

ment was too fragile to endure strong opposition; Scoville, that it was not worthy of support. They gave separate press conferences, and in the end, a majority held with Stone.

Scoville said that this time he "didn't want to get into a hassle with Jeremy in public." Several others had the same response. Garwin considered the split to be "a very slight difference of view on tactics." Yet both he and Scoville called Stone's approach naïve, unrealistic, and potentially disastrous. Most important, Garwin said, is that for the Senate to reject SALT II now would be to tell the Soviets and the world that the Carter Administration is impotent. This might make it impossible to negotiate *any* agreement in the future, for who bargains with the powerless?

Bernard Feld, a specialist in arms control at MIT and chairman of the executive committee of the Pugwash Council, shares Scoville's outlook, but he did not sign the Scoville letter. Those who want to move ahead on arms control, in his view, must "put up a brave front." Ratification of SALT II is "an absolute prerequisite for getting on with the task, and it seems to me it would be an unmitigated disaster if it were not to be ratified. I don't think we have the choice that Jeremy would like us to have."

Like his critics, Stone describes the division as a mere quibble over tactics, a subject, however, on which he considers himself better informed than most. He wrote recently that "at least a wing of the FAS should be working to preclude SALT III from duplicating the under-achievements of SALT II by getting suitable commitments *now*." The Scoville group "fails to appreciate why this is a uniquely important time to complain and exert pressure unlike the last 7 years," Stone argued in the latest newsletter. He does not believe the SALT process is as fragile as it has been depicted. If the treaty runs into trouble, "It's not going to be defeated," he said, "it's going to be deflected" by senatorial tinkering.

An aide to one of the senior Democrats who will carry the burden of the pro-treaty debate described how the tinkering will proceed. There will be three kinds of amendments offered, two of them "killers," and perhaps a fourth innocuous motion in the form of a "sense of the Senate" resolution. During the Panama Canal debate, the aide explained, the late James Allen dredged up a forgotten rule and showed the Senate that it had the right to amend international treaties on a line-by-line basis. Senators' memories are short, but not so

(Continued on page 926)

DNR Given Up as a Loser, Citizen Support Lacking

To the surprise of nearly everyone, President Jimmy Carter has decided to abandon his proposal to bring the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Forest Service, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) together into a new Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Still more surprising, the official who took the lead in urging the President to drop the proposal was Secretary of the Interior Cecil D. Andrus, whom Carter planned to appoint as Secretary of DNR.

Carter is the fourth president to try to group the natural resources management agencies in a single department, and like the other three—Roosevelt, Eisenhower, and Nixon—he seems to have failed. This is not for lack of merit in the proposed reorganization plan. That substantial economies and gains in efficiency would result from the plan does not seem to be questioned by most persons familiar with resource management problems. Overall, the proposed reorganization plan was expected to eliminate 2000 personnel positions and to save \$100 million annually.

Why, then, has the plan been abandoned?

As head of a big, new department with a \$8.6 billion budget, Secretary Andrus would have had a much enhanced position in the Carter cabinet. Yet, according to White House sources who know what went on when the Secretary and key presidential advisers met with Carter on 15 April, Andrus had concluded that to try to push the plan through Congress would be futile and dangerous for Interior.

Up until very recently, the President had intended to submit the plan to Congress under the Executive Reorganization Act, whereby it would become effective unless disapproved by either house within 60 days. But opposition to this strategy by Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, and majority leader Robert Byrd (D-W. Va.), who favored the proposed reorganization but felt no new department should be created without an act of Congress, led the President to de-

cide not to press it and to submit a bill instead (*Science*, 25 May).

Andrus was getting a lot of heat from the bureaucratic fiefdoms at Interior, which, unlike Andrus himself, stood to lose from the reorganization. While willing to stand this heat as long as there was a reasonable chance the reorganization would go through, Andrus now foresaw only a long, frustrating siege of congressional hearings in which his agency would be under heavy criticism and threat of legislative tampering.

Harrison Wellford, the Office of Management and Budget official who has been in charge of reorganization planning, observes that a reorganization proposal of this kind generates powerful opposition in Congress, the bureaucracy, and among resource user groups, and—despite its merits—generates little political support to offset that opposition. The result, in his view, is that such a plan will never be approved, not in this Administration nor in any other, unless a broadly based citizen lobby similar to Common Cause gets behind improving government efficiency.

As Wellford sees it, congressional committees, such as the Senate and House committees on agriculture (which have jurisdiction over the Forest Service), become intensely antagonistic because they do not wish to lose any power or control. Their antagonism is encouraged covertly by officials in the bureaucracy who feel threatened. Resource user interests have long established ties and relationships with certain agencies and tend to fear that any change in existing bureaucratic arrangements will, from their standpoint, be for the worse. For instance, the timber industry perceives Andrus as an environmentalist and does not want the Forest Service placed under his authority.

Wellford goes on to say that, while the advantages of reorganization are not seriously disputed, few members of Congress see enough political benefit in it to themselves to be willing to help push it through. There is no pressure on them to act from citizen groups lobbying for reorganization because abstractions such as "better government" are not likely to move people to lobby. "People need a more selfish interest to act," Wellford observes.

