We can postpone work on the supersonic transport, if it means we can safely sit still in our cities. We can adjust our research and development programs, now running into the billions of dollars, if it allows us to search for purpose and human dignity within our own communities."

On 19 April, in a talk to business and financial executives in Los Angeles, Kennedy expanded on these points. Noting that in California "planes are being built to fly men across oceans in two hours," while "neglect of public transit has trapped the young job-seeker of Watts two hours away from a decent job," Kennedy stated: "Now we are coming to understand that there is a national agenda before us, that we must begin to arrange our national priorities, so that each of us in his own way can help fuse private freedom and public purpose in a new American commonwealth."

Kennedy continued: "We know that with enough public concern and resources, we can build radically new kinds of abilities, to solve awesome problems. That is what we did when we constructed an impregnable defense system. That is what we did when we began our space program. That is what we can do now: by directing government's influence toward new and unsolved problems—in the cleansing of our air and water, in the reconstruction of our urban transportation system, in the development of sources of recreation within our urban center.

"We now spend almost $18 billion on research and development in public funds alone. But we have scarcely begun to put this resource to work within our own concerns. Surely this kind of incentive, offered to the men who are building for defense and space, can also encourage them to build what we need so desperately within our own cities and communities, so that men will walk on the moon—and walk with pride and confidence in the streets of American cities. We are training almost 20,000 Ph.D.'s a year. Surely they can be encouraged—through public incentives—to develop for their companies and their country the keys to better lives for our citizens."

That Kennedy's statement is characterized by airy rhetoric and lack of detail should not be surprising at this early stage of the presidential campaign. Nor, considering that the business community has no great affection for him, should it be surprising that he placed considerable emphasis on the private role in developing technology. But the drift of his thoughts is clear, and they harmonize to a large extent with last week's events in the Senate: the specter of external threat is no longer the dominant force that it was once for determining how the United States shall develop and employ its scientific and technological resources. It is yet to be determined whether domestic needs can underwrite American science and technology as effectively as Communism once did, but it is plain that the old motivation is rapidly declining and that politicians are beginning to grope around for new answers.

—D. S. GREENBERG

Social Science: British Council Has Key Role in Research Support

London. The social sciences have had a late flowering in Britain as compared to their history in the United States, but in 1965 the British, by establishing a government-supported Social Science Research Council (SSRC), did what Americans have so far only talked about doing.

The idea of establishing a separate government organization for the support and coordination of research and education in the social sciences has been in the air in Britain since the end of World War II, but official opinion was doubtless moved to create the council by the so-called boom in the social sciences. In its recently published annual report for 1966–67 the SSRC noted that, in the 5-year period between 1962–63 and 1966–67, the number of full-time students admitted to university social science faculties increased by 62 percent. Last year it was possible to admit only 38 percent of the qualified applicants in social sciences, as compared with 56 percent in applied science and 71 percent in pure science.

What accounts for the boom? Asked to speculate, Michael Young, the SSRC's first chairman and probably Britain's best-known practicing sociologist, suggested that behind it all is a growing acceptance, both by government and by society at large, of the view that the social sciences can be usefully applied to their problems.

Economics was the first of the social sciences to win acceptance in Britain as a useful discipline, and the most influential in changing the climate of opinion. Keynes and Beveridge were public figures of considerable magnitude, and economists held prominent posts in Britain during and after World War II. The exploits of the economists seem to have made other kinds of social scientists think more about public life and public problems. Another spur was the growing influence and affluence of the natural sciences.

The example of the United States has been important. Many British social scientists have spent postgraduate or sabbatical time there. In leading centers of social science research in Britain there is usually at least one person who has had crucial exprience in the U.S.

Young dates the beginning of general public awareness of the social sciences at about 1960. The most obvious sign was the increasing number of British secondary school students opting for the social sciences rather than the natural sciences. The explanation given most widely by the students was that they felt emphasis on the natural sciences had become excessive. At the same time, interest in other social sciences, particularly sociology, was catching up with the interest in economics. The boom of the 1960's, says Young, was created by a "student-propelled demand."

It is in the new universities that the social sciences seem to be blooming most brightly. At Oxford and Cambridge and the older civic universities new disciplines often get limited encouragement. Oxford and Cambridge have had distinguished scholars in the newer social sciences, but teaching in these subjects tends to be ad hoc and

mostly at the graduate level. Cambridge, for example, only last year announced establishment of a chair in sociology, the first at "Oxbridge."

A new and more numerous generation of social scientists is on the scene in Britain. Many have found berths in the expanding universities, and the volume of academic research is rising. British social scientists are reluctant to follow the patterns of the past and to limit themselves largely to "library research" or small projects because of shortages of money and staff. They are thinking in terms of bigger projects. It is a time when the social scientists and the government need each other, and this, of course, is where the SSRC comes in.

