

tellectuals in Chile and Argentina and elsewhere in South America. We sadly watch the disappearance of democratic or almost democratic governments; we wonder at the soundlessness of the imposition of repression in India. . . .

We have been congratulated for our seemingly successful defense of Sakharov and we have been criticized for not having done much more for many others and been more publicly visible when we do so.

Patently, the Academy must learn its own mind in these matters, must decide whether it has a responsibility . . . to speak to violations . . . must determine whether our exchange programs with Communist countries or programs of technical assistance to developing countries are leverage in discussions with the officialdom of such nations.

Handler reaffirmed his belief that private protest is often the best action and warned that a "continuum of protest on behalf of every scientist whose rights have been violated can easily saturate the receptor mechanisms."

The Academy, as is indicated in a set of guidelines from the council to the foreign secretary, is going to continue along much the same path it has been following. It will emphasize private remonstrations, issue public protests only rarely, and do nothing to deliberately sever its relations with other nations. A particularly noteworthy provision, in some persons' view, is the guideline allowing for some greater measure of public activity. It says, in part, "we do not eschew entreaty by public vehicles; indeed, we anticipate that such actions will occasionally be appropriate." FAS director Stone, who says he "fails to see the political significance" of the affirmation, calls the guidelines a "distant improvement" in the Academy's position. He is, he says, "happy and hopeful" that the "logjam" over the private versus public route has been broken.

Another change in the Academy may be the creation of a new committee of its own members—probably those who are most activist—to advise the foreign secretary. A likely candidate for such a committee, were it to be created, is mathematician Bers who epitomizes the school that says the route of private versus public protest is not an either-or situation. Bers believes in having it both ways and insists the joint approach is the most effective.

"I see no conceivable situation in which I would sever scientific relations with a country with which we are at peace," says Bers, who adds that he has no reason to believe that public protest and interrupted relations necessarily go hand in hand. The Soviets, he cogently points out, did not hesitate to write to the United States government on behalf of

Angela Davis, and even sent a representative to her trial for alleged involvement in a courthouse shooting in California without damaging relations. The same approach, he maintains, applies to science.

By supporting the affirmation of freedom of inquiry, the Academy has

reached a compromise of sorts between the public and the private view. It is a decent gesture. But the tragedy is that it takes so much to do even a little good for a few scientists, and even the most optimistic cannot expect that the barriers to scientific freedom worldwide will come down soon.—BARBARA J. CULLITON

"Fleece" Winner Sues Proxmire

The predilection of Senator William Proxmire (D-Wis.) for making sport of funny-sounding federal grants has raised quite a few hackles in the scientific community. Now one of the targets of the senator's derision, Michigan psychologist Roland R. Hutchinson, is striking back—in the form of a \$6 million lawsuit claiming that the senator's attacks have damaged his reputation and his career.

Hutchinson over the past decade has been involved in research using rats, mice, and squirrel monkeys to "determine the environmental causes of aggression." With the aid of numerous federal grants from the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Office of Naval Research, among others, Hutchinson has been devising techniques to measure manifestations of aggression by the animals when they are exposed to various drugs and external stimuli. The aim is to develop quantitative measurements that can also be used on human beings.

The senator's office got wind of Hutchinson's work last year and in April 1975 issued a press release announcing that the agencies supporting the work had won one of Proxmire's "Golden Fleece of the Month" awards designed to call attention to examples of foolish government spending, for "spending almost \$500,000 in the last seven years to determine under what conditions rats, monkeys and humans bite and clench their jaws." The release concluded that "the good doctor has made a fortune from his monkeys and in the process made a monkey out of the American taxpayer." It said that in view of the "transparent worthlessness" of the study "it's time we put a stop to the bite Hutchinson and the bureaucrats who fund him have been taking out of the taxpayer." Proxmire also pressed his attack during an appearance on the Mike Douglas television show.

Hutchinson filed suit on 18 April this year. In his complaint he claims the senator implied that he was making improper personal profits from his work. The complaint also says the psychologist suffered a loss of professional respect, public humiliation, mental and physical anguish, and a loss of income and ability to earn income in the future. It also says his contractual relationships suffered interference from a Proxmire staff member who called the agencies involved and pressured them to terminate his existing grants and contracts.

Hutchinson received the grants in question while working as director of research at the Kalamazoo State Mental Hospital. He now directs the Foundation for Behavioral Research, which he and a handful of colleagues set up in 1972. He currently has two government grants, totaling \$38,000, from NASA and the National Institute for Mental Health, but his lawyer says "at this point he's basically without funding." Hutchinson declined to elaborate on his sufferings, but told *Science* that "the central element [of his complaint] is a formal expression by me of wounding and displeasure because of false public statements."

Because of the constitutional issues involved, the Senate leadership has asked the Senate to pay the costs of Proxmire's defense. Members are supposed to be immune from legal action for any remarks made on the floor. A staff member of the Senate's Democratic Policy Committee explains that since Proxmire first made his comments about Hutchinson on the Senate floor, any subsequent publicizing of the remarks does not change their status.

—CONSTANCE HOLDEN