

sentative Clarence Cannon of Missouri.

In the report, the committee says "significant improvements have been made in the areas of research and development management," but it is of the opinion "that there are other areas which require the introduction of improved management concepts."

Credit is given the McNamara regime particularly for improving the management of large weapons systems programs, but the report seconds critics of McNamara about a lack of new weapons and equipment.

The committee goes on to suggest that, "under existing procedures, the personnel of the Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDR and E) must assume too often a primarily negative role in their review of proposals of the military services. Perhaps more of the negative role could be vested in the Comptroller's office and DDR and E could undertake a more active part in expediting the successful completion of approved development programs."

The committee thinks DDR & E also has a more active part to play in applying tighter management and getting more mileage out of the military sciences program.

While not a new target, federal contract research centers—specialized nonprofit organizations formed to do specific research, analysis, and systems development work for the military services—came under the committee guns. The committee concedes an original need for such organizations but takes the view that, since the services have had time to develop "in-house capabilities" and Congress has voted federal salary increases for in-house specialists, it is questionable whether contracting with the nonprofits should be continued at its present levels. "When next year's budget is presented," the report notes, "the Committee will require more extensive data and justification for the Federal Contract Research Centers."

Citing the gold outflow problem and its concern over the management of research grants and contracts as a whole, the committee also called for reductions in research grants and contracts with foreign colleges, universities, and nonprofit institutions. In doing so it referred to a staff report which noted that the work of the separate research contracts offices maintained by the military services in different cities in Western Europe was poorly coordinated, and it directed that no grant should be made abroad unless a specific require-

ment for the Defense Department is involved.

The House Appropriations Committee has traditionally been the economizer among congressional committees, even in the freewheeling field of defense spending. But while Congress may reduce or increase appropriations beyond amounts requested, its effective power to direct in detail how the money appropriated shall be spent is limited, particularly when such strong-minded administrators as President Johnson and Secretary McNamara are in office. The bark, so to speak, is therefore likely to be worse than the bite.—JOHN WALSH

Stamler vs. HUAC: Heart Specialist, Called by Committee, Responds by Challenging HUAC's Legality

Encounters between scientists and congressional committees investigating alleged subversion—common in the 1950's when McCarthy and McCarthyism seared university campuses—have today become something of a rarity. One exception is the case of Jeremiah Stamler, M.D., whose current involvement with the House Committee on Un-American Activities or, as it is commonly called, HUAC, is part of a new chapter in the committee's history.

Stamler, 45, is a well-known heart specialist with impressive professional credentials. He is currently an employee of the Chicago Board of Health, where he is director of the Heart Disease Control Program and the Division of Adult Health and Aging, and executive director of the Chicago Health Research Foundation, the Board's research arm. He is also an assistant professor in the department of medicine at Northwestern University Medical School, and Western Hemisphere editor of the *Journal of Atherosclerosis Research*. Since 1949, the year after he was licensed to practice medicine, Stamler has published over 150 articles on diseases of the heart and blood vessels, and he is also the author of several books. He is currently the principal investigator on three research grants awarded by the National Heart Institute of the National Institutes of Health, where his activities are very highly regarded, and is at work on a number of other projects as well.

Early in May 1965, on the same day that he was named winner of the Albert Lasker Award in Medical Journal-

ism for his co-authorship of a series of articles on the prevention of heart disease, Stamler was subpoenaed to appear before HUAC during the committee's planned stint in Chicago to investigate an alleged resurgence of Communist activities there. Mrs. Yolanda F. Hall, a research nutritionist associated with Stamler at the Board of Health, was also ordered to appear. The committee never revealed why the two had been called. Their lawyers claim that the committee was attempting to deter Mrs. Hall from involvement in civil rights activities in her community, by harassing both her and Stamler, a close professional associate. The names of the subpoenaed witnesses were released to the Chicago press, and Stamler, the most eminent of those called, was immediately engulfed in headlines announcing "City Doctor Gets Red Quiz Subpoena," "Heart Expert Subpoenaed in Red Quiz," and so forth. Most newspapers featured Stamler's name in the lead paragraphs of their stories; at least one ran his photograph as well. (In response to the publicity—and the concern of his employers—Stamler signed what amounted to a loyalty oath for the Chicago Board of Health. Subsequently—after the hearings—the Board in effect gave him a vote of confidence and voted to retain his services.)

