

STANFORD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

STANFORD MEDICAL CENTER
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94304

DEPARTMENT OF GENETICS

October 4, 1968

Area Code 415
321-1200

Dr. Sam Nilsson
The Nobel Foundation
Sturegatan 14
114 36 Stockholm, Sweden

Dear ~~Sam~~

I received your letter regarding the Symposium XIV to be held in Stockholm next September only a few days ago and have been giving a very large portion of my thinking to it since then. I am deeply grateful for the opportunity that you give me to comment on the proposed Symposium and write you in the spirit of confidence that you suggest with the knowledge that my remarks may also be shared with Professors Tiselius and Heden whom I have the great pleasure of having some small personal acquaintanship with.

I take the liberty of sending my comments to you while they are still in a somewhat incoherent form in view of the obvious pressure of time. If my remarks are fragmented, I hope they will not be too blatantly self-contradictory.

First of all, let me stress I am extremely enthusiastic about proceeding on the central theme of "with the ultimate goal to explore the best choice of possible alternatives that may secure an acceptable future of mankind".

I also agree tht the Nobel Foundation is in a particularly advantageous, and therefore responsible, position to sponsor such discussions. I assume that if the meeting next September meets with any obvious degree of success that it may be followed by a series and perhaps even a growing program of similar activities. All the more reason to give the most critical consideration to the selection of topics and of participants.

After my first flush of enthusiasm I must admit to having entertained some doubts as to the practical utilities of such a conference. After all,

could anything useful come from mere talk at this stage of history? I then happened in a discussion with my friend Ceppelini from Turin to mention that Ronald Clark had written biographies of the Huxleys and then recently of J. B. S. Haldane. He remarked that Julius Huxley and to some extent Haldane were the "first scientists to be also humanists". One may quarrel with these attributions, but there is enough truth in them to give one cause to think and this certainly helps answer one of the questions about the purposes of such a conference.

It is evident that it should then be scientific, humanistic, universalist in approach. Its main contribution may be in the mere demonstration that these orientations are not mutually inconsistent. Another close friend, David Hamburg, remarked to me that very few physical scientists give any substantial thought to the real problems facing the world and this is certainly not a consequence of lack of good will or good intent. If we could help to strengthen the process whereby the real problems can be framed so that they become more amenable to rational analysis, we need have no further apologies for these kinds of efforts.

The conference will then, in my view, have principally symbolic value, but this is by no means to depreciate its importance. It does suggest certain desirable biases in the choice of its participants. Other things being equal, its members should be already well known to the public and be recognized as particular representatives of their own special disciplines. In many cases it will even be especially desirable that they illustrate the significance of the seemingly most irrelevant sources of scientific and cultural insight towards the fundamental world goals, even survival. It is also very desirable to achieve as widely international a spread as is

realistically possible, and especially not to permit the conference to be grossly overdominated by Americans, and I believe you have steered clear of this in your preliminary selection. I trust you will keep this in mind in adjusting the lists of individual names that I submit which will undoubtedly aggregate far more than you will be able to accommodate. I do feel that it will be difficult to confine your group to thirty, but I wonder if this is not already sufficiently large that you lose most of the intended intimacy that a group of, say, under twenty could achieve and that you could then profitably go to as far as forty or forty-five.

Let me first give you a checklist of names from your original tentative list. Those which I have marked (1) in the first category I note with deep enthusiasm and can only hope that you succeed in bringing them all to the conference. Category (2) are individuals about whom I cannot make such a strong statement, either because I am less well informed or because I might be able to suggest some competitive alternatives, but which I have to regard in any event as very desirable prospective members. Category (3) I simply know nothing about, at least for the purposes of the present symposium. I will have some specific comment to make on some of the others.

Revelle- I have met only relatively recently for the first time and was deeply disappointed at the discrepancy between his private performance and his public reputation.

Bundy - has little to do with science policy, but would undoubtedly be an interesting colleague at the discussion, being so actively involved in so many different projects from the vantage point of the Ford Foundation.

Szent-Gyorgyi would, I believe, be a diversionary element.

Bunche, I believe, will inevitably be taken to be a "Negro" representative, as well as a public figure of considerable importance, despite that connection. I would suggest that if there had to be a choice on this criterion that you would get a much more candid involvement, and a very much more interesting discussion, from Professor Kenneth Clark, a psychologist at the City College of the University of New York City. Clark is almost the only man I can think of who corresponds to the heritage of Martin Luther King in a more academic background.

Lasswell, I am told, is quite tedious these days and you might well find much more interesting alternatives in the area of law.

Koestler is an interesting proposal. Some of my friends know him from his stay at the Center for Behavioral Studies at Stanford a few years ago, and express mixed feelings about him. There is some danger of his going into a rather disruptive mood of the kind evidenced in the closing chapters of "The Sleepwalkers", but he is undoubtedly a very articulate and appealing writer, and if one could assay the spirit with which he approached conference he might be a very great asset. I am a little afraid that his being embedded in large company of scientists may be just the trigger to provoke him into a highly negative mood.

The name of Emily Mudd is very understandably on such a list, but I do have to remark that there are other psychiatrists who are both better known and can possibly speak from a broader vantage point on similar issues. She would undoubtedly be an asset to the meeting, and there is a certain sense in which the universality of a conference so largely dominated by men might be doubted. That might be one reason for me to suggest Barbara Tuchman as a conceivable alternative, representing history, of course, rather than psychiatry.

