

Announcing the 6th Annual AAAS Colloquium on R&D Policy

25-26 June 1981

The Shoreham Hotel
Washington, DC

This highly successful Colloquium, sponsored by the AAAS Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy, will bring together leaders in government, industry, and the scientific and technical communities to address issues relating to R&D and public policy-making in the new administration. Topics will include:

- *Federal R&D* • R&D issues in the FY 1982 budget • Outlook for FY 1983 and the future;
- *Defense R&D* • R&D issues in the defense budget • Current policies and program content • Trends and future projections • Alternative perspectives on defense R&D;
- *Agency perspectives* • Question and answer sessions with officials of key federal agencies on R&D programs in their agencies;
- *R&D Outlook in the Scientific and Engineering Community* • Impacts of new R&D budgets and policies on engineering; physical, social, and biomedical sciences; science and engineering education • Short- and long-range outlook for health of U.S. science and technology.

Research and Development: AAAS Report VI, by Willis H. Shapley, Albert H. Teich, and Gail J. Breslow, will be provided in advance to colloquium registrants. The Report covers R&D in the federal budget for FY 1982, a review of the federal budget process as it relates to R&D, and other topics on R&D and public policy. Registrants will also receive the published proceedings of the conference.

For program and registration information, write:

R&D Colloquium • AAAS Office of Public Sector Programs
1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
or call (202) 467-4310

stand this when they assert that evolutionary theory is religious or that creationist theory is scientific. With all due respect for biologist Arthur Kornberg, astronomer Carl Sagan, and biophysicist Thomas H. Jukes, the successful defense of science will probably depend on philosophers of science, as Broad proposes, and possibly also on historians of science.

ANTHONY B. WAY
Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine, and Department of Anthropology, Texas Tech University, Lubbock 79430

... If methodological problems and doctrinal disputes add up to an undercutting of evolutionary facts, as creationist attorney Richard K. Turner claims, what about the creationists? Leaving aside the progressive creationists, the day-age creationists, the gap-theory creationists, the pre-Genesis gap-theory creationists, and others (1), the 6-day creationists by themselves encompass a spectrum of views, some departing considerably from the literal Genesis account. Some of these have been summarized by Morris (2). One of the disagreements concerns the number and kind of miracles in the creation model, a topic discussed further by Lammerts (3). While Morris is in favor of playing down the role of miracles, Lammerts insists there are a great many. Certainly incorporating miracles into explanatory hypotheses qualifies as a methodological oddity in a discipline that calls itself scientific creationism!

FRANK J. SONLEITNER
Department of Zoology, University of Oklahoma, Norman 73019

References

1. H. M. Morris, Ed., *Scientific Creationism* (Creation-Life, San Diego, Calif., 1974), pp. 220-243.
2. ———, *Creation Res. Soc. Q.* 11, 173 (1974).
3. W. E. Lammerts, *ibid.* 12, 75 (1975).

... The evolutionists seem to be allowing themselves to be boxed in by accepting definitions stipulated by the creationists. One might dispute these definitions by making the following four points:

1) The minimum necessary to make a doctrine religious is that it asserts the existence of at least one supernatural deity. Evolution is thus no religious doctrine and the establishment clause remains inviolate when schools mandate its teaching.

2) It is impossible to teach all the different views that may be held on any

point by different persons or groups. In any science it is appropriate to teach those views held by general consensus in the relevant competent scientific community, always provided that the views can be put in manageable form for students, and that the open-ended character of science is stressed.

3) There is no reason to hold that all theories properly described as scientific are predictive. A theory might well be oriented in one temporal direction for explanatory purposes, in this case the past, and still provide a scientific explanation in its domain. And if falsifiability were held to be the criterion for distinguishing scientific from nonscientific theories, it would not be too hard to devise tests for such a theory.

4) In any case, evolution can be considered a complex fact rather than a theory (1). What is in dispute among scientists is not the existence of the fact, but the mechanism through which evolution works.

BARRY R. GROSS
Department of Philosophy, York College, City University of New York, Jamaica, New York 11451

References

1. A. Montagu, *New York Times*, 17 March 1981, p. A16.

Same Name, Different Spelling

The 23 January issue of *Science* contains an article by R. Jeffrey Smith (News and Comment, p. 364) discussing the illegal transfer of sophisticated technology to the Eastern Bloc. On page 366 the author describes the activities of a certain Bryan Williamson, who is referred to as "a consulting engineer" "now with an electronics firm in England."

My name is Brian Williamson. Like the man in the article, I used to live in America and now live in England. I, also, am "a consulting engineer," and my company, Williamson Interface Ltd., is "an electronics firm in England." I earn my living consulting in the area of electrical and electronic engineering and have clients all over the world, especially in the United States. . . .

I know nothing of Bryan Williamson, and neither I nor any member of my firm has ever been engaged in the activities described in the article. . . .

BRIAN WILLIAMSON
Williamson Interface Ltd., Monksfield House, Malvern, Worcestershire, WR13 5BA, England