Such jolts to individual lives have not been uncommon in the years that HUAC has been at work. What was uncommon was Stamler's response to it. He and Mrs. Hall, after conferring with many people, decided neither to go along with the committee nor, as often occurs in such cases, to avoid testifying by taking the Fifth Amendment. Instead they chose to attempt a counteroffensive, and they brought a suit challenging the committee's constitutionality. In this action they had the support and counsel of one of Chicago's best-known lawyers, Albert E. Jenner, Jr. Jenner, who is a Republican, is, among other honors and offices, a past president of the Illinois Bar Association. He was also a senior counsel to the Warren Commission.

The day before the hearings were to begin, Jenner brought a motion before the Chicago federal court asking that the committee be declared unconstitutional and that it be enjoined from holding hearings. The petition was overruled—chiefly on the ground that it was premature—and the hearings began as scheduled. The case is now pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals,

and will probably be argued there around October.

The essential argument in the case is that Rule XI of the House of Representatives, a rule adopted in 1946 establishing HUAC, violates the U.S. Constitution. According to the Rule, HUAC is authorized to investigate (i) "the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States," (ii) "the diffusion . . . of subversive and un-American propaganda that . . . attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," and (iii) "all other questions . . . that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation." The Jenner brief argues that Rule XI violates the First and Fifth Amendments because "it is unduly vague, uncertain and broad." Rule XI, the argument continues, has authorized the "creation of a governmental mechanism with the sole purpose . . . of forcing public disclosure of beliefs . . . and associations of private citizens which may be unorthodox or unpopular, resulting in public stigma, scorn and obloquy;" it authorizes "compulsory examination of witnesses" so all-inclusive that it violates the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment; and "it violates the prohibition against Bills of Attainder . . . in that it authorizes and provides for legislative punishment."

Further complaints contained in the brief were that the subpoenas were not issued for "any legitimate legislative purpose"; that Hall and Stamler were not informed as to the purpose and scope of the hearings; that the committee, in calling open hearings, violated its own rule that testimony likely to be defamatory be taken in closed sessions; and that the advance publicity (for which the brief blames the committee) was improper.

Unfortunately, the hearings themselves did more to verify Jenner's arguments than to refute them. To judge from the hearing transcript, the 3-day sessions were rather like a purge trial staged by Ringling Brothers. Jenner, writing to Chicago's Mayor Daley after the hearings, said that he observed "many shocking occurrences, all of which were designed to fortify us in our determination to test the legality of the Committee and to challenge directly the tactics . . . of intimidation and public exposure for exposure's sake." Among objections to the proceedings Jenner cited were the following:

- The committee claimed to be seeking information as the basis for legislation, "yet the only two witnesses who testified . . . were paid informers for the FBI for many years, and the Committee had already heard their testimony in executive session."

- The committee refused to hear testimony about Stamler and Mrs. Hall in executive session.

- The committee mistreated witnesses' attorneys and "verbally abused" the witnesses themselves.

In addition, Jenner stressed that not a single witness during the 3-day hearings referred to Mrs. Hall at all, and only one witness mentioned Dr. Stamler. All other references to Stamler and Hall "were merely assertions or innuendos contained in questions of Committee counsel put to witnesses who declined to answer. . . ."

The one reference to Stamler, Jenner pointed out, was a "hearsay statement as to something which [the witness] recalled hearing another person say in 1959."

