of plans for a plastic scale model of a nuclear submarine which gave model enthusiasts and Soviet intelligence a detailed idea of the design and dimensions of one of the nation's prime engineering secrets. Anderson, Senator Henry Jackson, and others have operated over a period of years as an informal senatorial task force to insure that Admiral Rickover be kept in the Navy and on the job as chief of the Bureau of Nuclear Propulsion.

Senator Anderson's interest in such matters as weather modification, with its obvious relevance for New Mexico, has not flagged—last week he led a group of western senators in introducing a bill (S. 1020) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to set up five projects to "increase usable precipitation." Since NASA operates weather satellite systems, Anderson could find new scope for his interest.

Anderson's performance in committee administration during the 2 years he has been chairman of the interior committee may well have significance for the space committee. Anderson felt that the interior committee was overstaffed when he assumed chairmanship in 1960. There were 21 on the staff when he took over and 11 when he left.

Anderson is accustomed to the JCAE, with its technically trained staff members to handle technical questions, and he says he will "try to find the most talented people possible" for his new committee.

The space committee was generally regarded on Capitol Hill as being staffed in the traditional manner, mainly with retainers of the chairman, which in this case meant Lyndon Johnson, the first space committee chairman, and Robert Kerr, the second.

There have been some departures.

On the broader congressional field, Anderson is likely to continue to march in the vanguard of attempts to reform the Senate rules, especially those that arm the filibuster.

Anderson says "the Senate has no ability to control debate or end it. The threat of the filibuster affects legislation. You have to alter the law so it meets the approval of a Senate bloc."

Anderson says he would like to get home to New Mexico more often to see his children and grandchildren, and he feels that the Senate rules needlessly prolong the sessions of Congress. "It's a waste of time," says Anderson, "and hate waste."—JOHN WALSH

Behavioral Sciences: Meeting Reflects Increased Interest in Issues of Public Policy

Though the physical scientists after World War II rapidly became the most active and best known public symbols of the new involvement of science in politics, other scientists too are bending their disciplines and their individual talents to the shape demanded by the nuclear age.

In part because the physical scientists had both a 2½-year lead time and a peculiarly intense burden of guilt imposed on them by their role in the Manhattan Project, their commitment to peace activities has been more direct and less equivocal than that of the behavioral scientists. Much of the growing commitment of the behavioral scientists (whose fields are newer, anyway) has focused on "peace research" within their own disciplines, and because their public pronouncements are therefore more closely related to their professional work than are those of the physicist, the behavioral scientists, even when vocal, have been somewhat less conspicuous. At the same time, the intimate connection between their work and their politics has raised its own problems and has left behavioral scientists vulnerable to attack for "biased research," whereas the physicist is generally immune.

Despite the problems, though, behavioral scientists are today much concerned with defining a role for themselves in maintaining peace, and they have begun to organize to perform one. The national associations for anthropology, orthopsychiatry, psychology, and sociology, together with more general organizations such as the AAAS and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, all now have activities in this field. The American Orthopsychiatric Association last week devoted a full day of its annual meeting to discussing the role of behavioral sciences in human survival, and listened both to researchers and to politicians telling them how to make their influence felt in higher places.

In mobilizing their national scholarly organizations, the behavioral sciences have taken a turn which the physical sciences did not. The physical and chemical societies have remained strictly aloof from politics, freeing themselves from the complicating tax problems that arise from lobbying activities and leaving their interested members to organize themselves extramurally into political action groups. This they have done most successfully in the Federation of American Scientists, and it is in part their success and their tendency to exclusiveness that has forced the behavioral scientists into other channels. FAS has lately been inviting membership from the behavioral and social sciences, but the bulk of its members are still physical scientists. Other groups which have faded and bloomed more recently—Scientists on Survival and the new Scientist's Institute of Public Information (Science, 22 Feb.)—have been organized jointly by scientists from several disciplines. But for the most part, communication between disciplines has been difficult, the efforts have been separate ones and the behavioral scientists have been relatively less effective.

One reason for this is that there are far fewer demands for behavioral scientists to serve in government, particularly in the high-level and critical areas of national security. This leaves them babes in the political woods and gives their pronouncements less authority. Behavioral scientists did serve in the government in large numbers during World War II, and their numbers in government are growing again, especially in new organizations such as the Peace Corps, but their influence does not extend to the higher levels of the government's scientific establishment.

Then, too, the behavioral scientists' knowledge seems only peripherally related to the central questions of nuclear testing, or of new weapons systems. Although their knowledge of human behavior may in fact be critical, they have found no way to infuse it into the crucial decisions of the government. In other words, though war may be made "in the minds of men," as the UNESCO charter maintains, the behavioral scientists have not been able to tell the politicians how it is made there, or what we can do to unmake it.

The political birth of the behavioral sciences thus faces many complications: they are seeking to contribute not only by separate political action but in their role as researchers, and they are seeking increasingly to contribute to the actual processes of government, as the physical scientists do, as well as to the political debate. The hazards they face in these efforts will be both professional and personal.—ELINOR LANGER