

Humphrey: "The Happy Warrior" Continues His Grim Battle

"We must choose our policies and priorities carefully—yes."—Vice President Humphrey, 23 April 1968

Hubert H. Humphrey's main personal problem is that he has rarely given careful choice to his priorities. The Vice President's main political problem is that he has identified himself, almost haphazardly, with the policies of an unpopular President.

Since he announced his Presidential candidacy in April, Humphrey has found it difficult to articulate how his policies and priorities differ from those of President Johnson. His ambiguity, especially on Vietnam, has meant that many scientists and other voters have refused to openly back the Vice President. Among academic scientists and scholars in other disciplines, there was substantial support for the candidacy of Senator Eugene J. McCarthy. Most of the people supporting McCarthy would, in past years, have lined up automatically for Humphrey in a race against Nixon.*

Attitude of Scientists

In assessing the attitude of scientists toward Humphrey, it is instructive to consider the case of three scientists, all of whom know Humphrey well and all of whom respect his abilities: former Presidential science adviser George B. Kistiakowsky of Harvard, physicist Herbert F. York of the University of California at San Diego, and physiologist Maurice B. Visscher, of the University of Minnesota. In an interview with *Science* last year, Humphrey included Kistiakowsky and York in a list of a half dozen people upon whom he relied most for scientific advice. Visscher has been a friend and supporter of Humphrey's for the past 25 years.

All three actively supported McCarthy. They are, however, just the kind of men who could be expected to give public support to Humphrey against Nixon in a normal election year. At present none of the three is pub-

licly supporting Humphrey or working for him. "I have a great deal of admiration for Humphrey," Kistiakowsky told *Science*, "but I am trying to determine if Humphrey's views will lead to an administration different from President Johnson's. I eagerly read his positions on Vietnam." York said, "Humphrey is one of the most intelligent men in public life, but at the present time it is impossible to disassociate him from Johnson and Daley." Visscher said he could not publicly support Humphrey unless the Vice President broke with President Johnson's position on the Vietnam war.

Numerically, the support of the scientific community doesn't count for much in a Presidential election, although scientists, physicians, and engineers did much useful work for the Johnson-Humphrey ticket in the 1964 campaign. The public support of scientists and other intellectual leaders is mainly of symbolic value to presidential candidates. As one Humphrey aide said, commenting on the unwillingness of scientists like Visscher, York, and Kistiakowsky to endorse Humphrey publicly, "If we can't get people like that to back Humphrey with enthusiasm, who can we get?"

Most of the scientists interviewed by *Science* thought that scientific research and education would flourish in a Humphrey administration. The others thought that it was impossible to tell, because of the Vietnam war and the difficult federal budget situation. None thought that Humphrey would be critical of federal support for research. Presidential science adviser Donald Hornig, who has worked with Humphrey on a variety of scientific activities, comments: "I have no doubt that Mr. Humphrey would give problems of research his real positive concern; what's more, he understands them."

Whatever they think about Humphrey's personality and politics, many scientists who know Humphrey think he is better acquainted with science policy questions than any other man who has sought the Presidency. More-

over, his activities in this field are a matter of public record; it is much easier to assess his views on science-related questions than those, for instance, of the other major contenders.

As Vice President, Humphrey chaired two federal science-related councils, one on marine sciences and the other on space. According to members of the councils, he was a regular attendee at the meetings, and made his presence felt, especially in the area of the marine sciences. (An article on Humphrey's scientific role appeared in *Science* on 27 February 1967.) The executive secretary for the Marine Science Council, Edward Wenk, Jr., the assistant on whom Humphrey perhaps relies most for scientific advice, comments: "There was no case where we asked for the Vice President's backing in the marine sciences area where he failed to give it." National Academy of Sciences president Frederick Seitz comments that, on several occasions, Humphrey sought out Academy experts on marine sciences and space for discussions. Before his presidential campaign forced him to divert his attention to more pressing matters, Humphrey told *Science* that he spent more time on marine sciences and space than on any other assignments.

Interested in Research

Those who have worked with Humphrey describe him as a "people-oriented" man who is interested in scientific research primarily because of what it can do for social welfare. Hornig comments that Humphrey is "very much interested in what science can do for people but understands the importance of basic research which is unfettered."