None of these arguments against HUAC is startlingly new. They have been heard before from individuals who have felt similarly victimized by the committee's operations from a legion of disinterested outside critics, and in occasional court cases. They have also been heard on the floor of Congress, where moves either to abolish the committee entirely or at least to arrange an official confrontation between the committee and its critics have been slowly but steadily gaining ground. Some have attributed the committee's recently announced decision to investigate the Ku Klux Klan to an attempt on the part of committee chairman Edwin Willis (D-La.) and some of its more moderate members to shed its "red-baiting" image and prove its wider usefulness. As to whether HUAC will really change its spots, most observers seem very doubtful; and while the 58 votes last February in favor of an anti-HUAC move in the House is some measure of how much the opposition has grown (opponents in the past few years have rarely numbered more than a handful), it is also some measure of the reluctance of legislators to seem to condone "subversion." A vote against HUAC, the reasoning seems to be, is an apparent vote "for communism." Anti-HUAC sentiment seems to have been increased by the events in Chicago—the sessions were characterized by organized demonstrations, verbal hostili-

ties, and other indices of mutual disrespect between the committee and the audience. But it appears, nonetheless, that HUAC is still snugly ensconced and that it will be around—and powerful for some time.

The difficulty of the position taken by Stamler and Mrs. Hall should not be underestimated. To avoid rendering moot the constitutional case pending in the Court of Appeals, Stamler and Mrs. Hall were advised to decline to answer the committee's questions. In addition, they expressly refused to claim the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. Instead, they both submitted brief statements, then left the hearing room—and were threatened with contempt citations as a result.

Science and HUAC

In a statement addressed to scientists and physicians, Stamler argued that the operation of HUAC was a threat to the independence of science. The statement reads, in part:

As a working scientist, I learned early that false initial assumptions inevitably lead to false conclusions and erroneous proposals. Thus, as long as the false notion persisted—prior to Galileo, Kepler and Copernicus—that the sun rotated around the earth, there could be no real science of astronomy. As long as the belief held on—prior to Harvey—that the blood surged to and fro, and did not circulate, there could be no real science of physiology or medicine. As long as the superstition held sway that persons with mental illness were possessed by devils, there could be no scientific psychiatry. And in my own field of research on atherosclerosis, there could be no substantial progress until the false premise had been dispelled that this was not a disease but rather an aspect of normal aging.

The Committee on Un-American Activities—I am deeply convinced—is in profound error precisely because it proceeds throughout on the basis of totally erroneous premises. Its fundamental false assumption is that it has the right and ability to define Americanism, and to fix its criteria for Un-Americanism—and on the basis of these arbitrary self-selected standards ferret out "Un-Americans."

As already emphasized, the adoption or imposition of false premises and hardened dogmas in science has a grossly debilitating effect. It is a truism that the forward advance of science—including biomedical science—in its continuously expanding effort to master nature for the benefit of mankind, requires a healthy free intellectual climate, a true open market place—national and international—for the exchange and flow of ideas. Repressive political interference in science can have only one effect—to stifle and hold back the acquisition of vital knowledge, to do great harm to research programs that have the potential to bring great benefit to all

Americans and all humanity. This threat is very real and concrete in the present instance.

An additional factor which influenced his decision, Stamler said recently, was a belief that the particular projects in which he is engaged might have suffered had the committee been given an opportunity to put the spotlight on the federal and other public institutions that support his work.

Some might disagree with Stamler's conclusion that HUAC threatens science, either in general or in his particular case. Federal agencies have withstood similar sniping in the past, and the city of Chicago has indicated that it intends to continue its support. Nonetheless, although it is too early to judge how far it will spread, the Stamler case seems to be arousing substantial interest in the academic community. A Legal Aid Fund has been established to help pay the legal costs, which, it is expected, may rise to the neighborhood of \$50,000. The chairman of the fund is Paul Dudley White of Boston, and the treasurer is Robert W. Wissler, professor and chairman of the Department of Pathology at the University of Chicago. Mailings sent out by two independent groups of physicians and scientists in the Midwest have already brought in over \$10,000 in contributions. In addition, a committee of well-known scientists and other academicians is in the process of formation, not only to support Stamler but to lead

in the exploration and exposition of the constitutional principles that his case against HUAC poses.

