# Sir John Cockcroft Dies at 70

Sir John Cockcroft, a leading pioneer in nuclear research and a Nobel Prize winner, died 18 September in Cambridge, England. His long and brilliant career began in 1924 when he worked under Lord Rutherford at the Cavendish Laboratory. Later he worked with Russian physicist P. Kapitza on the production of intense magnetic fields and the generation of low temperatures. After this he turned to nuclear physics and joined Ernest T. Walton in developing an ion accelerator. Their collaboration in 1932 resulted in the first proton-induced artificial disintegrations. Cockcroft and Walton both received Nobel Prizes in 1951 for this work. In 1939 Cockcroft accepted the wartime post of assistant director of scientific research in the Ministry of Supply and devoted his time to the development of a radar defense system. In 1940, as a member of the Tizzard Mission, he came to the United States to discuss military-related scientific cooperation between the two countries, returning the same year to England to take up the position of head of the Air Defence Research and Development Establishment. In 1944 he was appointed head of the Canadian Atomic Energy Project and director of the Montreal and Chalk River Laboratories. Returning to England again in 1946 he became director of the Atomic Energy Research Establishment at Harwell, receiving the Atoms for Peace Award in 1951. In 1954 Cockcroft was appointed a research member of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority and remained a full-time member of the agency for 5 years. From 1961–65 he was chancellor of the Australian National University, Canberra. At his death, at the age of 70, Cockcroft held the positions of president of the Manchester College of Science and Technology, part-time member of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority and Master of Churchill College, Cambridge.—G.P.

Sir John Cockcroft

sometimes compromise a scholar's judgment. Yet, strict abstention from politics and policy making is not the answer. The committee noted not only that many political scientists believe that observing government from the inside is good research practice but also that "professionals" and "intellectuals in general" have "special responsibilities" to contribute to public understanding.

The committee urged that scholars openly acknowledge their sources of financial support, but indicated that most issues of ethics could merely be raised, not conclusively resolved. It made a few initial recommendations and will continue its studies, preparatory to issuing a final report at next year's meeting.

Interestingly, there was no real debate on the substance of the report. Critics of the Kirkpatrick-Kampelman ties with OPR contended that the issue of CIA involvement could be divorced from the grander questions studied by the ethics committee.

The defeat of their resolution deepened some members' disappointment with the proceedings of the APSA meeting. At the business session a number of other policy resolutions were offered. All were rejected. Some fell on the grounds that they involved ethics and should be left to the special committee; others (such as one condemning the House Unamerican Activities Committee's subpoenaing of membership lists of student organizations) failed because the APSA is prohibited by its own constitution from taking stands on "political" matters.

The day after the business meeting, 50 members responded to an informal invitation to discuss the possibilities of a "radical political science." The idea for the meeting did not spring from the defeats of the previous day; in fact, the notice announcing the discussion was posted well before the business session. But demonstrated impotence undoubtedly helped stimulate interest. The first "radical" meeting led to two others, and by the time the convention closed on Saturday there was an independent "Caucus for a New Political Science" with a 13-member steering committee and a mailing list of about 200.

The caucus' fundamental complaint is that the association at large has a built-in "establishment" bias. This perspective naturally leads, it was charged, to distortions in the conduct of the annual meeting and—just as importantly—in research and writing. This year's meeting, for example, had no formal discussion on Vietnam, and the caucus passed a resolution urging that both a full day of panels and a plenary session be devoted to the war at the next annual meeting.

The future shape or significance of the caucus is uncertain. It started off by saying some angry things, but decided immediately that it would remain within the APSA rather than try to become a totally separate, rival organization. Many—but not all, by a long shot—of its members are graduate students, and the interest it generated is not insignificant. No more than 130 people ever attended any one meeting, but, by comparison, only 250 to 350 people came to the business session of the full APSA.

The caucus' steering committee is already preparing for a meeting at the next APSA convention. But what will the independent caucus do? It has so far explored two roles: redirecting the attention of the annual meeting and of political scientists in general, and making the APSA more "activist."

American political scientists have been too preoccupied with "teaching the values and virtues of American democracy," Mark Roeloff, professor of political science at New York University and chairman of the steering committee, told the caucus. There seemed to be a widespread feeling that political scientists had not looked critically at the American system; the sympathetic perspective was neither wrong nor evil in itself, said Roeloff, but it led to "indifference or ignorance of fundamental or organic weaknesses [in American politics]. . . . Vietnam is not a mistake." There was no extended examination of political science's alleged shortcomings, but the thrust of criticism was that