In the spending of money for scientific research, associates indicate that Humphrey is interested in a more equitable geographical distribution of expenditure throughout the country. They also anticipate greater attention to marine sciences, social sciences, science applied to social problems, and family planning programs. There is no expectation that Humphrey, as President, would lower the space budget, and it is thought that he would support the expenditure necessary to build the 200-GeV accelerator at Weston, Illinois.

Although it is impossible to tell who Humphrey would appoint as his Presidential science adviser, the name of M.I.T. Provost Jerome B. Wiesner is mentioned most often in talks with

* This is the first article in a series which *Science* will publish on the Presidential candidates.

Humphrey associates. Wiesner, who served as science adviser for President Kennedy and, briefly, for President Johnson, is heading up the science policy study group for Humphrey and has been active in working to persuade scientists to back Humphrey. When asked whether he would take the presidential science adviser position in a Humphrey administration, Wiesner replied that he was busy at M.I.T., but he did not absolutely rule out the possibility.

As President, one Humphrey priority in the science field would be a greater centralization and strengthening of existing science policy machinery. In the late 1950's, Humphrey advocated the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Science and Technology, and there is no reason to believe that he has lost his enthusiasm for the idea. This year he has advocated giving serious consideration to combining the Office of Science and Technology and the Marine Science and Space councils into one body. He has also advocated that consideration be given the idea of upgrading the Federal Council for Science and Technology and having the Vice President chair this group. Humphrey has urged that the membership of the President's Science Advisory Committee be broadened to emphasize the role of technology and the social sciences. He has also advocated the creation of a National Domestic Policy Council, which would have, for domestic affairs, an advisory role similar to that of the National Security Council. He has said that a board for giving greater attention to ecological questions could be created under this council.

One of Humphrey's main interests in science is the utilization of scientists to further international cooperation, including that with the Communist countries. In a major foreign policy speech delivered in San Francisco in July, Humphrey said that reconciliation with the Communist countries was the "top priority for American foreign policy in the next decade." In that speech, he said that he favored early U.S.-Soviet agreement to freeze and reduce offensive and defensive strategic armaments, accelerated technological interchange between nations, and coordination of U.S. and Soviet post-lunar manned space exploration.

In another San Francisco speech, on 26 September, Humphrey argued that "the United States cannot play the role of global gendarme." He called for "an end to nuclear testing under adequate safeguards" and "the control of chemi-

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **GERMAN RESPONSE:** The German government has agreed in principle to help build the new European 300-Gev accelerator. A letter from the West German Minister for Scientific Research, G. Stoltenberg, says his government feels that preliminary work on the project should go ahead, including selection of a site, but indicates that Germany will insist that matters of cost and design be clarified. Austria, Belgium, France, and Italy already have gone on record as supporting the new high energy physics laboratory program of the European Organization for Nuclear Research.

● **AMA RESEARCH INSTITUTE:** Under a contract signed early in September, the American Medical Association's Institute for Biomedical Research will be moved from the AMA headquarters building in downtown Chicago to a site on the University of Chicago campus. Nobel laureate George W. Beadle, retiring president of the University of Chicago, has been appointed director of the institute (*Science*, 29 December 1967). The AMA plans to erect a new building, costing perhaps \$1 to \$3 million, within 18 months to 2 years.

● **WOMEN AT GEORGETOWN:** Georgetown University, a Jesuit men's school for 179 years, will admit women into its undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences next fall for the first time.

● **NAVY CUTS:** Scientists and engineers are likely to be among those fired as a result of the Navy's nationwide economy program, aimed at cutting 2400 jobs and saving \$12 million in the Navy's 15 nationwide research laboratories. Navy officials say that each laboratory will determine which employees will be affected, and a national computer center will try to match dismissed persons with new jobs in industry and government. The reduction is part of the Defense Department's drive to cut fiscal 1969 expenditures by \$3 billion.

● **PLUTONIUM REGISTRY:** A National Plutonium Registry, which will maintain records of all persons known to be carrying transuranic elements in their bodies, has been established by the Hanford Environmental Health Foundation at the Richland, Washington, Atomic

Energy Commission site. The registry will help to determine, for medical research studies, the pathological changes in persons who have minute quantities of plutonium and other heavy elements in their bodies.

