

come preoccupied with death and the preparation for death." The evangelistic Wald said, "These are the facts of death and I urge you not to accept any of them." He received a standing ovation at the end of his address, as he had before when he said that Senator Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) was guilty of "criminal insanity" for justifying deployment of the ABM Sentinel system with the statement that, if nuclear war reduced the human race to a new Adam and Eve, he wanted them to be Americans. "We scientists, we opt for life," Wald thundered.

Wald also deplored a trend for scientific organizations to develop large bureaucracies in Washington which build up their associations with the Defense Department to keep occupied. He lambasted the American Institute of Biological Sciences for having sponsored scientific conferences last year at Fort Detrick (the Army's biological warfare research station). Wald, a

Erratum

Page 1118B of the 7 March issue of *Science* included an error concerning AAAS membership dues. The rate has been \$12 since 1 January 1968.

member of the National Academy of Sciences, said the National Academy was the "worst offender" in this regard and termed it "a shocking thing" for Frederick Seitz to serve simultaneously as Academy president and head of the Defense Science Board.

March 4 was another example of the way in which student activists are forcing some faculty members to re-examine their attitudes toward connections with the military. At M.I.T., graduate students in the natural sciences provided much of the organizing

drive behind the March 4 events. These students were shrewd in getting the support of senior professors and the consequent publicity that faculty participation meant. And, a significant number of these faculty members gave generously of their time. But, without the students, March 4 would never have taken place.

The students and their faculty backers maintained a show of unity through the events of March 4, but their alliance had worn a little thin during the preceding weeks. The students had initially expressed their opposition to the draft and to the Vietnam war, but they had been induced by their professorial supporters to expand the spectrum of their protests.

Also, some students called March 4 a research "strike," a word which, when reported in the press, threw many M.I.T. professors, including some of the backers, into a state of alarm. They quickly explained that March 4 was

. . . At Stanford—Convocation, Not Confrontation

that basic research by individual scientists deserves society's "untrammelled sustenance." And the fourth major speaker, professor of electrical engineering John G. Linvill (one of the few engineers who actively participated), discussed some of the socially useful research in which Stanford engineers are engaged. Both Schiff and Linvill argued rather summarily for maintenance of support of basic research by defense agencies, an issue of great interest and concern to many scientists. Linvill's discussion of individual engineering triumphs, in particular a significant new reading aid for the blind, failed to shed light on the structural implications of the flourishing war-related scientific and industrial complex that surrounds Stanford.

There was some protest, at the opening gathering, about the domination of "establishment" views. The explanation, offered by Grobstein, was that the speakers had been selected deliberately, to "place the issues" before the audience. The difficulty—and the source of the frustration felt by some of the audience—was that there was no satisfactory chance to respond; the opening remarks set the tone. There was some discussion in smaller panels that met in the late afternoon and early evening. In one panel, on the "military-industrial-university complex," young dissidents had the initiative, and they used it to beat down arguments such as that of a professor of engineering who maintained that development of a "people-sniffer" (to detect guerrillas) was justified because it might also be used to help find small boys lost in the mountains. "That's like justifying the bomb because it might help make canals," commented a student in the audience. "The purpose of the people-sniffer and the bomb is to kill people. That's what it's

all about." (He received warm applause.) In an evening panel on chemical and biological warfare (CBW), however, the initiative was back with what one could call the "conservatives," with an address by Merrill J. Snyder, a microbiologist from the University of Maryland, arguing for the retention of CBW research by the universities and praising Fort Detrick, the Army biological warfare research facility, for its work.

The audience, if unfailingly polite, was plainly restive, and it was, in fact, a bit anomalous that the format favored a sort of old guard when it was in large measure as a response to the anxieties of the young that the gathering had been called. There were a few exceptions. Martin Perl, another SLAC physicist, discussed ways in which grass-roots scientists could affect politics, and he was warmly received. But there was strong feeling that the audience was hungry with concern for a way to make science benign and relevant, and, for the most part, that is not what they were hearing.

The March 4 observance at Stanford was not much of a setback for the military-industrial complex. Perhaps 1200 to 1500 people participated there, and newspapers estimated that more than another thousand took part in related programs elsewhere in the Bay Area (at Berkeley, at the University of California Medical Center in San Francisco, and at San Francisco State). But it was perhaps the first infusion of a comparatively large and public interest into questions of scientific policy-making that had occurred in a long time, and it may be that it is a portent.—ELINOR LANGER

Elinor Langer is a former member of the Science news staff.