

outside experts, and lobbyists—a clique described by one reporter as “a mutual admiration and reinforcing society” which tries to head off the vicissitudes of politics and keep everybody going along the same track.

Money and Members

But FAS's rejuvenation could be short-lived if two aspects of the organization fail to revive: money and membership. When it comes to political muscle, the most powerful influences on congressmen are groups which can deliver campaign funds or votes for candidates. This is one reason for CLW's success; its 12,000 active sponsors raised over \$300,000 for candidates in last fall's campaign. But FAS can deliver neither money nor votes. It hardly has funds to boost its own membership, let alone to give away to candidates.

When the FAS National Council decided to hire a full-time director, it was understood that reviving the national organization would be part of his mandate. Stone has recaptured the flavor of FAS's early lobby. But he has yet to work the second miracle of breathing life into the near-defunct national organization.

Stone first aimed to double membership—then at 1500—within a year. But before he was hired, the dues had been doubled to \$15 yearly, and renewals were dropping. Mailings to purchased lists of scientists have netted a respectable return of 1 percent; they have brought Stone 800 new members to date. He now predicts that at the end of his first year on 1 July 1971, he will have brought something above this increase of 50 percent.

But persuading scientists to pay \$15 to receive a newsletter is one thing; persuading them to generate local action is another. Even though membership is swelling on paper, FAS local chapters are limp. Even the Seattle and Chicago groups who fought the ABM locally in 1969 are thought to be less active now.

A volunteer who aided Stone last summer is setting up a second FAS national network: Technical Advisory Committees to Influence Congress (TACTIC). So far, B. Michael Casper, associate professor of physics at Carleton College, has enlisted 500 scientists in 225 congressional districts—or about half in the nation—to form local TACTIC groups to talk to their representatives and senators about science-related issues when they revisit their home districts. The aim is to exert precisely the

same kind of local pressures that were so effective in the postwar years of FAS. But so far, the groups have been inactive. Moreover, one Council member who talked with *Science* at some length about FAS failed to mention that he had been invited to chair a local TACTIC group. Casper himself says that the whole project, launched on a budget of \$1000, is too embryonic for evaluation.||

Two other pieces of the national FAS include the Council itself, which Rodberg says has become less active since appointing Stone. Another is the so-called issue committee, set up by Stone to research and publish on FAS issues. On paper, FAS has seven issue committees—but most of them have only one member, a chairman. Only the strategic weapons committee headed by Scoville has consistently worked on ABM; another one on chemical and biological warfare is also somewhat active.

To broaden its base, FAS has tried to get nonphysicists in council and committee posts. FAS now is self-described as “a national organization of natural and social scientists and engineers.” Both Stone and the Council agree that FAS should not be a one-issue organization, and, by broadening its membership and participation, Stone hopes to broaden also the range of issues it will deal with in Congress. Thus, it can become the “voice of science on Capitol Hill.”

FAS and SESPA

But one group it is not likely to add is the radical younger scientists whose principal organ is Scientists and Engineers for Social and Political Action (SESPA). Michael H. Goldhaber, assistant professor of physics at the University of Arizona, a SESPA founder and member of FAS's National Council, says that, at one time, there was a chance SESPA would “fold up and join” FAS. But both groups are glad nothing happened, he says. “There is room for both a SESPA and a FAS.”

He says that many young scientists see the FAS Council as “big, fat partners of the Pentagon,” who believe too much in “the Washington approach” to problem solving. He argues, for example, that ABM opponents first claimed that ABM wouldn't work—a technocratic argument, he said, which only had the effect of the Pentagon's proposal of an ABM which would work. “An ABM which works is even worse.”

|| TACTIC, B. M. Casper, Physics Department, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 55057.

Goldhaber says that there are many radicals in science who “don't speak the language of FAS.” “Even to talk about continuing to build weapons at this point is an insane way of speaking.” And these people are, rightfully, part of SESPA, he says.

But just as there has been a lull among activities on the SESPA wing of science this year, there has been apathy among the more “established” scientists as well. As Bernard Feld, professor of physics at M.I.T., president of the Council for a Livable World, and FAS Council member summarized: “The real question is whether people feel the country is in a crisis situation of sufficient magnitude so that people will do the kinds of things FAS would do.”

—DEBORAH SHAPLEY

RECENT DEATHS

J. Minor Gwynn, 73; former professor of education, University of North Carolina; 16 January.

Frederic J. Kenny, 76; professor emeritus of chemistry, Hunter College; 20 January.

Timothy Lehmann, 89; former president, Elmhurst College; 12 January.

Bertram D. Lewin, 74; visiting professor of psychoanalysis, Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine; 8 January.

Edgar W. Olive, 100; retired curator, Brooklyn Botanical Garden, 3 January.

Lloyd H. Shinnars, 52; director, Southern Methodist University Herbarium; 16 February.

Clarence H. Smeltzer, 70; former chairman, psychology department, Temple University; 21 December.

Joseph W. Spelman, 52; medical examiner for Philadelphia, Pa., and visiting professor of pathology, Temple University; 9 February.

John D. H. Strickland, 50; head, marine food-chain research group, Institute of Marine Resources, University of California, San Diego; 12 November.

Harry B. van Dyke, 69; professor emeritus of pharmacology, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; 14 February.

Harry R. Weimer, 64; chairman, chemistry department, Manchester College; 15 December.

Richard H. Young, 65; dean, Northwestern University Medical School; 26 December.