

Engineering Company, and two professors of nuclear engineering. Other members include two economists, a geophysicist, a sociologist, a zoologist, a radiation biologist, an environmental lawyer, and the head of Caltech's division of engineering and applied science. Apparently the only committee member well known to critics of nuclear power as being actively and vocally on their side is John P. Holdren, who is an associate professor of energy and natural resources at the University of California at Berkeley and one of the signers of a recent statement presented to the National Council of Churches opposing "the pluto-

onium economy" and recommending that the resources now devoted to nuclear power be diverted to "safer and more constructive channels."

In announcing the study, Handler said, "We are aware of the polarization of attitudes on nuclear energy among the public and in the scientific community as well. Accordingly, [the committee that] has been selected not only contains a broad range of competence but also represents the full spectrum of opinion surrounding this controversial issue." He added that, in January, the committee will hold public meetings in five cities—San Francisco,

Denver, Minneapolis, New York, and Atlanta—to receive "essential input from interested groups and citizens." A preliminary report will be made to ERDA in December 1976 and the final report will be issued by 30 June 1977.

*Science* reporters asked several leading nuclear critics—Nader, J. G. Speth of the National Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Dan Ford of the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), and Dean Abrahamson (a University of Minnesota professor of public affairs who was a prime mover in the preparation of the petition to the National Council of Churches)—for

## Briefing

---

### Hope Slim for Sakharov Nobel Trip

---

Since late October, after the first news that the Soviet government had denied dissident physicist Andrei D. Sakharov permission to go to Oslo, Norway, on 10 December to accept the Nobel peace prize, a number of prominent scientists have protested the denial—but so far to no avail. It is still too soon to guess whether the Soviet leadership will reverse its initial decision—as it has done sometimes in the past.

Sakharov has told Western visitors that he had asked for permission to go to Norway and for assurances he would be allowed to return to the Soviet Union, in keeping with his long-standing aim of remaining a critic of Soviet repression from within that country's borders. However, at some level in the government—it is not clear where—his request has been denied. The issue is particularly noteworthy to Western observers since the Soviet Union earlier this year signed the Helsinki Accords, which are interpreted in the West as pledging the Soviets to show greater respects for human rights, such as the freedom to travel.

On 12 November, 35 American Nobel prizewinners—some of whom don't often sign their names to political statements—addressed a petition to Soviet leaders urging them to allow Sakharov to go. Signers included Luis W. Alvarez, John Bardeen, Murray Gell-Mann, Glenn T. Seaborg, and Eugene P. Wigner, among others. Protests have also been sent by the International League for the Rights of Man and the Federation of American Scientists. Both groups urge those wishing to protest, in

the closing days before the award is given, to address statements to Soviet Ambassador Anatoliy F. Dobrynin, in Washington.\*

At present, hope is slim that Sakharov will be allowed to go. On the other hand, the Soviet bureaucracy is certainly capable of abrupt changes in policy. In fact, for many months, it denied Sakharov's wife, Yelena Bonner, permission to go abroad for an eye operation, but then it reversed that decision after protests from Western scientists, organizations, and political leaders.

—D.S.

\*Embassy of the U.S.S.R., 1115 16th St. NW, Washington D.C. 20036.

### Rumsfeld No Friend to Arms Control Scientists

---

Donald Rumsfeld, the former naval aviator whom the Senate confirmed last month as Secretary of Defense, is even less likely than his predecessor to listen sympathetically to the arms control lobby and its allies in the scientific community. While counselor to President Nixon, Rumsfeld enthusiastically supported the attack on certain arms control scientists by the Operations Research Society of America.

ORSA's vituperative criticism—it went beyond technical points of disagreement to impugn professional behavior—focused on the congressional testimony given by George W. Rathjens, Steven Weinberg, and Jerome B. Wiesner against the now much reduced and soon to be mothballed ABM system, a project then being pushed hard by the Nixon Administration (*Science*, 15 October 1971). Rumsfeld wrote to the then president of ORSA, Robert

Machol of Northwestern University, in terms considerably more fervent than demanded by a mere thanks-for-hitting-our-critics letter. He had discussed the ORSA critique personally with the President, he told Machol. Indeed, he had heard Admiral Zumwalt himself discuss the work of the society in a most favorable way. "All in all, I would say," Rumsfeld continued, "that you and the Society have performed a magnificent service. . . ." Since this tribute presumably sounded insufficiently hyperbolic the counselor to the President added the encomium that "To me the action by your Society, and certainly by you personally, is the kind of incremental act of leadership and good sense that makes this such a wonderful country."—N.W.

### Sociologists of Science Get Organized

---

How scientists go about their business is a matter of such interest to sociologists that there has grown up a thriving young specialty in the subject. Sociologists of science have now undergone that crucial *rite de passage* in a discipline's struggle for acceptance, the transformation from a coterie of like-minded colleagues into a fully fledged learned society. The Society for Social Studies of Science, whose debut was announced in August this year, already has 120 members. (Those wishing to join should apply to Robert McGinnis, SSSS, SASS/Department of Sociology, 323 Uris Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853.)

