

About four or five members of People for Peace seemed visibly distressed by our findings, an equal number seemed ready to make use of the results, while the remaining members gave little immediate indication of their reactions. Those who were upset seemed most disturbed by the evidence of similarity between the groups. Some members showed their disturbance by hearing the results incorrectly, denying or rationalizing them, or criticizing the research design. A few also displayed a competitive attitude toward OASIS, saying for example, "But they've folded and we're still going." An unwillingness to renounce their exaggerated conception of the opposing group seemed to underlie these reactions, as if the researchers had removed what had been a convenient enemy.

At least an equal number of the People for Peace group responded in the opposite fashion, making what appeared to be more constructive use of our findings. These members commented freely, in a partly self-critical fashion, on the possibility that their communication with the community might have been exclusive, narrowing their base of support. They seemed eager to discern the motivations for their misperceptions of OASIS and considered changes they might make in the activities of their own group. The difference in the responses of the two groups to the report of our findings

might have been expected, for there was little in the results presented that could have been disturbing to OASIS, and if any were disturbed, they were probably the members who refused to be retested.

Conclusion

While the extent of similarity between the two groups was surprising, this similarity may have been due to the particular community studied and should not obscure the real differences which were found, which apparently remained fairly stable. The two groups differed not only in their beliefs about shelters but in their attitudes toward war, United States foreign policy, the motives of the Soviet Union, political affiliation and activity, risk-taking behavior, their own descriptions of themselves and of the opposite group, and a number of general social issues. Finally, each group had misperceptions about the other, one group exaggerating, the other under-rating, the differences.

In thinking about negotiation and communication between individuals from different nations, we are impressed at the ease with which these two groups from the same community, with similar backgrounds and responding to a common threat, could generate such extensive misperceptions (9).

Notes

1. We are indebted to John A. Starkweather for pointing out the existence of these two groups and their potential interest.
2. Some of the questions used were taken from "The U.S. and the U.S.S.R." (1961), a study by Stephen B. Withey, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan. The adjectives used were selected from Harrison Gough's "Adjective Check List."
3. Except where indicated, there were no differences in results between sexes, and the results are not attributable to the difference in sex ratio for the two groups. Complete copies of the questionnaires and detailed presentation of results may be obtained from the authors.
4. The group scores were compared with figures given in "The Effects of Nuclear Weapons," prepared by the Department of Defense and published by the Atomic Energy Commission, June 1957. We thank Rear Admiral A. G. Cook (USN, Ret.), director of the San Francisco Disaster Corps, for making this and related material available to us.
5. Separate tests requiring estimation of the magnitude of various objects demonstrated that the difference in the evaluations of the effects of a nuclear weapon cannot be attributed to any difference in the general tendency of the groups to over- or underestimate.
6. In discussion of single items, "underestimation" and "overestimation" refer to the sign of the difference between predicted and actual values of the mean response. Members were not asked to evaluate similarities explicitly, but an implicit measure of assumed similarity was obtained by summing the squared differences between predicted and actual mean response over items. Actual similarities between two groups were estimated by summing squared differences between the mean responses of the groups to each item. In a discussion of similarity, "underestimation" and "overestimation" refer to a comparison between assumed similarity and actual similarity.
7. Kathleen Archibald suggested that the groups differed in their felt efficacy in dealing with their environment.
8. This interpretation was suggested in part by comments of Arthur Gladstone.
9. This article is based on a paper delivered at the American Psychological Association Convention, 1 September 1962. We thank the Committee for the Application of the Behavioral Sciences to the Strategies of Peace, which provided interviewers and aid in data analysis.

NEWS AND COMMENT

Congress: Session Will Take Up Variety of Issues Affecting Science, Education

The 88th Congress convened this week with an agenda that includes an unusually large number of issues that will directly affect people who work in the nation's scientific and educational institutions. These range from such major political questions as federal support for education to the relatively minor matter of imposing a tariff on electron microscopes. In addition, Congress will consider a variety of other

issues that have come to be of concern to sizable segments of the scientific and university communities, such as civil defense and the growth of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The political terrain over which these issues must pass defies precise or even reasonably accurate measurement, and it is a safe bet that many of those who are compelled, or feel compelled, to practice political fortune telling will

wish 6 months from now that public journals were printed with disappearing ink.

(Congress defies prediction by computer just as horse races do; in the latter case, it is because the computer can be told everything except what the owner whispers to the jockey. A similar information gap disrupts any attempt to figure out what 535 power-loving, ambitious, and independent legislators are going to do when they take up the nation's business.)

But some of the peaks and boundaries on the congressional scene are more or less visible, and they are as follows. Kennedy is today considerably "stronger" than he was 2 years ago when he laid his first program before Congress. He is stronger for a number of reasons, but principally because of the prestige that accrued to him from the successful outcome of the hair-raising Cuban missile episode. In the manner in which

such things work, his performance in Cuba won massive public respect and support, and it becomes more perilous politically to oppose Kennedy the Cuban hero than it was to oppose Kennedy the man who became President by 112,000 out of 64 million votes.

