

ions. We will have to decide what is right, not who is right."

The committee has heard testimony on both the scientific and ethical points in the case and has even solicited the informal opinion of David Bazelon, chief justice of the U.S. Court of Appeals. Bazelon, who has long had an interest in questions of medical ethics and law, discussed in an interview with *Science* some of the issues raised by the Harvard controversy.

The judge is concerned that a cult may be growing up around the ethics

of human experimentation that may neither be good for patients nor for the progress of medicine. "Experimentation," he observes, "is becoming a dirty word." He finds that his own feelings about patients' rights are changing a little as "the pendulum swings against experimentation."

Bazelon has always been a defender of patients and believed they had rights before it became fashionable. But now he wonders whether concern may not be getting mixed up with paternalism on the part of some "elitist"

scientists who underestimate patients' abilities to cope with complex information and tough decisions.

On 20 November, the Farnsworth committee will meet to prepare its final recommendations, which will be delivered to the full medical school faculty at a meeting on 13 December. Ultimately, the full faculty will have to decide whether to permit research in an area that is not without risk or whether to permit only that which is guaranteed to be safe.

—BARBARA J. CULLITON

Congress: A Seismic Shift toward the Young and Liberal

The Democratic tsunami that swept through the House on mid-term election day was the third such deluge to strike the Republican Party since the end of World War II. It was comparable in magnitude to the debacles of 1958 and 1964, and it dramatically reversed the small gains toward a more balanced Congress which the GOP had made with the Nixon landslide of 1972.

Although half a dozen congressional races were still subject to alteration by recount as of mid-November, it appeared that the Democrats had gained 44 seats in the House for a veto-resistant margin of 291 to the GOP's 144. A net gain in the Senate of 3 seats widened the Democratic margin there to 61 to 38 (with 1 Conservative). By and large, the members of Congress who will be departing at the end of this session are conservative. The freshmen who will replace them in the 94th Congress are predominately young and liberal.

Whether one reads this reversal of Republican fortunes as a post-Watergate deluge or merely, as some analysts would have it, as a cyclic inclemency in the electorate, the fact is that an unusually large freshman class of congressmen was made possible, in large part, by an unusually large number of retirements. This term, 30 representatives and 7 senators are retiring; 13 other representatives and 2 senators were defeated in the

primaries; and another 9 House members ran for other offices. Thus in 61 congressional races neither candidate enjoyed the incumbent's edge.

Voluntary departures and primary losses, in fact, had a more dramatic effect on the structure of committee power in most instances than did the November election. Certainly this was the case with the committees dealing with science and the environment.

Most sharply depleted were the House Science and Astronautics committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Seven of the JCAE's most senior members are leaving at the end of this term. Senate dean George Aiken (R-Vt.) retires this year, and so do Senators Wallace Bennett, a deeply conservative Utah Republican, and Alan Bible, a Nevada Democrat and an influential member of the Senate Interior Committee. Senator Peter Dominick (R-Colo.), a Goldwater conservative on the joint committee and the ranking minority member of Senator Edward Kennedy's science subcommittee, lost his bid for reelection to Gary Hart, the young and liberal manager of George McGovern's presidential campaign in 1972.

On the House side, the joint committee will lose its two most doctrinaire advocates of nuclear technology, Chet Holifield (D-Calif.) and Craig Hosmer (R-Calif.). Both are retiring.

A member of Congress since 1943

and a former chairman of the committee, Holifield has dominated congressional thinking on the mysteries of nuclear technology for the better part of 20 years. Hosmer arrived in Congress in 1953, having begun his career as a lawyer for the Atomic Energy Commission at Los Alamos in the late 1940's. Few if any congressmen in recent years could match their knowledge of nuclear energy's intricacies, but their departure is likely to facilitate a mellowing trend in the committee's attitude toward nuclear critics and environmental groups.

The House Committee on Science and Astronautics faces the next session with 24 members and 6 vacancies. Among those not returning are John W. Davis (D-Ga.), the chairman of the science research and development subcommittee, whose territory includes general science policy and the National Science Foundation budget. Davis lost out in the primaries.

His departure, and the retirement of Representative Charles S. Gubser (R-Calif.), leave two vacancies on the governing board of the congressional Office of Technology Assessment. (Gubser also was the ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Research and Development subcommittee.)

Other members of the Science and Astronautics committee not returning are Representatives Paul W. Cronin (R-Mass.), John N. Happy Camp (R-Okla.), and Stanford E. Parrish (R-Va.), who were unseated in this month's election, and Representative Bill Gunter (D-Fla.), who lost a primary bid for the Senate.

Ordinarily, Representative James W. Symington (D-Mo.) would be expected to succeed Davis as chairman of the

science subcommittee, but when the new Congress convenes the science subcommittee may no longer exist in its present form. The somewhat diluted jurisdictional reforms adopted by the House last month (*Science*, 25 October) gave the Science and Astronautics committee a much wider purview, encompassing all varieties of non-military and non-nuclear R & D. Accordingly, chairman Olin Teague (D-Tex.) and the surviving core of the committee leadership are working out new ways to divide the territory among themselves. The number of subcommittees devoted to space probably will be reduced from three (out of six) to two or even one, but beyond that little else is certain. Placement of jurisdictional boundary lines within the committee, as one staffer put it, is "still wide open."

