Zak Smith
November 8, 1995

Watson's *The Double Helix* and Jungk's *Brighter Than a Thousand Suns* give two sharply contrasting views of science, and the behavior of scientists. Many think Watson's is a "dirty" science, while Jungk's is "pure, clean" science. Just as it is an error to stereotype all people who live in Wisconsin as farmers, so it is an error to assume all scientists are the same.

Before the Second World War, there were not many ethical implications of physics, or science in general. The Bomb brought the power of science into focus. Before this was an issue, the physicists lived in a world where there was not much political pressure put on them, which allowed them to freely do their work.

More important than the ethical implications to the difference between Watson's and Jungk's books is probably the fact that after WWII, governments were giving out grants for lots of research. While enabling study, it also provided the opportunity for scientists to work "just for the cash." Another effect of this funding was that since it came from the government, scientists were less dependent on their international correspondents for support. This detracted from the worldliness of science and contributed towards the attitude reflected in *The Double Helix* .

The students at Bohr's institute were poor, and received little or no funding. They chose their field primarily because it was exciting and they loved to explore the secrets which were being rapidly uncovered. While Watson also did his part for discovery, or at least integration of data into theory, but his primary motivation seemed to be primarily money. He wanted to win the big prize — The Nobel Prize.

The view offered by Jungk is not compatible with the focus Watson had. Jungk's physicists were primarily driven by the search for Truth and Beauty in nature. Watson only got “down to business” when he thought Pauling was going to beat him to the Nobel Prize!

Physics is viewed differently than Biology. Physics is a “hard” science, and its results generally have more profound impact. The examples are numerous: Einstein’s Relativity, the Uncertainty Principle, Quantum Mechanics, and even Copernicus. All of these have fundamentally changed the way we look at the universe, and our place in it. This is not the case in Biology. The only biological advance that has had fundamental, world-view-changing effects, might be Darwin’s Natural Selection. But even that has not betrayed *everyone’s* world-view. This gives Physics a unique place in society, and that reflects our image of it.

The differences between the two books stem from a combination of factors. Because of the advances in Physics, namely the Atomic Bomb, and WWII, the political arena had changed. The two disciplines of Biology and Physics are viewed differently by Society. Finally, it is an error to assume there is just *one scientist* — each is unique, and just like everything else, there will people scientists considered more ideal than others.