● **EXCHANGE PROGRAM BOARD:**

A number of privately funded joint exchange programs with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union will be coordinated for the first time by a board funded primarily by the Ford Foundation. The International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) has been established by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) and the Social Science Research Council to coordinate exchange programs, which will involve about 200 American, Soviet, and Eastern European scholars in 1969-70. Events in Eastern Europe notwithstanding, the Board will coordinate individual scholar exchanges in the Ford Foundation's East European program, the ACLS 2-year exchange program with the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and a travel grants program sponsored by the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants. The IREX program will cooperate, but not be affiliated with the National Academy of Sciences' Soviet and Eastern European exchange program, which involves about 80 persons in American and foreign exchanges.

● **A-WASTE PLAN PROTEST:** Islanders on the small Italian island of Lampedusa, between Sicily and Tunisia, forced the return of Italian Atomic Energy Agency drillers, who were planning to bury radioactive waste from Italian nuclear power stations on the island. The islanders, who staged a general strike, expressed fears that Lampedusa would be turned into a nuclear waste cemetery.

● **ANTARCTIC MAPS:** A series of two-color topographic maps, which are the most detailed available to date of selected areas in Antarctica, have been published by the Geological Survey in cooperation with the National Science Foundation. The reconnaissance maps are available in two series at scales of 1:250,000 and 1:500,000; each map costs 75 cents. An index to the maps may be requested from the Washington Distribution Section, Geological Survey, 1200 S. Eads St., Arlington, Virginia.

cal, radiological, and biological weapons."

For many years Humphrey has expressed public interest in science-related questions, including that of arms control. His speeches have abounded in phrases like "the madness of the arms race," and many of the scientists who are most sympathetic to Humphrey are those who have been most involved in attempts to obtain arms control agreements. One openly declared Humphrey supporter, physicist Hans A. Bethe of Cornell University, says he is backing Humphrey "very largely for arms control reasons," although he disagrees with the Johnson Administration on Vietnam. Bethe says that "Humphrey has supported arms control measures more than any other prominent politician." Jerome Wiesner says that, in Humphrey, the country would have "for the first time, a President who is really knowledgeable about arms control matters." Wiesner adds that he first came to know Humphrey during the 1950's when he came to M.I.T. to rally support and obtain advice for his arms control work in the Senate.

Work in Arms Control

Humphrey's voice has been heard on arms control problems since 1955 when he became chairman of the Senate's disarmament subcommittee. He led the fight for formation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and for ratification of the atmospheric test-ban treaty for nuclear weapons. During the current campaign he has criticized Nixon for not urging immediate approval of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

Throughout his Senate career Humphrey has identified himself with science-related issues. During the late 1950's he chaired the hearings of a Government Operations subcommittee on problems of science organization—which some scientists believe led to the creation of the Office of Science and Technology and the Clearing House for Federal Scientific and Technical Information. His subcommittee also held hearings on the drug industry and on the misuse of thalidomide; he sponsored legislation which gave the FDA more supervisory powers over the drug industry. He was one of the cosponsors of legislation creating the National Science Foundation, and he has shown an interest in the National Institutes of Health and in the maintenance of NIH appropriations. He has consistently sup-

ported conservation legislation. He has been a long-time battler for federal aid to education, was one of the sponsors of the National Defense Education Act, and has sponsored legislation for assisting education in the health professions and for construction of medical and educational facilities.

In looking back at his work in the Senate, where he served from 1949 to 1965, Humphrey listed the four legislative achievements he had helped author which gave him the most satisfaction: (i) The test-ban treaty of 1963; (ii) the Food for Peace program; (iii) the Peace Corps; and (iv) the Civil Rights Act of 1964. During his final 4 years in the Senate Humphrey served as Democratic Whip, a position in which he earned a good deal of praise.