Environment a Factor

Among other things, the election seemed to show that environmental issues retain much of their vitality. Each election year since 1970, a Washington lobby group called Environmental Action has designated a "dirty dozen" legislators whose record on environmental issues is regarded as poor. This year 8 of the 12 were defeated, the largest number thus far. They were: Representatives Glenn Davis (R-Wis.); William Hudnut (R-Ind.); John Hunt (R-N.J.); Earl Landgrebe (R-Ind.); Robert Mathias (R-Calif.); William Scherle (R-Iowa); Frank Stubblefield (D-Ky.); and Roger Zion (R-Ind.). The four who won reelection were Representatives Samuel Devine (R-Ohio); Dale Milford (D-Tex.); Sam Steiger (R-Ariz.); and Burt Talcott (R-Calif.).

In addition, the League of Conservation Voters, which poured \$80,000 into 17 House, Senate, and governors' races, picked 13 winning candidates. Among the winners was Joseph L. Fisher, a respected economist and the former president of Resources for the Future, an environmental policy analysis group in Washington supported by the Ford Foundation. Fisher, a moderate Democrat who is thoroughly conversant with interlocking issues of energy, land use, growth, pollution, and the economy, defeated Representative Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia's senior Republican.

The potency of environmental issues was particularly dramatic in Colorado, where controversies over land use, growth policy, shale oil development,

and the use of nuclear explosives to open new reservoirs of natural gas have helped impel a seismic shift in congressional representation. The shift began with the defeat in 1972 of House Interior Committee Chairman Wayne Aspinall, regarded by many environmentalists as overly sympathetic to mining and development interests. That year as well, Colorado Senator Gordon Allott was defeated by antiwar Democrat Floyd Haskell, partly as a result of Allott's support of a Colorado site for the winter Olympic games.

This year, Democrat Richard Lamm, who came to prominence as an opponent of the winter games and a champion of land use and growth legislation, beat incumbent Republican John Vanderhoof for the governorship.

Moreover, Gary Hart's successful campaign against Senator Peter Dominick centered in part on Dominick's support for a weakened version of the Senate strip mining bill. And Representative Patricia Schroeder, a Democrat who campaigned against Plowshare nuclear explosions in Colorado gas formations, handily won reelection. Colorado voters also approved an initiative measure that would require public approval for future nuclear explosions in the state.

On other fronts, the combination of retirements and election losses opens a significant number of seats on key committees affecting research and education. Twelve of the 55 members of the House Appropriations Committee, chiefly conservative members of the Defense, Interior, and science subcommittees, will not be returning. On the Armed Services Committee, House minority whip Leslie Arends (R-Ill.), is retiring, and Representative William G. Bray of Indiana, the committee's ranking Republican, was not reelected.

In the area of health, the House Commerce subcommittee on public health and the environment, with jurisdiction over most biomedical research legislation, will lose 4 of its 11 members. They are: Representatives Peter N. Kyros (D-Me.); William R. Roy (D-Kan.); William Hudnut (R-Ind.); and Ancher Nelsen (R-Minn.), the senior Republican member.

Freshmen members of the 94th Congress have yet to be dealt their committee assignments. But when they are, at least a marginal shift toward the liberal end of the spectrum should be visible in legislation ranging from defense expenditures to national health insurance.—ROBERT GILLETTE

RECENT DEATHS

Daniel C. Baker, Jr., 65; former professor of otolaryngology, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; 2 June.

Vannevar Bush, 84; former professor, vice president, and dean of engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; 28 June.

W. Harrison Carter, Jr., 69; former dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Connecticut; 6 June.

Ernst Cloos, 76; professor emeritus of geology, Johns Hopkins University; 28 May.

Jacob E. Dinger, 60; retired head, atmospheric physics branch, Naval Research Laboratory; 9 May.

Paul F. Gast, 57; senior physicist, Argonne National Laboratory; 27 May.

Foster R. Lampkin, 83; former professor of psychology, Savannah State College; 8 June.

Abraham L. Marshall, 77; retired manager, chemistry research department, General Electric Company; 23 May.

Bernardine Meyer, 65; professor of food science, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; 5 June.

Russell C. Miller, 74; professor emeritus of animal industry and nutrition, Pennsylvania State University; 31 May.

Peter A. Paytash, 68; chairman emeritus of chemistry, Xavier University; 3 June.

Eugene K. Rabe, 61; professor of astronomy, University of Cincinnati; 11 July.

James R. Reilly, 56; professor of biology, University of North Dakota; 28 June.

Victor H. Ries, 81; professor emeritus of floriculture, Ohio State University; 28 June.

Julien A. Ripley, 66; former professor of physical sciences, Stanford University; 27 June.

Bernard Serin, 52; former professor of physics, Rutgers University; 18 June.

Erratum: In an article about Boston City Hospital (1 Nov. 1974), Ernest Lowe was incorrectly identified as chief resident in obstetrics and gynecology at BCH. Lowe is professor and chairman of the department.

Erratum: In Lynn A. Cooper's review of *A Psychology of Picture Perception* by John M. Kennedy (27 Sept. 1974) a line was garbled in the first paragraph beginning on page 1160. The passage in question should have read, "But his oversimplified interpretation of the constructive theory blinds him to the fact that he has in no sense refuted the constructive theorists' claims. For at the heart of the constructive theory is