As a result, he is likely to find more votes sticking to him where he chooses to commit his political strength, and this is likely to incline him to commit it more often, since, in the last session, the prospect of defeat quite understandably deterred him from rushing into battle. This was most notable on such issues as aid to education and civil defense. (In his recent television interview, Kennedy said, "There is no sense in raising hell and then not being successful. There is no sense in putting the office of the presidency on the line on an issue and then being defeated.")

Within the Congress, the lineup of votes is numerically close to what it was last time, which, for administration purposes, was fine on paper but frequently disastrous at roll-call time. In the previous Congress the House was controlled by the Democrats 263 to 174, but the conservative coalition—southern Democrats and conservative Republicans—was able on numerous occasions to put together a majority opposed to administration measures. The new division is 259 to 176 (two seats temporarily created for newly admitted Alaska and Hawaii were automatically eliminated). In terms of administration and antiadministration sentiments, however, the House appears to remain close to the ideological makeup that existed throughout the last Congress.

Even more significant is the fact that, however the rank and file may be affected by the new aura of political power that Kennedy emanates, the committee chairmen who successfully defied him in the last session remain enthroned and virtually immune to political tides. For example, Wilbur Mills, the Arkansas Democrat who is chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, does not see eye to eye with the administration on the need for a tax cut or medical care for the aged, items over which his committee has jurisdiction. Mills's position is not indestructible, but it is massively fortified by his great competence, the seniority system, his power to command support from his colleagues by granting or withholding favors, and his own invulnerability in his one-party district. Mills's committeemen and the House may be brought to act against his wishes, but the price would be the

creation of an appetite for vengeance as well as some costly favors that would have to be paid those wavering members who were brought around to defying the powerful chairman.

In the Senate, where there was a fairly constant trend to go along with the administration in the last session, the new lineup is even more favorable to Kennedy—68 to 32, a gain of four seats for the Democrats. There has been speculation that the death of Senator Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma, "The uncrowned king of the Senate," would impair the administration's cause in the Senate, but it appears probable that the administration has enough support in that chamber to continue to get by on most measures. The one exception—and it is an important one—is the tax cut, which the administration has decided is the most certain means of invigorating the nation's economy. This was an issue on which Kerr, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, was expected to counteract the power of chairman Harry F. Byrd of Virginia, who has been opposed to the administration on virtually every issue that has passed his way.

Medical Care Expected

In other respects, however, the political gloom created by Kerr's death does not appear likely to prevail when the votes are counted. The fact is that in the last session the Senate was pretty much of a rubber stamp for the administration, and there is nothing visible that can radically alter that relationship. It is perhaps worth noting, too, that while Kerr was unquestionably a most potent legislator to have on one's side, he was not always on the administration's side. His dealings with the President were best summed up by the saying that "what Kerr wants, Kennedy gets." Kerr, for example, did not want medical care for the aged financed through social security, and Kennedy did not get it, though he had singled it out as the key domestic issue of the session.

Against this political background there is the question of what Congress has on its mind. It is bound by necessity to devote a good deal of time to such annually recurring issues as the military budget and foreign aid. But then it can turn its considerable energy and manpower to whatever happens to interest it, and as far as the scientific and educational communities are concerned, the most noteworthy prospect in this area is growing congressional dissatisfaction with the way in which many

tax-free institutions and government-financed researchers are taking care of the public's money. A lot of this dissatisfaction concerns the way the National Institutes of Health are accounting for the funds they make available to their grantees (*Science*, 28 Dec.) And, just in time for the new Congress, a special House Small Business Committee, headed by Representative Wright Patman (D-Tex.), has charged that some tax-exempt foundations are being employed as tax dodges. Patman, who began his foundation study last year, says he examined 534 tax-exempt charitable and educational foundations out of the approximately 45,000 now in existence, and he arrived at some very uncharitable conclusions. These include a recommendation that consideration be given to setting a 25-year lifetime limit on foundations, so that they would be self-liquidating rather than self-perpetuating. He also recommended considering whether a new federal regulatory agency should be established to supervise tax-exempt foundations. It can be expected that more will be heard about this in the new session of Congress and that such sentiments will be fed by what are undoubtedly serious abuses as well as by Congress's instinctive concern when a large segment of federally assisted activity is not under tight fiscal control. These sentiments are in an embryonic stage, and it seems likely that considerable time and controversy will intervene before they are reflected in realistic legislative proposals that have any prospect of passage. Other issues are more immediately before Congress.

