Who Are the Gay Scientists?

Responding to numerous accounts of discrimination, the AAAS Council, in January 1975, recognized the problems of gay and lesbian scientists in the conduct of their science and passed a resolution in support of the rights of sexual minorities. In this resolution, the AAAS deplored "any form of discrimination on the basis of sexual behavior between consenting adults in private." It noted that "because of this discrimination, some scientists are denied the opportunity to practice their profession and others are treated unequitably in terms of salary, promotion, or assigned duties." Subsequent to passage of this resolution, scholarly research questions related to homosexuality and issues of homophobia have been raised at other Annual Meetings. Most notably in January 1980 in San Francisco, a group of gay and lesbian scientists convened to discuss such issues and to set up a national organization.

In June 1980 the Committee on Opportunities in Science (COOS) offered a statement, later transmitted to the Council, which encouraged continued cognizance by the Office of Opportunities in Science (OOS) of the resolution by reiteration of AAAS advocacy of policies of nondiscrimination; assuring the airing of relevant scholarly issues in open forums in the scientific community; and working with the Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility in defining specific and general cases of discrimination for appropriate action. At that same time, however, COOS advised OOS to continue its program emphasis on groups who face barriers related to career access, that is, minorities, women, and the physically handicapped.

In the 18 July 1980 issue of *Science*, a letter appeared from a number of the organizers of the national gay and lesbian scientists group. It outlined some of the specific problems faced by gay and lesbian scientists who seek to conduct their science without the discriminatory behavior and stumbling blocks placed in their paths by those who would put issues of sexual orientation above issues of scientific merit and ability as professionals. The authors cited a number of examples of rights violations based on sexual preference, such as the effect on gay scientists of immigration practices which bar U.S. admittance to homosexuals.

But who are the gay scientists? Where are they? What are they doing? The staff office for the Committee on Opportunities in Science—the committee charged in the Council resolution with overseeing Association activities regarding sexual minorities—recently received a number of letters from gay and lesbian scientists urging that nondiscrimination on the basis of sexual preference or orientation be included as an advertising requirement of *Science*. Some scientists merely endorsed the request; others gave a more detailed account of the problems and barriers which they have faced as scientists who have had varying amounts of difficulty in their professional life because of being gay or lesbian.

While stereotyping might lead one to think that such letters probably came from a few enclaves within the United States where homosexual life-style is not punished either legally or socially, such as California, New York, or the Washington, D.C., area, letters were in fact received from scientists all over the United States, from Massachusetts to Florida, from Iowa to California. Stereotyping might also lead us to expect that gay and lesbian scientists might choose some fields over others; this proved to be false. Letters were received from persons working in nutrition, psychology, chemistry, astronomy, mathematics, anatomy, engineering, public administration, biology, that is, any field which anyone else would enter. Gay and lesbian scientists and engineers are employed in industry, academia, and the federal government. Letters were received from persons employed at major Ph.D. granting institutions as well as 4-year colleges, again the full range that one would expect of any other scientist.

Gay scientists, following the lead of minority and women scientists, have formed caucuses within a number of professional societies where they can band together as a political unit or as an action group to demand rights within the profession. At the San Francisco meeting on homophobia in the workplace, speakers noted, for example, the existence of a caucus among the psychologists; there is a group of gay dentists and several groups of gay engineers. The Los Angeles Gay Scientists and Triangle Area (North Carolina) Gay Scientists are but two local and regional groups with whom the Office of Opportunities in Science has corresponded.

Perhaps too many of the arguments advanced to date have focused on discrimination against gay and lesbian scientists and engineers, without enough corresponding attention being focused on the effect such discrimination has on the rest of the scientific community. The nongay scientific community may be denied the opportunity for interaction and exchange with persons whose scientific ability and competence is unrelated to their sexual preference. They may be denied the talent of a scientist who cannot obtain a security clearance, or who has given up many professional activities

Call for Nominations: 1982 General Election

The Committee on Nominations will meet this fall to select candidates for the 1982 general election. The Committee invites AAAS members to submit nominations, including self-nominations, for the positions of President-Elect and members of the Board of Directors for consideration at that meeting.

A list of current Board members is given on the contents page of *Science*. Candidates for terms to start on 9 January are listed in the 21 August issue.

Nominations should be sent to the Executive Officer, at the AAAS address, no later than 9 October 1981. Each nomination must be accompanied by a curriculum vitae of the proposed candidate.

because of past ostracism. Still less attention has been paid to the special aspects of research questions that involve gay-related issues such as health problems that may be peculiar to this population.