Several of the leading members of the society are pupils of Robert K. Mer-

comment on the study. Without exception, they regarded the committee as conspicuously unbalanced in makeup and as unlikely to accomplish the declared aim of clarifying the nuclear issues.

"It's been set up to justify proceeding with nuclear power," said Abrahamson, who added that ERDA, the study's sponsor, is still essentially the "AEC, despite what people say." Speth spoke similarly, "If I had to characterize it, what we are seeing is the industrial establishment of the country organizing for an attack on the nuclear critics," he said. Technical people associated with the "public interest commu-

nity," which is comprised of organizations such as NRDC, UCS, and Nader's Public Interest Research Group, simply were not represented on the committee at all, Speth observed.

Furthermore, he said, except for John Holdren, none of the 66 signers of the petition to the National Council of Churches was named to the committee—and this despite the fact that, among the petitioners, there were 26 members the National Academy itself (14 of whom also were Nobel laureates). In Speth's view, the Academy's "lack of credibility" on the nuclear issue is demonstrated both by the

makeup of the committee and by Handler's "about-face" early this year on the breeder reactor and the use of plutonium.

This last refers to an episode which Handler, though confessing to some embarrassment about it, says points up the wisdom of excluding from the study committee such publicly committed advocates as Nader and Abrahamson. September a year ago, Handler, in a lengthy formal speech "On the State of Man," addressed the hazards that would be posed by an all-out commitment to the breeder reactor as the world's primary source of energy. Evoking a "worst case" scenario in which

---

## Briefing

ton of Columbia University, one of the founding fathers of the subject in the United States. The society also includes historians of science such as Derek Price of Yale and Arnold Thackray of the University of Pennsylvania. Merton is the society's president, and its first benefactor is Eugene Garfield, president of the Institute for Scientific Information, a profit-making organization on which sociologists of science depend for certain raw data, such as that to do with citation analysis.

The studies emerging from use of the citation analysis technique (*Science*, 2 May) afford one of the most obvious examples of how the new discipline promises, or threatens, to influence the conduct of its object of study.—N.W.

---

## Knowledge 2000

The federal government's chief effort at hooking science up to the Bicentennial was announced in the Capitol the other day. It's called Project: Knowledge 2000, and will be a series of three 3-day symposia on the need for, generation of, and communication of knowledge. The \$736,000 project was conceived of and largely funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF); the Xerox Corporation will feed, board, and provide an estimated \$250,000 worth of sophisticated communications facilities for the crowd at its training center in Leesburg, Virginia.

Two senators lent their presence to the announcement—Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), chairman of the authorization subcommittee for NSF, and Lowell Weicker, Republican from Xerox's home state of Connecticut. Weicker

said he was not enthusiastic about most Bicentennial projects—"too much steel and concrete"—but he really likes this one because the results are to be disseminated around the country to educate and provoke discussion within the body politic.

Everyone has high hopes that the symposia, to be conducted by leaders and heavy thinkers from all major segments of society, will have a lasting impact via the videotapes and teaching materials that are to be distilled therefrom. Jacob Goldman, chief scientist at Xerox, said these were the greatest-sounding symposia he'd seen, and he'd seen a lot. A spokesman from the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, which is kicking in \$150,000, said the project was "one of the jewels in the crown of the Horizons program" (the Bicentennial is divided into Heritage, Festival, and Horizons).

There is no official word as yet on who the star panelists will be—each forum will have a core of 12—but active participation by foreigners is promised. The meetings are scheduled for January, April, and June.—C.H.

---

## Psychiatrist is New Head of Institute of Medicine

David A. Hamburg, whose appointment as the third president of the Institute of Medicine (IOM) was announced earlier this fall, is characterized by Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, as a "quite profound scholar" who has exhibited a strong and "growing concern with the manner in which medical care is brought to the American people."

Hamburg comes to the IOM from the Stanford University School of Medicine, where he was the Reed-Hodgson professor of human biology and professor of psychiatry, specializing in the biological aspects of emotional stress and aggressive behavior. He was for 11 years chairman of the psychiatry department at Stanford and led in developing it into a nationally recognized center for scientific inquiry into psychiatric problems.

Hamburg was the last to know he was IOM's first choice to replace Donald S. Fredrickson (who left last July to become director of the National Institutes of Health), for he spent most of last summer racing around Africa negotiating the release of four Stanford students who had been kidnapped from the Gombe Stream Research Centre in Tanzania. Hamburg has done research at the center, which until the kidnappings was partially supported by the Stanford Laboratory of Stress and Conflict.

The IOM, which was started in 1971, has had difficulty keeping its presidents. The first, John R. Hogness, left after 3½ years to return to the University of Washington; Fredrickson moved on after a year. Hamburg says he intends to stick out the full 5-year term. His wife, Beatrix Hamburg, also a psychiatry professor at Stanford, will be coming along too, to work on problems of early adolescence at the National Institute for Mental Health (NIMH).

Hamburg, 50, comes from Evansville, Indiana, and got his medical degree at Indiana University. He did his residency at Yale and at Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago. He has already worked in Washington, first at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and later as chief of the Adult Psychiatry Branch at NIMH.—C.H.