

impact statements are required for every program involving nuclear arms, all programs whose estimated costs exceed \$50 million a year or \$250 million in all, and any other program deemed by the National Security Council to have a significant impact on arms control and disarmament policy. That last clause is intended to cover programs of potential arms control importance whose dollar costs would otherwise not qualify them for scrutiny.

The impact statement was opposed by the Ford Administration and by leading "hawks" in Congress who feared, as Senator Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) put it, that "this provision may needlessly delay or obstruct crucial defense programs." Some hawks were particularly concerned that the "doves" might be able to sue the Defense Department for alleged deficiencies in the impact statements, thus blocking military programs in much the same way as environmentalists have used the courts to block projects whose environmental impact statements are deemed inadequate.

Thus, to secure the acquiescence of the hawks, a clause was inserted that "no court shall have any jurisdiction" to review the impact analysis. Berdes believes the legislation would never have passed without this concession. "We had to put it in," he said. "The resistance in the executive branch was absolutely catastrophic. They were thrashing about from all the walls." Fisher believes the concession is no overwhelming loss, since courts often decline to inject themselves into national security issues anyway.

In its final form, the act now requires any government agency that is preparing any legislative or budgetary proposal for the programs covered to provide the director of ACDA with "full and timely access to detailed information" on "a continuing basis." The director of ACDA is to analyze the likely impact of these programs on arms control and make recommendations to the National Security Council, the Office of Management and Budget, and the agency proposing the program. If the proposing agency submits a request to Congress for authorizing or appropriating legislation, then it must include an "impact statement." The precise form of the statement—and the question of whether it would be classified or not—is left vague, though the assumption is that at least an unclassified version will be made public. Finally, if specified committees request it, the director of ACDA must advise them of the arms control implications of the programs for which impact statements have been submitted. The law may not be as tough as its advocates originally hoped, but in the opinion of Fisher it's "a major step forward."

The goal of this detailed and complicated procedure is to ensure that the originating agency—usually the Defense Department—gives thought to arms control implications early in the process of devising new programs, and that both ACDA and Congress get warning of significant new programs early enough to do something about it. In the development of past weapons programs, according to Fisher, "generally ACDA would find out about it by the grapevine and try to bull their way in, sometimes successfully, and sometimes not."

Arms control specialists speculate that a requirement for an impact statement might well have changed our government's assessment of the desirability of pursuing development of particular weapons systems. At a recent meeting of the Arms Control Association, for example, Richard Garwin, of IBM, suggested that the Defense Department had not adequately analyzed the arms control impact of Multiple Independently Targeted Re-Entry Vehicles, Submarine Launched Cruise Missiles, or high-powered laser weapons. In each case, he suggested, the impact of the new weapon on the arms race is apt to render the weapon counterproductive.

Some members of the association were skeptical that the mere existence of an impact statement would change congressional voting patterns on big weapons systems. But Garwin suggested that if a congressman receives an "official" statement warning of an adverse impact on the arms race, he is more apt to be swayed than if he received the information some other way.

In addition to the impact statement, the new amendments try to enhance the effectiveness of ACDA by requiring it to submit an expanded annual report to Congress analogous to the annual "posture statement" submitted by the Secretary of Defense; by repealing language that had previously been interpreted as inhibiting the agency's ability to conduct a public information program; and by making the ACDA director a principal adviser to the National Security Council, a status comparable to that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the director of the Central Intelligence Agency. An effort to make the ACDA director a full member of the Security Council was abandoned in the course of legislative compromise.

Few observers believe the changes guarantee that ACDA will assume a more vigorous and important role. For one thing, most specialists agree that the key factor in slowing the arms race must be strong leadership from the President, a level far above ACDA's head. However, Berdes detects a feeling in Congress that ACDA "has become awfully timid," particularly "in con-

trast to the behemoth [the Pentagon] on the other side of the river." Thus the amendments are intended as "a heart transplant" to a weak and somewhat reluctant patient, in hopes that he may at least get started on the road to recovery.

—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

APPOINTMENTS

Charles D. Cook, chairman, pediatrics department, Yale University School of Medicine, to chairman, pediatrics department, Downstate Medical Center, State University of New York, Brooklyn. . . **Sidney D. Rosenberg**, dean, school of allied medical professions, University of Pennsylvania, to dean, College of Health Related Professions, Wichita State University. . . **Creighton A. Burk**, chief geologist, Mobil Oil Corporation, to director, Marine Science Institute, University of Texas, Austin. . . **Marcus M. Mason**, president, Mason Research Institute, Worcester, to director, Contract and Research Development, Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology. . .

RECENT DEATHS

Thurman B. Givan, 87; former professor of clinical pediatrics, Long Island College of Medicine; 23 October.

George C. Griffith, 77; professor emeritus of medicine, University of Southern California School of Medicine; 26 October.

Orin Halvorson, 78; former chairman of bacteriology, University of Minnesota; 20 October.

Leigh Hoadley, 80; professor emeritus of zoology, Harvard University; 6 November.

Norman Kaplan, 52; chairman, sociology and anthropology department, Northeastern University; 14 October.

William B. Kemp, 85; former director, agriculture experiment station, University of Maryland; 15 October.

John E. Klimas, Jr., 48; professor of biology, Fairfield University; 28 October.

Thomas L. Popejoy, 72; former president, University of New Mexico; 24 October.

Frederick A. Wolf, 90; professor emeritus of botany, Duke University; 7 November.

Erratum: On the order form for tours and concerts (28 Nov., p. 873), the time for tour 2-B should be 10:30 a.m.

Erratum: In column 2 of Products and Materials (12 Dec., p. 1120), the device referred to as "Animal Bedding Disposable Cabinet" should be "Animal Bedding Disposal Cabinet."