

ties throughout the state. Another, associated with the governor's report on coastal development, would establish a Maine Coast Industrial Development Corporation, financed by bond issues, to develop the Portland and Machias areas.

The weakness of this approach to the problem of development capital is that other states are using similar techniques to attract new industry. Therefore the competition in the capital markets, not to mention the competition for a limited supply of new businesses, could be quite intense. Maine's bond issues and capital costs are thus likely to reflect the market's estimate of Maine's real competitive advantage. This is not a highly promising approach except perhaps in connection with well-financed heavy industry serving a clear regional or national demand, such as oil refineries, power plants, and paper mills.

Clearly the state will have to find additional inducements for investors if the advocates of light industry wish to realize their dream of a self-sustaining but nonpolluting economy for Maine. (The alternatives are continued unemployment and depopulation of rural areas or more heavy industry. The political pressures for the latter are not likely to abate if it is the only alternative to heavy unemployment.)

One approach, already being given a limited trial by the state, is direct state action to develop resources and markets that would support light industry. The state government supports an aquaculture research program and is encouraging a pilot project in furniture-making. But these are cautious and modest efforts, with no immediate prospects of creating many jobs. On a slightly more ambitious scale, the State Department of Commerce and Industry recently obtained federal funds for a feasibility study of a "life sciences" park, to be located between Portland, Brunswick, and Lewiston. The concept is patterned after the North Carolina research triangle (Raleigh, Durham, Chapel Hill). The park would attempt to attract research-oriented industries in the life sciences.

A somewhat more radical approach to stimulating economic development in Maine was put forward last spring by Harvard professor Richard Barringer. He argued that the state should establish a development agency that would use public funds—not proceeds from bond sales—to start new enterprises where they would do the most

economic good and least environmental harm.

The Barringer study, "A Maine Manifest," was sponsored by the Allagash group, a nonprofit institution, financed by anonymous wealthy donors, that was recently set up to study the Maine economy. Its activities during the past year were directed by the editor of the *Maine Times*, John N. Cole. The study was prepared by Barringer and other members of the Huron Institute of Cambridge, on a \$50,000 grant from Allagash. (It is perhaps indicative of the condition of Maine's own academic community that the study was produced by a Massachusetts think tank.)

The crux of Barringer's concept is that the state and local communities should capture a part of the benefits

being realized, often by speculators, from the appreciation of Maine property values and use this capital to finance state and local development organizations.

Barringer suggests that a portion of the property tax collected in every community be used to finance a state land bank. The land bank would operate like a development agency in acquiring land. It would not resell land, but would give long-term leases and retaining state ownership. According to Barringer, the land bank could be used, among other purposes, to preempt resort development possibilities before large land developers could move in.

The Barringer approach would require the state to assume a larger proportion of local school costs now fi-

## Gofman Honored; AEC Mum

On 20 October, John Gofman, best known for his fight with the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) over radiation standards, was one of four scientists to be awarded the Stouffer Prize for heart research.

Gofman's work on lipoproteins was done during the 1950's at Donner Laboratory on the University of California's Berkeley campus, which is almost totally funded by the AEC.

But the AEC, usually so quick to publicize any award that redounds to its credit, has said not a word about Gofman's achievement. Nor has any notice been taken by Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, where Gofman has been doing cancer chromosome research.

The AEC public information office, in response to an inquiry, explained that Gofman's award-winning research had nothing to do with the AEC. But soon afterward there came an embarrassed phone call from an information officer at the Lawrence Laboratory, who acknowledged that the research had been supported by the AEC, but that, naturally, it was the privilege of the Vernon Stouffer Foundation to decide how and when to publicize its awards.

Gofman, when called by *Science*, greeted this negative public relations effort with his usual outspokenness. "If anyone else in an AEC lab got an award like this they would spread it anywhere in the far corners of the earth," he remarked. "This is perhaps the lowest behavior I've seen on the part of the radiation lab." Nonetheless, he observed that his scientific stature seems to rise in proportion to the AEC's attempts to discredit him.

Gofman's research staff and grant funds from the AEC have been shrinking steadily since 1969, when he and Arthur Tamplin publicized calculations which showed that the possible harmful effects of low-dose radiation were considerably higher than the AEC believed.

Gofman says he hung on through the hottest part of the controversy, but now "I've made my point." He plans to sever all connections with the AEC as of 1 January. He will continue in his half-time post as professor of medical physics at Berkeley and is casting around for another research grant.

Gofman is sharing the \$50,000 Stouffer Prize with Vincent P. Dole of the Rockefeller Institute in New York, Robert S. Gordon of the National Institutes of Health, and John L. Oncley of the University of Michigan.—C. H.