troubled the members of the movement since the beginning, and that many members regard it as a properly open question.

The information movement was pioneered by two groups established in 1958, the St. Louis Citizens Committee for Nuclear Information (CNI) and, in New York, the Scientists Committee for Radiation Information (SCRI), which, as the names suggest, were at the outset primarily concerned with hazards involved in the uses, particularly the military uses, of nuclear energy. Later groups have modeled themselves on the original committees and have in the main followed their lead by dealing with the effects of radiation, particularly those of strontium-90 and iodine-131 in fallout.

As prototypes, the two original groups differ in that New York's SCRI includes only scientists among its 40 active members, while CNI in St. Louis welcomes laymen. The nonscientists among CNI's 650 members not only contribute through membership fees and by unburdening scientists of routine tasks but also provide closer links to the community.

Most groups stress their speakers' bureaus which perform the primary function of bringing the scientist and the citizen face to face. All make efforts to provide advice on technical questions to newsmen and public officials. St. Louis has its "baby tooth survey," a collection of thousands of deciduous teeth for radiation analysis, and the Western Montana Scientists Committee for Radiation Information, in Missoula, is seeking funds to finance an antler study.

Concern over radiation in peace and war has moved many groups to prepare information on the effects of nuclear weapons and, particularly in the period of debate over civil defense during the summer of 1961, to contribute technical data relevant to the shelter controversy.

Editors of the chief publication of the information movement, *Nuclear Information*, published by the St. Louis committee, are devoting a series of issues to nuclear war and civil defense.

At least one new group became a subject of controversy when either the members or the public failed to make a clear distinction between the group's giving information on civil defense and opposing it, but the members of the group feel they have weathered the storm that blew up.

The movement's interest in radiation has been broadening to include hazards involved in the industrial uses of nuclear energy and such older problems as hazards caused by improperly shielded diagnostic x-ray machines.

At the conference in New York there appeared to be general agreement that the information movement should address itself to a wider range of problems in which education of the public on scientific matters could result in better public policy decisions—for example, on air and water pollution, fluoridation, transportation problems, and uses of pesticides.

There is no doubt, however, that the main motivation of those now active in the information movement is the threat of nuclear war. Many at the meeting obviously agreed with the participant who stated his views as "disarm or die." In fact, many of the individual members of information groups who feel that scientists are morally obligated to express their own opinions on which policy choices should be made, do in fact say what they think about, for example, a test ban or disarmament when they are speaking to audiences.

A working rule favored by the senior organizations seems to be that the information groups should never as a group take a position on political or ethical questions, but that members of the group may provide both information and personal opinion so long as the opinion is clearly labeled. To guarantee the integrity of the scientific information, it is felt, a scientist in the movement should be willing to publish what he says and have it subjected to review and criticism by other scientists.

The unanimity of the vote on conference questions at the end of the tightly scheduled and smoothly run conference was probably assured by the careful way in which participants were invited from among those who returned questionnaires. That unanimity to some extent conceals the tension, which appears to be built into the information movement, on the question of whether the scientists should actively persuade as well as inform.

New Board

The new institute board is made up both of persons of general prominence and of energetic younger scientists—most of them in the biomedical fields—who have been active in the movement. Its members are as follows.

Nathan E. Cohen (Western Reserve); James P. Dixon, Jr. (Antioch); Theodosius Dobzhansky, Rene Jules Dubos, Ludwig Edelstein, and Edward L. Tatum (Rockefeller Institute); Lytt I. Gardner (State University of New York); Hardin B. Jones (California); Margaret Mead (American Museum of Natural History); Russell H. Morgan (Johns Hopkins Hospital); Jason J. Nassau (Case Institute); Warren Weaver (Sloan Foundation); Warner Wells (University of North Carolina).

Barry Commoner and John Fowler (Washington University); Jules Hirsch (Rockefeller Institute); Gerson Lesser (New York University); Jacques Lipetz (Manhattan College); Allen C. Nadler (Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital); E. W. Pfeiffer (Montana State); Halsted R. Holman (Stanford).—JOHN WALSH.

Civil Defense: New Office Seeks Links with Scientific Community

Last year, in a letter to Congress, President Kennedy said that "postponement of practical measures to shield our people from fallout radiation cannot be justified by the inevitable imponderables and the continuing need for a greater research effort." He was not able, however, to assuage the doubts of many segments of Congress, the scientific community, and the public about the soundness of the administration's civil defense plans.

The continued criticism of the technical assumptions underlying the government's program has now been followed by the establishment within the Office of Civil Defense (OCD) of a Directorate for Technical Liaison. Its stated purpose is to "assure that OCD policies, programs, plans and executive actions are fully consistent with and predicated on sound technical and scientific concepts." To the extent that these functions were performed before, responsibility for them was diffused throughout OCD.

The new office, staffed by two engineers with long service in the government's civil defense operations, will try to establish contact with scientists and others throughout the country whose work bears on civil defense problems. The office is headed by Gerald R. Gallagher, Director for Technical Liaison, Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, Washington 25, D.C.—E.L.