

Mikhailov told Green that his main office had only about 60 employees, but that he had ten "Central Bureau Institutes" of information. Presumably these are bodies organized by industrial field, such as the Central Bureau of Scientific and Technical Information for Heavy Industry and the Bureau of Technical Information and Propaganda in the Meat Industry.

In each of these organizations 60 percent of the activity is devoted to processing information—acquisition, scanning, cataloging, abstracting, preparing, and so forth—and 40 percent to distribution. The central bureaus all publish journals, and each issue of these contains a prescribed number of suggestions to industry. Mikhailov also referred to 60 or 70 smaller regional units. In addition, he mentioned that his office maintains reporters at big plants.

Aside from the obvious organizational differences, the key difference between the All-Union Institute and the industrial information agency is that one provides broad scientific and technological information for which the user must ask, while the other feeds highly selected material to the predetermined user. Most observers agree that the two bodies complement each other.

The group from the National Federation of Science Abstracting and Indexing Services also visited centers in Poland, Holland, and Denmark. As a result of these travels, they concluded that there is no single national plan which merits adoption by all. Since alternate plans are feasible, any nation planning to make special efforts in this field should carefully inventory its existing methods of collecting information and its communication links. Thereafter a national plan should be devised which takes maximum advantage of these important resources and which responds to the country's special needs.

U.N. Assembly Asks All States To Halt Atom Tests

Following are the texts of two resolutions adopted in New York on 21 November by the United Nations General Assembly which call for a halt in nuclear and thermoneuclear tests.

The General Assembly, recalling its resolution 1252-B (XIII) of 4 November 1958.

Noting that the negotiations on the

discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests and on the establishment of an appropriate international control system which began at Geneva on 31 October 1958 are still continuing,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the states concerned for their efforts to reach an agreement relating to the prohibition of nuclear weapons tests and including an appropriate international control system;

2. Expresses the hope that these states will intensify their efforts to reach an agreement at an early date;

3. Urges the states concerned in these negotiations to continue their present voluntary discontinuance of the testing of nuclear weapons;

4. Requests the states concerned to report to the General Assembly the results of their negotiations.

Second Resolution

The General Assembly,

Desiring to safeguard mankind from the increasing hazards resulting from tests of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons,

Bearing in mind the profound concern evinced by the peoples of all countries regarding the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons,

Welcoming endeavors at Geneva of the states concerned to reach an agreement on the discontinuance of these tests and the progress so far achieved,

Noting with appreciation that the states concerned have voluntarily suspended such tests, enabling progress in the discussions at Geneva,

Considering that an agreement on the cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests with effective international control is urgent,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the states concerned for their patient and sincere efforts to reach agreement on the discontinuance of nuclear and thermonuclear tests with effective international control and for the progress hitherto achieved;

2. Expresses further the hope that the states concerned will reach such agreement at an early date;

3. Appeals to the states concerned in the Geneva discussions to continue their present voluntary suspension of tests and to other states to desist from such tests;

4. Requests the states concerned to report to the Disarmament Commission and to the General Assembly the results of their negotiations.

Scientists and Writers Discuss Public Misconceptions of the Nature of Basic Research

A close look at public attitudes towards science and scientists at the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation Conference on "The Mass Media and the Image of Science" on 6 November yielded some sharp opinions on the American citizenry's ability to absorb scientific information. Speakers at the Washington conference—attended by some 300 scientists, broadcasters, and journalists—deplored the public's narrow notions of what science is and what its real aims are.

Chief criticism came from National Science Foundation director Alan T. Waterman, who asked for change in the current image which identifies science "with technical industry and its product." Asserting that science has for too long been held "in the public view to be an entity unto itself, quite disassociated from other elements of our cultural heritage," Waterman urged directors of mass media to help build "a climate of excellence" in which science would be seen as an adventure of the mind and the spirit.

This view was seconded by John R. Platt, professor of physics at the University of Chicago, who said that the public is tired of facts—that "quiz-show facts" are not enough to yield a serviceable image of science. He asked science writers to take up the challenge of communicating what he called "the sweep and excitement" of basic science and the "intellectual thrills" it afforded.

A comparison of Russian and American attitudes showed the U.S. taking second place in this regard. Both Waterman and Princeton chemist John Turkevich, who recently visited the U.S.S.R., attributed a greater general appreciation of science to the Russians.

"Science controls the picture over there," Turkevich said. And he cited the close liaison between scientists and other creative people—artists, writers, and so on—in the U.S.S.R. as a major reason why Russians are generally better informed about scientific developments.

How much information is the American public absorbing? Depressingly little, was the report made by another participant at the Edison Foundation Conference. Earl Ubell, science editor for the New York *Herald Tribune*, reported on a recent survey undertaken