rates in the United States were compared to data on the participation in riots, revolutions and the like, both here and abroad, and it was found that the patterns are broadly similar. In both cases, the "underdogs" participate much more widely in violence than the "topdogs." These findings substantiate the view that rates of violence, far from resulting from biological impulse or idiosyncratic propensities, can be explained in terms of the position of people within the social structure of a given society.

It was proposed by Anthony Leeds (Pan-American Union) that war must be approached as if it were merely another social phenomenon, to be understood with the same armamentarium of concepts, the same weaponry of analysis, the same strategy of socio-cultural explanations as any other social phenomenon, and without a priori value positions however much the analyst may personally derogate war. Viewed in this way, war has functions in the social order which include consolidation and redistribution of internal power; consolidation of trends already present in a society, such as industrialization, administrative centralization, or militarism; the establishment of institutions of community coordination and control over the populace with removal of effective opposition; technological innovations; the revitalization of existing norms and values, and the resolution or intensification of old social conflicts. If decisions are made to cope with nuclear war in the assumption that war in general and a qualitatively new kind of war, nuclear war, is undesirable and to be eradicated, then this range of functions must be transferred to other social institutions. These institutions must be multi-functional so as to have a high likelihood of persistence. Such institutions include the family, the state, and the church.

Margaret Mead (New York City) called attention to a basic biological characteristic which man shares with most other animals, the protection of females and the young by the male. In no known human group has this responsibility disappeared. Man's cognitive and imaginative abilities, not shared by other animals, enable 100 million people who never see each other to define themselves as con-specifics, or, on the other hand, enables two adjacent tribes to define each other as prey and predator and spend their time killing each other off. The basic biological ability of humans to live in small groups and protect each other can be extended through the knowledge that all men are in fact interdependent in the modern world scene. All human cultures attempt to ritualize and stylize destructiveness in ways that are reminiscent of the iguanas or stags. This is done through symbolic processes, understanding of which is the daily work of psychoanalysts, who can illuminate why the processes succeed with some individuals and fail in others. The concept that all men are, after all, conspecifics is relatively new. It can be the basis for Rado's suggestion of the human infant as a symbol that as one species all men will take responsibility for all the children of that species.

Several possible models of what a disarmed world might look like were described by Arthur I. Waskow (Peace Research Institute). This, he said, is not only a necessary exercise of scholarship, but a practical political one, of importance in making disarmament more likely. Even a government that wants disarmament and believes that problems of inspection and enforcement have been solved will not take such a step if it has no idea how its conflicts with other states and how the hostilities of its own citizens will be handled. One possible model is a "world under law," with controls vested in a world government, with an appropriate parliament, executive and peace police. The difficulty with this model is that existing conflicts between states are too intense and there is not sufficient agreement on the bases for the legal codes to be followed. Another model is that of "disarmed disorder," in which each nation could attempt to advance its interests and defend its ideology so long as it did not use violence. The main objection here is that nations would not stay disarmed very long. The dilemma is between placing so much emphasis on preserving order that no nation agrees to disarm, and having so little machinery to maintain order that the world cannot be kept disarmed. The dilemma might be resolved by a "world state" which would have a monopoly of legitimate violence, but not the physical power or legal authority to change the social systems of any country. Substitutes for war would have to be invented. Research in this direction can be undertaken at once, and is urgently needed.

Jules H. Masserman (Northwestern University Medical School), in a final critique and integration, concluded that the speakers at this program had shown that aggression is not to be regarded as a mythical, absolute quantity, which must be channeled, directed, turned on or off, discharged or accumulated. It is, rather, a panchrestic term, which does not have the same operational connotation to any two persons or to the same person in two successive transactions. Then, referring to Rado's proposal to adopt the human infant as a universal symbol of peace, Masserman offered a concrete alternative. He suggested that we send to Russia, as soon as possible, large numbers of students, and invite the Russians to reciprocate, in order to broaden mutual education and promote a new and advantageous understanding. Masserman said, "Perhaps, in this way we can help awaken the world out of its current nightmare of violence into a happier day of welfare through sanity."

ALFRED H. RIFKIN
Academy of Psychoanalysis, New York 21

Forthcoming Events

June

23–26. American Soc. of **Mechanical Engineers,** Ithaca, N.Y. (A. B. Conlin, Jr., 345 E. 47 St., New York, N.Y.)

23–28. American Soc. for **Testing and Materials,** 66th annual, Atlantic City, N.J. (ASTM, 1916 Race St., Philadelphia 3, Pa.)

23–30. American Soc. for **Horticultural Science,** Caribbean region, 11th annual, Mexico City, Mexico. (E. H. Casseres, Calle Londres 40, México 6, D.F.)

24–26. American Soc. of **Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning** Engineers, Milwaukee, Wis. (R. C. Cross, 345 E. 47 St., New York 17)

24–26. **Colloids,** 37th natl. symp., Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. (B. R. Ray, Dept. of Chemistry, Washington State Univ., Pullman)

24–26. International **Astrophysical** Symp., 12th, Liége, Belgium. (M. Migeotte, Institut d'Astrophysique, Cointe-Sclessin, Belgium)

25–28. American **Home Economics** Assoc., Kansas City, Mo. (D. S. Miller, 3705 Van Buren Ave., Corvallis, Ore.)

26–27. **Computers and Data Processing,** Estes Park, Colo. (W. H. Eichelberger, Denver Research Inst., Univ. of Denver, Denver 10, Colo.)

26–28. **Wind Effects** on Buildings and Structures, Teddington, Middlesex, England. (Mrs. S. M. Russell, Aerodynamics Div., Natl. Physical Laboratory, Teddington)

26–29. American Assoc. of **Bioanalysts,** annual, Chicago, Ill. (R. Thornburg, 720 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago 11)

26–29. Society of **Nuclear Medicine,** Montreal, Quebec, Canada. (S. N. Turiel, SNM, 333 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago 1, Ill.)

(See issue of 26 April for comprehensive list)