How much do homosexual life-styles contribute to the increase noted in the last census in the number of households comprised of unrelated adults? Clearly, gay-related issues must be considered in formulating research questions; the full participation of gay scientists in articulating these may help us achieve greater honesty in our inquiry. While we do not deny the effects on the persons who are discriminated against, we seldom see the effects on science and technology, which is poorer for the loss of any talent because of personal attributes that are irrelevant to ability as scientists and engineers, be it race, religion, sex, national origin, physical disability, or sexual orientation.

The National Organization of Gay and Lesbian Scientists and the Washington Area Gay Scientists have made plans to meet in Washington, D.C., in January 1982 at the AAAS Annual Meeting. At that time they will explore possible solutions to the real problems they face of discrimination in employment, promotion, hiring, and career advancement. Perhaps they can arrive at solutions to these problems. And perhaps they can find solutions to the larger problem—why do we discriminate, and what are we losing by continuing to do so?

SHIRLEY M. MALCOM
Office of Opportunities in Science

Federal Energy Policies and the Southeast

As federal energy policies change, how will the southeastern region of the United States adapt? This question will be explored in the third AAAS regional energy seminar for 1981. The seminar will use the state of Georgia, a net energy importer, as a case sample.

"Georgia's Energy Future: Issues and Alternatives for Policymakers" will be held 1–2 October at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta. The seminar will address the regional impacts of federal and state energy policies, including legislative issues and policy options affecting Alabama, Florida, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee, as well as Georgia. It will bring together leaders from federal, state, and local governments; industry; the scientific and technical communities; universities; and concerned citizens. Along with the AAAS, cosponsors for the seminar are Atlanta University; Georgia Institute of Technology; Georgia Office of Energy Resources; and Sigma Xi, the Scientific Research Society.

For additional information, please contact Patricia S. Curlin, program administrator, Regional Energy Seminars, at the AAAS address, or call 202-467-4310. This seminar program is supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Energy.

The seminar scheduled for 21 September in Boulder, Colorado, has been postponed.

Scientific Society Presidents Discuss Federal Budget

For the second successive year, the AAAS hosted a "Consultation of Presidents of AAAS Affiliated Societies" as part of a continuing effort to foster intersociety cooperation and interaction in science policy activities. The meeting focused on the prospects for federal funding for research and development. Held in Washington, D.C., on 24 June, it began with an afternoon briefing and consultation on R & D budget issues and continued into the evening with a reception and dinner.

AAAS president D. Allan Bromley presided over the discussion of recent Administration and congressional actions on the federal R & D budget. After briefly summarizing the status of the FY 82 R & D budget, Willis Shapley, senior author of *R & D: AAAS Report VI*, and Michael Telson, budget analyst from the U.S. House of Representatives Budget Committee, responded to questions. A lively interchange was sparked among the approximately 130 participants, including affiliated society representatives, R & D experts from Congress and the Executive Branch, and invited guests.

The evening's featured speaker was Republican Senator Harrison Schmitt of New Mexico. Addressing the Reagan Administration's approach to R & D funding for 1982 and beyond, the scientist/astronaut noted that the overriding concerns of the Administration are to reduce federal spending, reestablish an adequate national defense, and revitalize our economy. Schmitt pointed to science and technology as key to the Administration's goals. He felt that "science and technology, properly developed and used, are our critical advantages—in defense, in economic competition, and in providing a better life for our citizens."

Commenting favorably on the nomination of George Keyworth as the President's science adviser, Schmitt applauded Keyworth's knowledge in defense matters and his special concerns about strengthening research capabilities.

The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space singled out three priority areas for the new science adviser to focus on. Space, scientific and technical manpower, and strategic minerals and materials were seen as lacking in national policy direction or well-defined research programs. "Unless we correct this," Schmitt concluded, "our goals for national defense and economic revitalization will be much more difficult, perhaps impossible to achieve."

Eighty-five presidents or other officers of the affiliated societies attended the forum, reception, and dinner. Many participants also stayed for the 6th Annual R & D Policy Colloquium, which followed on 25 and 26 June.

The AAAS will hold similar activities with its affiliated societies in the future to discuss current, critical science policy issues of mutual concern.

PATRICIA S. CURLIN
Office of Public Sector Programs

Proposals and Resolutions Invited for 1982 Council Meeting

The AAAS Council will hold its next meeting on 7 January 1982 during the Association's Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. Organizations or individuals who wish to present proposals or resolutions for possible inclusion in the meeting agenda should send them in writing to the Executive Officer at the AAAS address, *for receipt no later than 30 October 1981*, so that they may be considered by the Committee on Council Affairs at its fall meeting. The Committee asks that the following guidelines be observed:

1) All proposals and resolutions should be consistent with the objectives of the Association and deal with matters appropriate for consideration by the council of a scientific organization.

2) Resolutions should be written in the traditional format, beginning with one or more "whereas" statement-of-fact clauses and concluding with a