—ELINOR LANGER

Announcements

The **Middle Atlantic Planetarium Society** was formed recently at a meeting in Maryland. The group's aims included helping new planetariums and new planetarium teachers, primarily with curriculum materials; providing boards of education which are planning a planetarium with recommendations on construction; and acquainting its members with curriculum material at all grade levels. Additional information may be obtained from the chairman, Margaret K. Noble, of the D.C. Planetarium, Cardozo High School, Washington, D.C. 20009.

The American Institute of Biological Sciences has announced the establishment of the **BioInstrumentation Advisory Council** (BIAC). The council's purpose is to "facilitate directed information flow between biological and physical scientists," according to John R. Olive, AIBS executive director. It will evaluate instrumental and experimental techniques developed by engineers and physicists; perform surveys, and publish instrumentation information for biologists; and undertake projects designed to improve interdisciplinary research efforts in the two areas and to educate scientists in bioinstrumentation.

An organizational meeting of ten selected members will be held 19 August during the AIBS meeting in Urbana, Illinois.

Lloyd E. Slater, formerly associate director of research at Case Institute of Technology is resident executive secretary of BIAC. He will continue at Case as a senior research associate in the Engineering Design Center. Headquarters for the council will be at AIBS, 3900 Wisconsin Ave., NW, Washington.

The **Universities Research Association, Inc.**, was formed last month at a meeting of university presidents at the National Academy of Sciences. The corporation will offer its services to the federal government as manager of a proposed high-energy proton accelerator (*Science* 18 June, page 1573), if Congress approves its construction. The group will function as a "Council of Presidents," with each member institution represented by its chief executive. Its operations will be managed by a board of trustees composed of six members-at-large and 15 elected from nominees of the member institutions. Temporary trustees include the following university presidents: Detlev W. Bronk, Rockefeller; Robert F. Goheen, Princeton; Fred H. Harrington, Wisconsin; Grayson Kirk, Columbia; Joseph R. Smiley, Colorado; Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Indiana; H. Guyford Stever, Carnegie; and John C. Warner, former president of Carnegie, who has headed the organizing committee.

REPORT FROM EUROPE

Decisions on Nuclear Power

London. Crucial decisions for the world's nuclear power industry have been occurring in Europe.

Britain has chosen its own advanced gas-cooled reactor (AGR) as the first of a group of power reactors which are scheduled to be completed between 1970 and 1975. When the choice was announced in May, it was said that gas-cooled reactors of the type selected would deliver electricity in Britain more cheaply than American-designed reactors offered by British builders, and more cheaply than the most modern coal-fired stations now on order.

Reinforcing the impact of the British decision was increasing confidence in France that French-developed reactors of the graphite-gas type, fueled with natural uranium, would, before the end of the decade, deliver electricity at a cost competitive with that for electricity from fossil fuels.

Another decision seems to ensure that cooperation on the development of atomic power among the six nations of the Common Market (West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg) will endure. The members of the European

Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) had been quarreling for more than a year about a revision of the agency's 1963-67 research program. Ministers of the six nations have finally agreed on a program which de-emphasizes work on reactor designs already developed and focuses Euratom's research on the future. Thus, spending for studies of the two reactor designs approaching competitiveness with conventional energy sources would be reduced, and spending on thermonuclear fusion, fast reactors, and a heavy-water-moderated, organic-cooled reactor called Orgel would be increased.

The author, Victor K. McElheny, is European correspondent for *Science*. He will report frequently on important scientific installations and developments. Mr. McElheny has been a science news reporter for the *Charlotte Observer*, a Nieman fellow at Harvard, and recently was associated with the Swedish-American News Bureau in Stockholm. His address is Flat 3, 18 Kensington Court Place, London W.8, England. Telephone: Western 5360.