Creationists Sue to Ban Museum Evolution Exhibits

In the latest foray by creationists, a small Bible-believing group called the National Foundation for Fairness in Education (NFFE) is suing the Smithsonian Institution to have all exhibits on evolution removed from the Museum of Natural History. The group argues that the exhibits, which include a major new display called the "Dynamics of Evolution," flout the First Amendment guarantee that there shall be no established church or religion.

The suit alleges that the theory of evolution is no more subject to scientific verification as an explanation for the origin of man and life on the earth than the biblical story of creation, and that to believe in the one involves just as much of an act of faith as to believe in the other. The religion of the evolutionists, the plaintiffs say, is "secular humanism."

A federal district judge in Washington, D.C., dismissed the suit late last year, but the plaintiffs are now asking a U.S. appeals court to remand the case for trial.

The prime mover, so to speak, in the case is Dale Crowley, Jr., a 50-year-old printer and former missionary to Japan who started NFFE 3 years ago "because of the drift toward atheistic secular humanistic philosophy in the schools." Crowley told *Science* he was reared in a "very strict, fundamentalist, Bible-believing home"; his father, now 80, still conducts a daily Bible devotional broadcast over a Washington radio station and helps raise money for the suit against the Smithsonian.

Crowley, who holds a master's degree in applied linguistics from Georgetown University, builds his case in part by quoting a number of more or less well-known scientists to the effect that evolutionary theory is in fact unverifiable. But few of the citations are current, and most go back 20 years or more. A major deposition filed by NFFE in the case is from Henry M. Morris, formerly chairman of civil engineering at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and now president of Christian Heritage College and director of the Institute for Creation Research in San Diego. He says more

than 600 persons with postgraduate degrees in science belong to the Creation Research Society, and, in his view, Porter M. Kier, director of the Museum of Natural History, displays "an academic arrogance frequently typical of the nation's scientific-educational establishment."

But Kier has stated, in his deposition, that "no claim is made, either explicitly or implicitly, in any of the current or planned exhibits presenting evidence supporting evolutionary theory, that [this theory] is the only credible theory of the origin of life." Others in the "establishment" are not so modest. *Life on Earth*, a textbook by Edward O. Wilson of Harvard, Thomas Eisner of Cornell, and other scientists, says, "The process of evolution is a fact. It occurs. Biologists have watched and measured its progress at the level of the gene. They have created new species in the laboratory and in the experimental garden. They have collected a very large amount of fossil evidence, in many cases so complete that it cannot be rationally explained by any other hypothesis . . . Darwinism [in its modern version] has been aligned so consistently with genetics, paleontology, systematics, and other branches of biology, that it must be regarded as one of the more firmly grounded and reliable explanatory systems in all of science."

Teddy Roosevelt's Name Invoked in Alaska Vote

In the showdown vote in the House of Representatives on the Alaska lands legislation on 16 May the oil and gas industry and other resource-user groups proved to be much less influential than expected, even among Republican members.

The strongly conservationist measure backed by the Carter Administration was approved by a vote of 268 to 157, with 66 Republicans helping make up the majority, which was surprisingly large in view of the lines forming at gasoline pumps around the country. Representative John Anderson of Illinois, chairman of the House Republican Conference and a principal cosponsor of the bill, had urged his party colleagues to vote in the

conservationist tradition of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. "A conservative approach must tilt toward conservation," Anderson said in the floor debate.

Although known as a supporter of environmental legislation, Anderson is also a firm backer of energy resource development, and his sponsorship of the Alaska lands bill may well have helped persuade a number of undecided members that to vote for it would not be a flaky or irresponsible thing to do. The bill would set aside 125 million acres in parks, wildlife refuges, and other conservation systems and would classify 67 million acres as wilderness where all oil and gas and mining (except on existing claims) would be prohibited.

Anderson lent his influence to this measure at the urging of Representative Morris Udall (D-Ariz.), chairman of the House Interior Committee. Udall had seen his own committee narrowly reject the bill earlier this year in favor of a more development-oriented substitute. On that committee vote the Republicans had voted as a bloc against him.

Perhaps the major factor in the bill's passage by the House was the grass roots support that had been generated for it by the environmentalists' Alaska Coalition and by the editorial support of numerous major newspapers, including the staunchly conservative *Chicago Tribune*.

A key issue in the floor deliberations had to do with whether to classify all of the Arctic National Wildlife Range (ANWR) as wilderness or whether to initiate a 7-year program of caribou studies and limited oil and gas exploration activities that could lead to development of part of it. Supporters of the latter alternative argued that the only way to find out whether there is another "Prudhoe Bay" on the North Slope is to allow exploration to go forward and to discount as inconclusive the U.S. Geological Survey studies which indicate that there is little prospect for another such discovery.

The Alaska lands legislation now awaits action in the Senate, where another and perhaps closer struggle is assured. But the Carter Administration can continue to protect the conservation lands that are in question by executive action, and this may weigh heavily in favor of a strong bill similar to the one passed by the House.

Luther J. Carter