Humphrey's liberal views on domestic issues seem to be marked by a streak of Western populism which comes naturally from his background. Humphrey, now 57, was born and raised in small towns in South Dakota where he experienced the frequent dust storms and the economic upheaval of the Depression. In his early adult life, he helped his father run the family drug store and received a degree from the Denver College of Pharmacy. He received a B.A. degree from the University of Minnesota in 1939 and an M.A. in political science from Louisiana State University in 1940; he served briefly as a college instructor in Minnesota. He was defeated for mayor in Minneapolis in 1943 but was elected for a 3-year term when he ran for mayor again in 1945. Many of his closest current friends and advisers have been associated with the University of Minnesota.

What personal strengths would Hubert Humphrey bring to the Presidency? First, although his understanding is not always deep, he is knowledgeable about an amazing variety of subjects and has a great capacity and willingness to assimilate new information about highly technical subjects. In Hornig's opinion, Humphrey "sees a broader range of things than most political leaders at his level." Betty Goetz Lall, who served as Humphrey's assistant on disarmament for 6 years, says that Humphrey told her to give him more advanced positions than she thought he would accept and that in those years, Humphrey never disappointed her by refusing to consider new ideas.

Humphrey would also bring a great deal of energy and resilience to the Presidency. The man whom some call

"Hubert the exuberant" seems to find it easy to work 16- or 20-hour days. There has been understandable criticism of Humphrey's "politics of joy" in this tragic year, and Humphrey's optimistic attitude may prevent him from recognizing the full depth of the frustration and anger of parts of the populace. Nonetheless, his natural "bounce" would help him survive the crushing demands of the Presidency. Hornig commented in an interview that Humphrey's presence gave the "governmental scientific machinery the lift that a good coach does a football team." In 1964, Humphrey called his campaign plane "The Happy Warrior," which seemed a particularly appropriate name.

An Unpretentious Man

Although some people dislike Humphrey and his politics at a distance, it is difficult for most people who have personal contact with Humphrey to dislike him. He is an open and gregarious man and is little given to the pretension which affects many politicians.

What personal weaknesses would Humphrey bring to the Presidency? In many ways his defects are inseparable from his strengths. Humphrey is a "super salesman" for many worthwhile programs, but he has thrown himself with equal vigor into selling "products" which have turned out to be unpopular, such as the Vietnam war. One former associate says that Humphrey is a "compulsive political evangelist in foreign affairs when we need a cool analyst. He might be a potential extremist." During Humphrey's February 1966 trip to Asia for President Johnson, some of those who traveled with him were surprised by what they considered to be his over-simplified descriptions of the monolithic nature of Communism and of Communist China. At several points during this trip, he is reported to have grown defensive and angry and made statements to the effect, "Don't tell me about the differences among Communists. I've known them since I fought them in Minneapolis and they're all alike." Within days after these angry exchanges, Humphrey was back in Washington calmly echoing the professorial phrase "containment without isolation" as his policy toward Communist China.

Although many people view Humphrey as a brash and over-confident man, others say that a more real problem for him may be a lack of real self-confidence. If Humphrey were really

confident of the wisdom of his words, they say he could perhaps end his speeches in a half hour instead of rambling on forever. If Humphrey really were confident of where he wanted

to go, perhaps he would have had more success in shaping up a disciplined staff. If Humphrey had really thought a lot about where he stood, perhaps he would be less prone to pay

so much attention to the last person to whom he listened, and perhaps he could have withstood the temptation to embrace Governor Lester Maddox on his trip to Georgia in 1966. In Win-

Committee of Scientists and Engineers Will Back Nixon

A 19-man organizing committee of scientists, engineers, academicians, and administrators has been formed to support the election campaign of Republicans Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew. The committee, which was put together by Rear Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, USNR (Ret.), former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), is heavily weighted with nuclear energy specialists who have served in various capacities with the AEC, the Manhattan atomic bomb project, the Defense Department, and other military agencies. Five of the committee's members, including Strauss, were active in organizing support groups for the Goldwater-Miller ticket in 1964. The committee includes one Nobel Prize winner, Willard F. Libby, who is professor of chemistry at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), and a former AEC Commissioner.

