does, that "space and time have ceased to be absolutes," but unfortunately this generalization is all too often misunderstood. Under certain circumstances, it may permit a reversal of apparent time-order, but under no circumstances does it permit a reversal of causality. We may indeed speculate whether something "might conceivably reincorporate purpose as a natural fact into the stream of natural causation," but this speculation should not be based on a misunderstanding of relativity.

ANTHONY STANDEN
*250 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.*

### Science, a Worth-While Endeavor

The mixed reactions, on the editorial pages of the newspapers [*Science* **125**, 269 (15 Feb. 1957)] (editorial), to the report of the Interim Committee on the Social Aspects of Science were no doubt duplicated in the mind of the general public. Science is widely considered to be amoral, being, in itself, neither good nor bad. Most of the practical applications of science are good, whereas a few of the applications are unquestionably evil. But in the mind of the public, amoral science is confused with its applications, and, depending on personal prejudice, "science" is seen as a good or as a potential evil.

Scientists can never hope for complete control over the applications of their work; the policies now being developed within the AAAS are based on this reality. It might be profitable, in order to further the development of these policies, to depart here from the obvious and indulge in a little speculation. A reexamination of the purposes of science may disclose a way to promote a more favorable attitude toward science on the part of the general public. As a start, it is proposed that the primary purpose of science is the attainment of certain knowledge of things by knowing their causes. All men, by their nature, desire to know. And if it is innate in man to wonder, to be curious, then surely the attainment of knowledge, however proximate or incomplete it may be, is, in itself, a good.

In a word, science, abstracting from its applications, is not amoral, it is a worth-while endeavor. If this point can be successfully taught to the general public, perhaps scientists, as a group, would be more easily able to recommend actions that seem, from the point of view of science, to be desirable. Perhaps, even, if it were eventually accepted as part of our cultural milieu that science is not amoral, that it is good in itself, more young men and women might choose it as a career.

JAY A. YOUNG
*King's College,*
*Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania*