. Dr. Richter finds that projects suffer "passing the buck" from committee to committee, because no one

takes time to find the facts or because fellow scientists are not willing to bet on a man who has an idea.

Team research or investigations by groups, designed or planned in great detail, may be effective in getting things done when discoveries already made are applied for war or industry.

But Dr. Richter finds that in the past great discoveries have with a few exceptions been made by individual workers, often working in great isolation. Some of the most important discoveries have been made without any plan of research, largely by accident or in dreams.

Discoveries have resulted from a state of mind that cannot be put in words and can

be called puzzlement at discrepancies in findings. Some of the best researchers do not know what they have been after until they actually arrive at their discoveries. Their thinking functions in terms of experiences and subconscious observations.

For better research Dr. Richter recommends: Less paper work and fewer reports. Few strings attached to research grants. Long periods of financial support. Fewer conferences and more time for experimentation and thinking.

Science News Letter, August 8, 1953

ANIMAL NUTRITION

Pup Growth Sparked With Amino Acids

➤ PUPS WILL grow and be as frisky on a low-protein diet as with a higher protein ration, if you add a bit of two amino acids, raw materials for protein, to their meals.

A 12% protein diet, supplemented with lysine and methionine, led to normal dog growth equal to that on a 20% protein diet, Drs. E. S. Robajdek and P. H. Phillips of the University of Wisconsin's Agricultural Experiment Station, Madison, have found.

Lysine alone with the low-protein diet allowed normal growth, but the addition of methionine made for more efficient use of the protein.

Science News Letter, August 8, 1953

PSYCHOLOGY

Don't Ask Man's Wife What He's Really Like

➤ WHAT IS a man really like?

"Don't ask his wife," advises Dr. Verne Kallejian, clinical psychologist at the Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California at Los Angeles, who is making a study of the factors involved in peoples' understanding of one another.

"We tend to believe that we understand best those people we like the most and feel that they are similar to us," he said. "In reality, great difficulty in understanding occurs with those whom we strongly like. We tend to see them as we want or expect them to be rather than the way they actually are. The same difficulty occurs with those we dislike since we tend to see in them characteristics which we dislike in ourselves."

Two other factors which interfere with the development of understanding are personal tension and the use of stereotype. When people are tense they tend to be less alert to what is happening around them. Since no one person ever conforms to a given stereotype, understanding based upon them is likely to be faulty.

These conclusions were drawn from an analysis of tests administered to 98 leaders in business, education and community groups before and after their participation in a group leadership training program sponsored by the University.

Science News Letter, August 8, 1953