

of this concept, it has become increasingly—though not thoroughly—discredited during the current debate.

The present controversy may also foreshadow the downfall of the local board. Although local boards were strongly supported in both the House and Senate, the new legislation does away with the bulk of board duties, the classifying of undergraduate and most graduate students. The board will still have jurisdiction (and discretion) on remaining graduate deferments, occupational deferments, hardship deferments, and the cases of conscientious objectors, to name a few. But there is no doubt that its job has been diminished. In a few years, it may seem foolish to keep the boards alive for so little work.

In fact, even the reports of the Administration's defeat may be premature. The lottery, which seems to have been pushed aside, is not dead. The Administration plans to present a lottery plan to Congress next session. This

commitment reflects more than attachment to the recommendations of the Marshall Commission.

The Defense Department has always wanted to keep the average age of induction low, between 19 and 21. With draft calls high and with most graduate school deferments in effect next year, the average draftee will remain, as he has been, relatively young. Because of this, the department saw no need to shift now to the 19- to 20-year-old pool. Next June, however, two new groups—this year's college graduates who go on to graduate school and have one-year deferments, and next year's college graduates—will join the pool simultaneously; this influx will presumably force up the average age of induction considerably.

As a result, the Defense Department would like to shift to the 19-year-old pool and mix the younger boys with older college graduates. The fairest way to do this, it believes, is the lottery. If it can't get a plan through Congress,

it will face a difficult choice: switching to the 19-year-olds with what it considers an unfair selection system (but one actually preferred by the House Armed Services Committee); or, staying with the present order of inducting the oldest first in the 19- to 26-year-old pool. Because of the department's preference for the 19-year-old pool, the push for the lottery may be undertaken with more fervor next session.

Regardless of what happens, the most important consequence of this year's debate may lie somewhere else entirely. By eliminating most graduate school deferments next year, the new law enlarges the size of the 1-A pool significantly. In 12 months, the Selective Service System will be able to efficiently draft many more men than it has in the past. The ultimate effect of the draft debate may be to give the Administration more flexibility in increasing the size of the army—and, if desired, the size of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam.—ROBERT J. SAMUELSON

200 Bev: Close Senate Vote Defeats Effort to Delay Weston Project

The hotly contested authorization for beginning the 200-Bev accelerator in Illinois received its first approval from the full Congress on 12 July. By a vote of 47 to 37, the Senate beat back an amendment offered by Senator John O. Pastore (D-R.I.) which would have deleted from the AEC authorization the \$7.33-million portion for design work on the accelerator.

Those who wanted to defer the accelerator construction obtained a surprisingly large number of votes, especially when one considers that the House of Representatives had earlier defeated a similar move by a lopsided vote of 104 to 7. The main force behind the larger tally in the Senate was the peppery Pastore. Although Pastore did nothing special to organize his opposition force, he gathered a healthy number of the votes of both liberal Democrats and of Senators from the five states representing the disappointed suitors in the site-selection courtship last year. Most of the Senate Republicans voted with their party leader,

Illinois Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen.

The tousled-headed Illinois orator and the fiery Rhode Islander provided the main verbal pyrotechnics of the Senate debate. In a display of feeling unusual for the ultrapolite Senate, Dirksen said he would show Pastore "the error of his ways" and accused Pastore of the "airiest nonsense and persiflage . . . that I have heard on this floor for a long time." Dirksen argued that many people commuted long distances to work. Pastore lashed back: "this idea that it is perfectly all right for a Negro to travel 60 miles a day but it is not all right for a white man to travel 60 miles a day—that the white man can live close to his job while the Negro has to live in a ghetto removed by 35 miles—does not strike me as a dignified argument."

Dirksen noted that Illinois was much bigger than Rhode Island and that the people of his state appreciated "vistas." Pastore gave back as good as he got. "I would not say that the Senator from

Illinois is insincere . . . But it is time to be serious as well as sincere. The idea of making a joke of the whole situation of . . . how large Rhode Island happens to be, and all that sort of nonsense, really has no place in this debate."

