

## Antiwar Group Raises \$250,000

When U.S. troops invaded Cambodia last spring, many members of university communities responded with strikes and with lobbying trips to Washington, while others began to organize action groups to influence this fall's elections by supporting antiwar candidates. Of the many groups which emerged at that time, the Universities National Anti-War Fund (UNAF)\*, headed by Jule Charney, professor of meteorology at M.I.T., is apparently the most significant in terms of national organization and money-raising power.

By next week's elections, UNAF expects to have distributed more than \$250,000 to Senate and House candidates who have a clear commitment to a rapid ending of the United States' involvement in Southeast Asia. The organization claims substantial credit for the defeat of several well-entrenched incumbents by narrow margins in primary elections. Among those defeated by candidates with UNAF backing were Representatives Byron Rogers (D-Colo.), Philip Philbin (D-Mass.), and George Fallon (D-Md.), whose collective seniority totals 76 years. In a separate House race, Parren Mitchell won the Democratic nomination in Maryland's 7th District and the chance to become the state's first black congressman—by 34 votes, with substantial UNAF support. In Virginia, another Democrat, George Rawlings, attributed the margin of his victory in the Senate primary contest to UNAF.

### "Day's Pay for Peace"

UNAF was organized by a small group of faculty from Harvard and M.I.T. around the theme, "Give a Day's Pay for Peace." The basic idea was to bring together those individuals in the academic community who opposed the war. The organization has coordinators and chapters on more than 500 campuses in all sections of the country including essentially all major universities.

The fund-raising process operates primarily at a local campus level, with the national organization providing literature and coordination. The campus coordinator, who most often was recruited by a friend on another campus, establishes a group of local sponsors, mails appeals for funds to faculty members, and follows up with person-to-person canvassing. Contributions are received by the seven-person staff at the Cambridge, Massachusetts, headquarters, which has records of more than 6000 individual donors.

UNAF is supporting candidates in 27 states spread across the country. The organization attempts to put its money into races which are close and in which UNAF money might swing the balance. The announced criteria for selecting candidates are the foreign-policy position of the candidates, the differences between the candidate and his opponent (a dove running against another dove is not supported), the chances of winning, and the amount of money available for distribution.

So far, the policy of investing political risk capital in tight races has paid off. Of the candidates who received substantial support (more than \$1000) in the primary campaigns, 14 of 16 were elected. A total of \$74,000 was given to candidates in primary races. For the November congressional elections, UNAF has endorsed 14 Senate and 50 House candidates and allocated more than \$200,000 to help elect them.

—ALLEN L. HAMMOND

\* The 27-member policy-making national board of UNAF includes Father Colman Barry, St. John's University; Mary Bunting, Radcliffe; John Coleman, Haverford College; Barry Commoner, Washington University; Bernard Feld, M.I.T.; John Galbraith, Harvard; H. Bentley Glass, State University of New York, Stony Brook; Christopher Lasch, Northwestern; Franklin Long, Cornell; Hans Morgenthau, University of Chicago; Franz Schurmann, University of California, Berkeley; Jacqueline Wexler, Hunter College; Jerome Wiesner, M.I.T.; and Herbert York, University of California, San Diego. The 70-plus member list of sponsors for UNAF includes Felix and Konrad Bloch, Harvey Brooks, Jerome Bruner, Owen Chamberlain, Max Delbrück, Carl Djerassi, Nathan Glazer, George Kistiakowsky, Salvador Luria, Edward Purcell, B. F. Skinner, Lionel Trilling, Harold Urey, Victor Weisskopf, and Jerrold Zacharias.

dealt with federal budget-making close up—as an economist in the Bureau of the Budget from 1949 to 1957. So when it comes to matters involving technology and federal funding, Weidenbaum can be presumed to have some expertise.

Weidenbaum opened his prepared speech by lamenting that most public discussion dealing with the role of science and technology in the United States is "both discouraging and unproductive" because the dialogue is generally limited to "a heated exchange between two polar alternatives." One of these alternatives, he said, tends to "view with alarm the extent to which 'uncontrolled' science and technology are supposedly destroying our society." The other alternative is the one which he claimed "looks upon science and technology almost as something sacred and inviolable." Weidenbaum suggested that some "holders of this position do not really view science and technology as being beyond criticism, but, perhaps worse yet, as ends instead of means." When a layman tries to enter this science policy debate, Weidenbaum said, he gets caught in a "forensic crossfire" and is greeted with "cries of interference, short-sightedness, and worse."

Nevertheless, Weidenbaum stuck his neck out and called for "an honest and sensible position—one that tries to balance the collective benefits against the social costs of certain technological advances or proposed scientific research undertakings." He argued that "every human undertaking, including the basic research and development process, involves the utilization of certain resources"; that the general public should decide how public resources will be used; and that "there is always the need for thorough analysis and justification before undertaking a major project."

Unfortunately, in Weidenbaum's opinion, the nation's track record in performing such analyses is poor. "When in the past I examined the actual justifications for undertaking many new major scientific projects," he said, "I was often struck by the absence of that objectivity and hard, factual quantitative analysis that I associate with the core of the scientific method."

As an example of the blind faith approach to R & D funding, Weidenbaum cited a speech he heard at an important meeting of a national scientific and engineering society. "The audience was assured by one very distinguished