Besides Strauss and Libby, the committee includes Edward Teller, professor of physics at large at the University of California and associate director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory; Lieutenant General Leslie R. Groves, USA (Ret.), former head of the Manhattan project; Henry Eyring, professor of chemistry and former dean of the graduate school at the University of Utah; Joseph Kaplan, professor of physics at UCLA and former chairman of the U.S. National Committee for the IGY; T. Keith Glennan, former president of Associated Universities Inc., the consortium that runs the Brookhaven National Laboratory, and currently assistant to the chairman of the Urban Coalition; Charles Allen Thomas, former president and chairman of the Monsanto Company; John H. Lawrence, professor of medical physics at the University of California's Berkeley campus and director of the Donner Laboratory; W. Kenneth Davis, vice-president of San Francisco-based Bechtel Corporation and former president of the Atomic Industrial Forum.

Also, Shields Warren, professor of pathology emeritus at Harvard Medical School; Jesse C. Johnson, consulting geologist, Washington, D.C., and former director of AEC's division of raw materials; Stafford L. Warren, professor of biophysics emeritus at UCLA and founding dean of the UCLA School of Medicine; Major General Harry C. Ingles, USA (Ret.), former chief signal officer for the U.S. Army; Major General Kenneth D. Nichols, USA (Ret.), former general manager for the AEC; Karl A. Wittfogel, professor emeritus of Chinese history at the University of Washington; Lieutenant General Elwood R. Quesada, USAF (Ret.), former administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; Mervin J. Kelly, former president and chairman of Bell Telephone Laboratories; and Ralph C. Hahn, consulting engineer in Springfield, Illinois.

Strauss told *Science* that Nixon contacted him in mid-

August, about a week after the Republican convention, and asked him to form the support group. Strauss said he then "got on the phone and called people I knew—that's why some of these men have similar backgrounds with AEC or the Manhattan district." Judging from biographies published in recent editions of *Who's Who* and *American Men of Science*, at least 16 of the 19 men have served in some capacity, direct or advisory, with the AEC, the Manhattan project, or various defense agencies.

Strauss played a similar role for Goldwater in 1964, when he headed up a Goldwater Task Force on Science, Space, and the Atom. Three other members of Goldwater's task force are also on Nixon's committee—Libby, Teller, and Shields Warren. Another member of the Nixon committee, General Nichols, was a charter member of the 1964 Scientists and Engineers for Goldwater organization.

The Nixon group has been given no official title and will apparently not be called "Scientists and Engineers for Nixon," the usual form of title in recent campaigns. It is simply described as "an organizing group of citizens concerned with the relationships of science and engineering to private enterprise and the government." Strauss says the usual title was ignored because it is "hackneyed" and because the Nixon committee includes administrators and academicians as well as scientists and engineers.

The press release announcing formation of the Strauss committee indicates that the group's chief campaign theme will be that the Johnson-Humphrey administration is responsible for a "depressed state of the support of research in many institutions" in contrast with the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, which encompassed "eight years of scientific growth and productive cooperation with universities and private industry."

What role the Nixon support committee will play is not completely clear at this stage of the campaign. The press release says Strauss's organizing group is at present enlisting a nationwide committee to "advocate the election" of Nixon and Agnew and to "advise" them on the technical aspects of public issues. But the advocacy may not be especially vigorous. Strauss told *Science* the group has no plans to raise money or place advertisements unless the Nixon campaign managers decide such action would be desirable. Strauss said his group has two main purposes: (i) "to demonstrate to the public that eminent men of science respect the Republican candidates," and (ii) to provide the candidates with technical advice and position papers. Some observers suggest the committee's main function is defensive; that is, if Humphrey comes out with a group of eminent scientific supporters, as expected, Nixon can say he, too, has support in the scientific and intellectual communities.—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

throp Griffin's *Humphrey: A Candid Biography* (the most informative book on Humphrey yet to appear), Humphrey is quoted as saying that politics is "like running a drug store. When people come in, you've got to do something for them."

In his book, Griffin says that one of Humphrey's "most appealing characteristics—his love of people—would in one sense be a Presidential weakness. Humphrey is almost incapable of saying 'No' to the request of any human being. . . . He would have trouble, as he does now, turning down the marginally important or inconsequential requests for his time and effort."