Education. More than a score of administration proposals in this area failed for lack of a formula that could resolve the church-state issue; because of aversion, on the part of the conservatives, to large and new spending programs that do not bear a readily visible Cold War label; and because of inept handling by the administration and dissension among educational organizations. There is no new formula at hand to resolve the issue of federal aid for private schools, nor are the conservatives any less inclined to oppose federal aid to education than they were. Nevertheless, there is considerable optimism that money will be obtained for the nation's schools. This optimism, regardless of where it prevails, is always grounded in the arrival of Francis Keppel, former dean of the Harvard School of Education, as U.S. Commissioner of Education. Keppel has an open door to the White House—something that his pred-

cessor did not have, or at least did not use. Furthermore, it is said, he has been working effectively to get the nation's major educational organizations to forget their differences and pull together for the administration's program.

Space. The budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$3.7 billion this year, is expected to rise to over \$5 billion. As it goes up, Congress is becoming increasingly unhappy about what it considers the administration's conviction that it has a blank check for beating the Russians to the moon. The Cold War justification for these expenditures is hard to fight, and there is little likelihood that NASA's budgetary request will be successfully attacked. But the nucleus of a revolt exists, and Congress is beginning to manifest a skepticism on space matters that could turn into serious hostility, especially if it finds cases of marked wastefulness or what it considers to be incompetence.

There is also going to be increased congressional pressure for expansion of the military space program. This is an area which the Republicans have staked out for assailing the administration. Whatever data they need for this purpose are happily supplied by the Air Force, which is in agony over the administration's decision to do nothing that might motivate the Soviets to expand their military space effort.

Medical research. The tradition of ample funding for medical research is well established, but there is growing unhappiness within Congress over the annual practice of giving NIH more than the administration requests for it. A handy club to wield against this practice is the contention that NIH maintains unnecessarily loose control over the use of funds by its grantees. There are thousands of grantees who can point out that their own institutions exercise tight control over their expenditures of NIH funds. But it is a fact that within the medical research community some people think NIH money is about as sacred as Monopoly money. Stories of extravagance abound, and it is worth noting that they are coming to the ears of Congress with increasing frequency.

Microscope tariff. In the last session the House adopted a bill to restore electron microscopes to the tariff list. The measure failed to clear the Senate, not because of opposition but because of the session-end rush to get home. The bill, which is aimed at protecting American manufacturers who claim they are hurt by foreign imports, will be re-

introduced in this session. On a \$30,000 instrument, the tariff would be approximately \$7000.

Arms control agency. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is close to having expended the \$10 million that was authorized it in its establishing act. It now requires legislation for additional funds as well as a specific appropriation of the funds. It is expected that the agency will request that it be given an open-end authorization, so that it will not have to seek new legislation to obtain money. The budget request for the agency in the coming fiscal year is believed to be considerably above \$10 million. Favorable congressional reaction to this request would be a useful tonic for the agency, which has been very much afflicted by what it considers to be latent congressional hostility. Just where any effective hostility exists is difficult to see, but the agency seems to devote a large amount of energy to its fears of Capitol Hill.

Civil defense. In the last session Congress gutted Kennedy's civil defense program, with scarcely a sign of protest from the administration. It altogether eliminated a request for \$460 million to construct community shelters in non-profit educational and health and welfare institutions. It also cut \$161 million

from a \$286 million request for the marking and stocking of shelters, for communication and warning systems, and for fallout monitoring equipment and research.

Technically, the \$460 million was refused because the House Armed Services Committee never got around to holding hearings on the bill authorizing the construction program. The fact that the bill failed to come up is related, however, to Congress's longstanding distaste for civil defense. Should that distaste decline, perhaps because of fears raised by the Cuban crisis, the administration will still have to cope with Representative Albert Thomas, the Texas Democrat who chairs the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee. The subcommittee, which passes on civil defense money requests, has traditionally been opposed to an expanded civil defense program. Thomas has never broadcast his reasons for this position, but it appears that he doubts that civil defense makes much sense in an era of big bombs. It can be argued that some civil defense is better than no civil defense, however big the bombs may be, but Thomas, as administration lobbyists discovered in the last session, is not easily persuaded.

—D. S. GREENBERG

U.S.-Soviet Exchange: Basic Premise Is Close Assay on Golden Rule

The formal exchange program between the United States and the Soviet Union, now entering its sixth year as a modest testimonial to coexistence, continues to operate on strict terms of quid pro quo.

A new exchange agreement for 1962 and 1963, signed last March, follows the form of two previous agreements in being a comprehensive arrangement covering a wide range of fields, from science, technology, and education to the performing arts and athletics. The latter sorts of exchanges, such as those involving Benny Goodman, the Bolshoi Ballet, and basketball teams, have attracted the greatest public notice, but subsidiary agreements have been negotiated under nearly a dozen separate headings. On the American side, pri-

vate organizations or quasi-official bodies have cooperated with federal agencies by giving advice and, in several cases, by sponsoring and actually making arrangements for the exchanges.

The agreement on the exchange of scientists, for example, is carried out under a separate agreement between the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and the Soviet Academy of Sciences. For the United States, the American Council of Learned Societies arranges exchanges of scholars in the humanities and social sciences; the private Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants coordinates the exchange of graduate students; and the Public Health Service and several of the National Institutes of Health administer