

Vietnam: AAAS Council Expresses Concern about Effects of Growing Conflict

The Vietnam war and its pressures on federal support for research were the subject of two resolutions adopted last week by the AAAS Council at the association's annual meeting in Berkeley. The Council, which is the parliamentary body of the AAAS, is composed of some 450 members, including the officers of the association and representatives of the association's more than 300 affiliated societies and academies. About half the Council members were present.

The first resolution was introduced by the Committee on Council Affairs, which is the steering committee of the Council; the second, which did not explicitly refer to Vietnam, was introduced by four members of the Stanford University faculty, Leonard Herzenberg, David Hogness, Halsted Holman, and Arthur Kornberg. The texts follow.

For Settlement of Vietnam War

We feel called upon to add our own to the many voices raised in concern for a continuing peace: We commend world leaders here and abroad in their increasing efforts toward negotiation and speedy settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Prolongation of the Vietnamese war, with its increasing danger of universal catastrophe, threatens not only the lives of millions, but the humanitarian values and goals which we are striving to maintain.

Besides this concern which we share with all citizens, we bear a special responsibility as scientists to point out the large costs of war for the continued vigor of scientific research. Like all scholarship, the sciences cannot fully flourish, and may be badly damaged, in a society which gives an increasing share of its resources to military purposes.

Concern for Budgetary Effects

The scientific community is deeply disturbed by the limitations in the federal budget for research in science and health that appear imminent as a result of unexpected budgetary commitments.

At a time when national commitments are growing greater than available resources, there must clearly be some means of assigning priorities to the various objectives on which our resources may be expended. Some difficult choices must be made by the nation as a whole.

As scientists we bear the special responsibility of providing some of the information on which such choices must be based. Particularly relevant is information as to how different allocations of tangible and intellectual resources might affect scientific research. This information must be made available to aid the public and those who bear final responsibility for decisions regarding allocation of the nation's resources.

Be it resolved, therefore, that the Committee on Council Affairs of the AAAS establish a committee to:

1. Investigate the status and consequences of decreased federal support for training and research in the fields of science and health,
2. Inform members of the AAAS on this matter, for example, through the journal *Science*.
3. Consider means of educating the public toward the end that informed decisions on allocation of public funds can be made with an understanding of the alternatives involved and
4. Propose possible actions on this matter which might be taken by the AAAS.

"hardening" of such functions as electric power supply, water supply, and food stocks and stockpiling of medical supplies—not only would require the creation of extensively reorganized governmental apparatus to manage it but also would run counter to main trends in the economy.

In the realm of strategy, Panofsky feels that, under the present conditions of nuclear stalemate between the United States and the Soviet Union, "a large civil defense program would only raise the level of armament on both sides of the iron curtain to a higher level without an increase, and [with] possibly a decrease, in our security."

Owen Chamberlain, a Nobel laureate in physics, speaking on the effect of civil defense on strategic planning, also took the position that a major expansion of civil defense implies an accelera-

tion of the arms race. But he noted at the outset that it would be difficult to make a scientific justification of the statement he was about to make.

With both the United States and the U.S.S.R. depending on a deterrent strategy, said Chamberlain, the citizens of each nation are hostages to the nuclear weapons of the other nation. He viewed civil defense as an attempt to "degrade" the weapons of an adversary, and stated, "anything we do to degrade its weapons, we can be sure the Soviet Union will respond to." If the Soviet Union developed a major civil defense program, he said, the United States would take action to regain its deterrent.

Chamberlain added, however, that, in view of nuclear proliferation, he could envision some kind of agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States for a limited civil defense

program "to forestall nuclear blackmail."

Wigner's topic was the possible effectiveness of civil defense. While he dealt primarily with technical problems, like other panelists he spoke on other facets of civil defense. "As in all technological problems," said Wigner, "the first question which arises concerns the purpose for which we wish to provide the technology. As I see it, the purpose of civil defense is, in the first place, to preserve our peace; that is, to render a war less likely without abandoning the way of life which we usually take for granted. . . . The second purpose is to preserve as many lives and as much means of livelihood as possible, in case neither civil defense nor the other efforts to preserve peace should prove successful."

Wigner gave much of his time to a