I will also remark on Lorentz that he may be the best known of the ethologists, but you might well find greater scientific depth in Tinbergen. However, it may be preferable on other grounds to have a German rather than another Briton.

Let me proceed to some more positive suggestions, some of which may be quite unrealistic for various ancillary reasons. Some of these names may also appear on a few of the longer check lists that I also append to this letter. I will not take time to give very extensive identification of names who will be recognizable as authors of recent books, or about whom you should readily be able to obtain additional information. I say this because I might be more persuasive if I could take the time to add a direct note about some of them, but I will leave this to your own resources.

It is fairly self evident that psychiatry and social psychology play a central role in the rectification of human behavior, and the present list is quite weak from this standpoint. Some of the names I would most strongly urge are Jerome D. Frank, Professor at Johns Hopkins - by all means see his book "Sanity and Survival - Psychological Aspects of War and Peace".

Eric Erickson and the British Psychiatrist, John Bowlby.

To pursue the relevance of animal behavior to human problems, there is no one better qualified than Professor Sherwood Washburn of the Department of Anthropology at Berkeley.

I should also emphatically call your attention to the name of A. R. Luria, of the Institute in Defectology of Moscow, who is a very fine and expressive human being and it would be an undoubted delight as well as asset for such a

conference for many different reasons. He is very much the Russian counterpart of Piaget in many of his interests.

While we are on the topic of the other side of the iron curtain, I have to bring up the name of Sakahrov realizing a certain peril in bringing up what might be a sensitive issue in the light of the advance of the last few months. If you have any way of discreetly exploring the feasibility of an approach to him I believe that it would be a great source of inspiration throughout the world to have him appear.

In the field of law, Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas commands the deepest respect among academicians and particularly for the breadth of his interdisciplinary view. Earl Warren, the retiring Chief Justice, may have a bit less to contribute from a narrowly intellectual standpoint, but in view of his own historic role in the development of American law, would be an undoubted asset to this kind of conference. In fact, I prefer to say that the most important precedent that he set during his term as Chief Justice was the establishment of the relevance of social science information as a source of legal insight.

Economics reserves deeper representation than you have in mind at the present time, although of course you have a splendid representative in Robert McNamara - he alone would make the trip utterly worthwhile in my opinion. I do have to stress that economists are precisely the people who wrestle with the problem of the establishment of values in the most realistic terms. Partly for this reason and in view of his other connections and from what

I know of him personally, I would strongly recommend Dr. Kermit Gordon who is now the President of the Brookings Institution in Washington, a very well known economist, and one time U. S. Director of the Budget. I can also recommend to you Dr. Charles Hitch who is now President of the University of California and had served previously as one of McNamara's principal deputies in the Department of Defense. In related fields of sociology, I should suggest to you the names of Daniel P. Moynihan and Daniel Bell. Forgive me for having passed over the name of Kenneth Bolding in the last paragraph or two. Among political scientists I think of Raymond Aron and Seymour Lipset. This area could undoubtedly be expanded very considerably. I should also bring up the names of Jouvenel and Ralf Dahrendorf, particularly as being non-Americans. May I also remind you of the contribution that Levi-Strouss might make if he could succeed in demonstrating that even our advanced industrial societies have some intellectual values if properly appraised.

I believe it would be very advantageous to have some journalists on the roster - the ones I most readily think of are Walter Lipmann and possibly more feasible, James Reston of the New York Times. You might also think of Norman Cousins, the Editor of the Saturday Review. Another political scientist who was represented to me as much more relevant for contemporary discussion than Laswell is called Deutsh.

I can understand why you would veer away from figures too actively involved in public life, but there are some who might very well be very advantageous to have. One is Senator Edward Kennedy, partly because he comes closest in fact to the Kennedy tradition of liberal politics in this country, but

is not now in a highly limelighted position. There are, however, many who believe that he may eventually be an important candidate for the Presidency, and if so the mere opportunity to add to his own education would be a meritorious item. I could also suggest such less central figures as Governor Nelson Rockefeller and Senator Mike Mansfield as very knowledgeable contributors to the central subjects of the conference.

Another name that has been represented to me very seriously is Premier Jomo Kenyatta. You will perhaps realize that Dr. Kenyatta holds a doctorate in Anthropology from London.

I have searched with relatively poor success for the names of excitingly relevant thinkers from other parts of Asia and Africa and then discouraged at the little I have been able to find. I have, however, given the name of Srinivas as an Indian Anthropologist of high and impeccable credentials again well known here from his having spent a year at the Center for Behavioral Study. Let me also bring up some additional names of more miscellaneous character, the sociologist commentator on science, Merton; Professor Adriano Buzatti Traverso from Italy, a Geneticist and Publicist; Dr. Rotblat of Pugwash experience and ~~Bow~~^{et} and Crick as very stimulating people with very profound scientific background.

I also have to add that I think I would be at least as interested to hear Dobzhansky as Waddington on similar themes of the relationship between biology and humanistic ethics and if I may say so Dobzhansky is by far the more engaging speaker.

As another part of my efforts I have put together some work lists from

various sources which are self-explanatory and which I send without further detailed comment for your consideration. I will stress a few names that strike me as being perhaps of the most evident early interest to you. Before I close - and I may also add a postscript - let me also add the names of John Gardner, formerly Secretary of Health Education and Welfare and now a private citizen, but Director of the Urban League and the philosopher called Popper. I must also bring up the name of Dr. Caryl Haskins, now President of the Carnegie Institution of Washington.