Humphrey's advocates do not think he deserves all the abuse he has received from the Vietnam dissidents. His supporters think he is still basically the same man that the liberals liked prior to becoming Johnson's Vice President. "Those of us who've known him know he hasn't changed. He's still the same Humphrey," physicist Ralph E. Lapp maintains. Wiesner comments, "I think that the predominant view of the scientific community is that the Vietnam war is a mistake and that we should

get out. I don't think Humphrey disagrees." Wiesner says that he trusts Humphrey's instincts on Vietnam more than either Johnson's or Nixon's.

When voters make the trip to the polling booth, many will be more influenced by what they perceive to be the candidate's "instincts" than by his past record. During the forthcoming month, Hubert Humphrey and his backers will be trying to convince the country that the instincts of the "Old Nixon" are still alive and dangerous and that the pre-LBJ Humphrey has risen again.—BRYCE NELSON

Topeka: Psychiatric Aides Shake Up the Old Order

Topeka, Kansas. In the late 1940's Topeka State Hospital broke with the snake-pit tradition of custodial care of mental patients and became the bellwether of reform for state mental hospitals in the United States. This dramatic change, accomplished with the aid and leadership of the Menninger brothers and the nearby Menninger Foundation, involved a rapid buildup of the hospital's then skimpy patient-care staff by the addition of many psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, therapists, and other mental health workers.

It is ironic, therefore, that many professional and nonprofessional staff people at Topeka State today regard the personnel policies of the hospital and the Kansas mental health system as hopelessly outmoded. In fact, the hospital's personnel problems—problems from which similar institutions in other states are by no means immune—are now acute, partly because a combination of old laws and old attitudes in this politically conservative state have largely frustrated dealings between state officials and militant hospital workers.

The new militancy at Topeka State, which seems too potent to be long put off, derives not only from the outrage of the workers at their low pay and status but also from their desire to have a say in the rules and policies governing their workaday lives. In short, the militancy of these workers,

nearly three-fourths of whom are Negroes, is simply a new manifestation of a pervasive national phenomenon.

Unrest at the hospital attained its present high visibility this past June with a demonstration—a "takeover" of several wards—by some of the psychiatric aides, who make up more than a third of the hospital's 900 employees and are its most numerous class of health worker. In the snake-pit era the aides served principally as orderlies and strong-arm attendants, cleaning up after patients and restraining those who became violent. A significant aspect of reform, however, was to give aides better training and to make them—the people closest to the patient—key members of the treatment team. Karl A. Menninger has expressed the view that the aide, more than any other hospital employee, could "exert a potent and continuous therapeutic influence."

Conflict with Nurses

Although such acknowledgments of the aide's importance have been frequent, his income, usually from \$3000 to \$5000 a year, is close to the poverty level unless he (or she) takes a second job, as many do. Moreover, his career ladder has even fewer rungs now than it had early in the reform period, when senior aides supervised other aides at the hospital-section as well as at ward levels. In time, graduate nurses (of whom the hospital once

had very few) were given the principal supervisory responsibility at the section level. Many aides now regard the nurses as despots whom the hospital administrators, psychiatrists, and other professionals allow, by default, to run the institution.

Moreover, some of the hospital's professionals, especially some of the residents and other younger staff people, agree that the aides are caught in an oppressive system. One of them, William Bronston, a bearded 29-year-old California physician who was in psychiatric residency training until dismissed from the staff last June, was a prime mover last year in reactivating the aides' union, which was first established in the late 1950's but had become dormant. Bronston, clearly a radical, is also credited with stirring up much of the current unrest. The principal reason given by the hospital for firing him was that his true interests were deemed to be in fields other than psychiatry. Coincidentally, Bronston was notified of his dismissal on the very day in June when the more militant aides revolted.

These militants, organized as the Kansas Health Workers Local 1271, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, last May set the stage for a confrontation by submitting a list of 17 "demands" to Robert A. Haines, state director of institutions. Included were demands for a contract, a 35-percent increase in pay, union-approved job specifications, better grievance procedures, and a voice for the union in personnel policies and hospital management.

On 12 June, the deadline the union had set for compliance with its demands, Haines replied. Though agreeing that there is a "marked lack of incentives" for aides, he cited a ruling by the state attorney general to show that the