Young, whose post as chairman requires him to preside over development of this new relationship, is 52 and a member of the generation of social scientists who made their reputations after World War II and before the boom in the social sciences. Born in Australia, he was trained in economics at the London School of Economics, the main nursery of the social sciences in Britain. He is now a fellow of Churchill College, Cambridge, but he has made his career chiefly outside the universities.

Young is most widely known as the author of *The Rise of the Meritocracy*. The book portrays a 21st-century Britain in which the social revolution has thrown up a ruling elite selected, not by birth or wealth, but by intellectual ability as demonstrated in examinations. The weeding process begins very early in Young's "Meritopia," and the elite proves to be just as self-perpetuating as old-model elites. The book, published in 1958, had a remarkable success and keeps on selling steadily in most major languages, probably because it combines sharp satire with solid sociology.

Ten years after publication, how is Young's social prognosis holding up? Young says he's afraid it is working out too well. Looking backward from its 21st-century vantage point, the book tells of hypothetical unsuccessful attempts to reform the public schools in the 1960's. Actual events have fit the prediction. Similarly, the book gives a hypothetical account of a 20th-century effort to democratize state secondary education through a shift to comprehensive school organization. The current government is uncertain how to press such a reform, says Young. In particular there is reluctance to touch the state direct-grant grammar schools, which Young calls "meritocratic strongholds." What Young believes necessary is "a movement within a movement devoted to extending the comprehensive principle within the comprehensive schools."

Young's concern for education made him a founder and present chairman of the Advisory Center for Education, a nonprofit organization which provides information on educational developments, problems, and opportunities; publishes a consumers' report of the education field; and has recently set up a National Extension College for adults, a prototype of the "open university."

Professionally, Young is probably best known as director of the Institute of Community Studies in Bethnal Green. The institute is located in a London working-class district and has been one of the most productive centers of British research on urban subjects. Young and Peter Willmott wrote the standard work *Family and Kinship in East London.*

Young's SSRC chairmanship is a half-time job in a very full schedule. The job on the council makes him a semi-civil servant, but he works in a tradition different from that of the heads of U.S. research-supporting agencies. James A. Shannon of the National Institutes of Health and Leland Haworth of the National Science Foundation, for example, are scientists turned administrators. What perhaps sets Young apart even more than his uninterrupted practicing of his old trade, however, is the fact that he still

Engineering Academy Elects 50

The National Academy of Engineering has announced the election of 50 new members, bringing total membership in the organization to 237. The new members are:

Charles F. Avila, Boston Edison Company
Edward J. Barlow, Aerospace Corporation
Milo C. Bell, University of Washington
Harvey Brooks, Harvard University
Donald C. Burnham, Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Stanley W. Burriss, Lockheed Aircraft Corporation
Ray W. Clough, University of California, Berkeley
Arthur A. Collins, Collins Radio Company
Ralph E. Cross, Cross Company
Ivan A. Getting, Aerospace Corporation
Robert R. Gilruth, National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Jerrier A. Haddad, International Business Machines Corporation
Lawrence R. Hafstad, General Motors Corporation
William J. Hall, University of Illinois
Stephen M. Jenks, U.S. Steel Corporation (retired)
Wilfrid E. Johnson, Atomic Energy Commission
Woodrow E. Johnson, Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Donald L. Katz, University of Michigan
Percival C. Keith, Hydrocarbon Research Inc. (retired)
Clarence F. Kelly, University of California, Berkeley
John A. Logan, Rose Polytechnic Institute
Benjamin Lustman, Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Wilfred D. MacDonnell, Kelsey-Hayes Company
Kenneth G. McKay, American Telephone and Telegraph Company
William C. Mentzer, United Air Lines
Otto N. Miller, Standard Oil Company
Rene H. Miller, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Eugene F. Murphy, U.S. Veterans Administration
Kenneth D. Nichols, Westinghouse International Atomic Power Company
Daniel E. Noble, Motorola, Inc.
Bruce S. Old, Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Elburt F. Osborn, Pennsylvania State University
Hilliard W. Paige, General Electric Company
Gerald L. Pearson, Stanford University
Maynard L. Pennell, Boeing Company
Eberhardt Rechtin, Department of Defense
Philip N. Ross, Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Will H. Rowand, Babcock and Wilcox Company
Philip C. Rutledge, Mueser Rutledge Wentworth and Johnson
Robert C. Seamans, Jr., National Aeronautics and Space Administration
William R. Sears, Cornell University
Fred N. Severud, Severud-Perrone-Sturm-Conlin-Bandel
Milton C. Shaw, Carnegie-Mellon University
Igor I. Sikorsky, United Aircraft Corporation
Samuel Silver, University of California, Berkeley
Wilbur S. Smith, Wilbur Smith and Associates
Dean A. Watkins, Watkins-Johnson Company
Gabriel O. Wessenauer, Tennessee Valley Authority
Robert M. White, Department of Commerce
Richard H. Wilhelm, Princeton University

continues to be such as activist.

