

(Continued from page 1102)

sarily encompasses the concept of a supernatural Creator," argues the complaint. "The concept of a Creator is itself an inherently religious belief. Creation-science cannot be taught without reference to that religious belief."

In their formal answer to the complaint filed on 19 August, the defendants simply deny this allegation but do not explain their logic. Such an explanation will be expected in court. Meanwhile, Clark states that reference to a Creator is as irrelevant to creation science as an explanation of the origin of matter is to evolution science.

Responding to the charge of violation of academic freedom, the defendants

make the direct countercharge. "It is the plaintiffs who in reality desire to abridge academic freedom by attempting to deny the right of teachers to teach, and students to learn, about two theories of origin—rather than one. The Balanced Treatment Act therefore assures academic freedom."

Bird also points out that the ACLU is making an unwarranted assumption that all teachers believe in evolution and reject creationism. "The ACLU's position on this is both extreme and illogical," he contends. "They say it is a greater danger to offer students choice and that the only way to ensure academic freedom is to indoctrinate children in evolution science."

The ACLU expects to be accused of censorship during the trial. "This could be the linchpin of Arkansas' defense of the statute," says ACLU attorney Jack Novik. "Our response is that the ACLU's creationism lawsuit is entirely consistent with our steadfast opposition to censorship and does not make us advocates of any scientific point of view." The rationale for this is that evolutionary theory is taught in schools because it has achieved wide acceptance in the scientific community whereas creationism would be taught because the law dictates that it should. "Thus, the ACLU opposes the Arkansas creationism statute because it *mandates* the teaching of government approved doctrine—in this instance, creationism."

The run up to the trial has not been entirely smooth for the defendants. Bird wanted to play a major role in representing the state's case. Clark refused, and offered him a minor role in preparing briefs and in the pretrial discovery process. Bird refused.

Bird now says he is pessimistic about the outcome of the trial, "not because the Balanced Treatment Act is not constitutionally sound but because the attorney general is doing an inadequate job." Clark's office is inexperienced in First Amendment law and is ill prepared in the science, Bird claims. "The ACLU is putting five to ten times more effort into this case than the attorney general is," he laments.

Clark's reason for refusing outside help, says Bird, is that he plans to run as a candidate for governor and therefore wants as much media attention as possible. "I haven't made a decision about my political future," says Clark, "but in any event, that has no bearing on whether Bird is involved or not."

"If the decision goes against the Balanced Treatment Act, the publicity will be extremely harmful," considers Bird. "Nevertheless, there is tremendous public support for the presentation of both sides in the teaching of origins." A recent Associated Press-NBC News poll put the following question to 1598 adults nationwide: "Do you think public schools should teach only the scientific theory of evolution, only the Biblical theory of creation, or should schools offer both theories?" Seventy-six percent said schools should teach both.

"The question was badly phrased," says Bird. "It shouldn't mention the Bible. Nevertheless, the survey does demonstrate that the demand for balanced treatment will not go away, no matter what happens in Arkansas."

—ROGER LEWIN

## Whitehead Link Approved

Edwin C. Whitehead's decade-long quest to establish a major biomedical research institute from his personal fortune has passed a crucial hurdle. Faculty members of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) voted at a packed meeting on 18 November to approve a plan to link the institute to MIT. The plan, which has been under negotiation for more than a year, has raised strong objections from some faculty members who argue that it requires the university to surrender some of its academic freedom (*Science*, 23 October, p. 416).

Although the faculty meeting is not the final word on the proposed venture—the MIT Corporation has the final say, and it will next meet on 4 December—the vote of approval is expected to be decisive. If the faculty had voted against the plan, the corporation would almost certainly have followed suit, but most observers now expect the deal to be consummated.

Whitehead, who amassed a fortune from Technicon, a family company that pioneered in the development of precision instruments for use in clinical laboratories, has agreed to put up \$20 million to build and equip the institute, provide \$5 million a year in operating funds, and leave an endowment of \$100 million when he dies. He has also agreed to give MIT \$7.5 million to offset the costs that may be incurred by linking the university with his institute.

The most controversial aspect of the plan is that although the institute would be administratively separate from MIT, most of its researchers would be full-fledged faculty members of the university. This has led to objections that MIT will be giving up some control over the selection of its faculty and over the choice of research areas in the biology department. On the other hand, supporters of the venture argue that the link will expand the biology department at a time when federal support is diminishing, and that it offers an opportunity to bring more junior faculty into a department that is now top-heavy with senior staff.

The 18 November faculty meeting was the first opportunity for most professors outside the biology department to voice their opinions on the venture. It attracted an unusually large turnout of some 400 faculty members. After some 2 hours of debate, a motion to disapprove the planned link was voted down by a margin of about 3 to 1, according to several participants. A resolution approving the arrangement but expressing "serious concern" over some of the implications was then approved by a margin of about 8 to 1.

MIT administration members then indicated that they took the vote to mean that the faculty approves a draft agreement that was finalized with the Whitehead Institute in October. The next, and probably the final, hurdle will be the corporation meeting on 4 December.—COLIN NORMAN