In the United States one of the major blocks to creation of a National Social Science Foundation has been the fear that social science research may have an ideological or partisan taint. Research in the natural sciences may occasionally strike a congressional committee as frivolous, but not as un-American. And there are other hazards. Project Camelot was a kind of social scientists' "Bay of Pigs." In this atmosphere the federal administrator strives for political neutrality.

Young holds known political and social views. As one insider-style newspaper column said last year of him, "He could have been a Labour MP, but chose instead to be a backroom boy, supplying facts and ideas to people too little equipped with either."

But Young seems not to have been the target of much flak from either political or academic quarters. He does admit that "a minor murmuring about a political appointment" has been audible. On the other hand, one civil servant said Young's standing probably bolsters the council's independence.

If Young's public visibility as chairman is higher than an American counterpart's would probably be, the SSRC is certainly no one-man show. The governing council, which may number between 10 and 16, is responsible for making policy and awarding grants, and it has its share of strong-minded members. The council is advised by subject committees organized much like the study sections in research-supporting organizations in the United States.

The SSRC bailiwick is pretty well defined by the names of the original "subject committees"—economics, economic and social statistics (now simply statistics), political science, psychology, social anthropology, and management and industrial relations. In addition there is a separate board to handle educational research, and there is a Committee on the Next Thirty Years, that has interests similar to those of the American Commission on the Year 2000.

The council is less concerned with staying within subject boundaries than with trying to support relevant research which needs to be done. Social and economic history and human geography are now on the eligible list. Projects in criminology and accountancy, for example, could be considered favorably.

A rule the council does stick to is that of not paying the salaries of principal investigators; it pays only the costs of projects, including necessary additional staff. Some critics argue that social science support in Britain has been hampered by the absence of long-term support of major projects. Some suggest that the council should finance permanent SSRC units at universities, on the model of laboratories supported by the Medical Research Council. There are few signs that the SSRC will do this.

The council, however, already contributes to national facilities such as a data bank at the University of Essex. And in the discussion stage are creation of an institute of forecasting studies and a social survey unit on the lines of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan.

So far the funds at the disposal of the SSRC have been modest, but they are increasing fairly rapidly. In 1966–67 the SSRC committed £650,000 for research grants, and in 1967–68 it committed £1.4 million for the support of research. For the same years the number of new postgraduate awards rose rapidly, going from 386 in 1966–67 to 535 in 1967–68. Funds for 901 new postgraduate awards are earmarked for 1968–69, and 120 of these awards are for subjects in which no award has been made in previous years. Council funds have been split more or less evenly between support of research and postgraduate awards in recent years, but it is expected that the proportion of the budget going into research will be increased more rapidly in the future.

In awarding research grants the council tries to decide on the merit of projects, regardless of field. There is a very deliberate effort to treat the social sciences as a whole and, in Young's words, to "avoid feudal empires."

Until now this seems to have worked reasonably well. As a new agency the SSRC has had room to maneuver in respect to both budget and policy. But as the boom in the social sciences breeds increased demands for funds for research and training, it will inevitably be harder to satisfy these demands.

—JOHN WALSH

Senator Harris: A Man Concerned about Research, Poverty, Indians

Oklahoma's Fred Harris, 37, has been in the U.S. Senate for little more than 3 years, but already he has achieved a position of visibility and influence surpassing that of many of his more senior colleagues. The latest indication of his political prominence is the 18 April announcement that he would serve as one of the two leaders (the other is Senator Walter F. Mondale) for Hubert Humphrey's presidential campaign. It is apparent that Humphrey feels that Harris' support is worth a lot to his candidacy and, in view of Harris' vitality and shrewdness, Humphrey's judgment is correct.

At the same time that Harris maintains his firm ties with the Johnson-Humphrey wing of the Democratic party, he remains on cordial terms with the other Democratic candidates. Harris says he has "very close friendships" with the other two Democratic candidates—Senators Robert F. Kennedy and Eugene J. McCarthy—and that any of the three could help "knit the country back together again" if elected President.

In recent weeks, Harris has been widely mentioned as a possible Democratic vice-presidential nominee, especially on a ticket led by Kennedy. Not only has Harris been close to Robert Kennedy in his views on domestic issues, but his very different social and geographical origins would nicely complement Kennedy's. Also, in the case of either Kennedy or McCarthy, the choice of an Administration supporter such as Harris would be a welcome gesture of conciliation to that important portion of the Democratic party which