Although Dirksen often used humor and sarcasm to make his points, he had placed his lance with skill. He argued that if Illinois was deprived of a federal installation merely because it did not have an open-housing law, then he was going to make sure that the 30 states without such laws were going to be punished along with Illinois when future projects were considered: "We are going to see if that is going to be the case that whatever is sauce for the goose is going to be sauce for the gander," he intoned. The realization of many Senators that their own states might be threatened was enough to bring them to vote with Dirksen.

Despite the initial congressional victory, all the major parties have suffered losses from the fight over the Illinois accelerator site. The scientists supervising the development are unhappy. National Accelerator Laboratory director, Robert Rathburn Wilson, who is charged with supervising construction of the machine, expressed his "deep disappointment" that Illinois had not passed "essential open-housing

A "Scientific Luxury"

In the lay press, the New York Times has long been a leading advocate and defender of federal support for basic research. On 16 July, however, the Times departed from this pattern to question the advisability of proceeding at this time with the construction of the Weston accelerator. Leading off with an editorial on last week's riots in Newark, New Jersey, titled, "The Gravest Responsibility . . .," the Times followed with an editorial on the 200-Bev accelerator, titled ". . . Vs. Scientific Luxury." Following is that editorial:

Newark's grim reminder of the nation's real needs makes particularly abhorrent the porkbarrel politics that won out when the Senate voted to approve Weston, Illinois, as the site for what is scheduled to be this country's largest atom smasher. But credit goes to Senators Pastore, Javits, and their colleagues who exposed the real issues at stake, and who won a moral victory when the vote margin in Weston's favor proved much narrower than had been expected.

Much of the Senate debate centered properly around the open-housing issue and the failure of the relevant Illinois and local authorities to provide adequate assurance that Negroes will be able to get housing on a par with whites in the neighborhood of this giant machine. There were numerous towns and cities with appropriate housing regulations that would have been delighted to have the atom smasher.

But there is an even more basic objection to any commitments or expenditures for this expensive research tool at this time. That objection is simply the irrelevance of a 200 billion electron volt accelerator to any real present national problem. The nation is engaged in a bloody war in Vietnam; the streets of its cities are swept by riots born of anger over racial and economic inequities; millions of Americans lack proper housing, adequate medical care, and essential educational opportunity. The budget cutters are now in full cry demanding reductions in already inadequate expenditures for human needs. It is a distortion of the national priorities to commit many millions now to this interesting but unnecessary scientific luxury.

legislation." In a letter to Pastore earlier this month, he said, "Already we are facing serious recruitment problems resulting from the antagonism that has been displayed toward open-housing legislation and from the uncertainty and unpleasantness generated by the conspicuously negative manner in which the State Senate has treated this important problem."

In addition, the failure of Illinois to do much to promote equality of housing opportunity has done nothing to enhance its reputation in Washington. Also, despite the great furor over the Weston site, Illinois Negroes have little to show as yet for their civil rights efforts.

Perhaps the biggest loser in reputation is the Atomic Energy Commission. Both supporters and opponents of the Weston site think that the AEC bungled the civil rights as a factor in the place-

ment of the accelerator; others deplore the AEC's failure to live up to its announcement that the civil rights factor was relevant. In the debate, Pastore said: "The trouble with the AEC is that, when the issue got to be a hot potato, they dropped it . . . once this issue was raised by a federal agency, in my mind . . . to back off is unpardonable."

The struggle over the Illinois accelerator site seems destined to continue. Pastore sits on the Senate Appropriations Committee on Atomic Energy and can continue to work to delay funds for the accelerator until Illinois obtains adequate open-housing legislation. Emboldened by their show of Senate strength and by the ever-growing economic needs of the Vietnam war, the critics of the Illinois location have yet to give up their fight.

—BRYCE NELSON

APPOINTMENTS

Morton D. Pareira, surgeon-in-chief at the Jewish Hospital of St. Louis and professor of surgery at the Washington University School of Medicine, to full-time chairman of the division of surgery at Albert Einstein Medical Center, Philadelphia, and professor of surgery at Temple University School of Medicine. . . . **Dean W. Roberts**, executive director of the National Commission on Community Health Services, to director of the Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital, the Division of Regional Medical Program, and also to professor of community medicine. . . . **John Y. Templeton, III**, director of the Division of Surgery, Pennsylvania Hospital, and professor of surgery at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, to Samuel D. Gross Professor of Surgery and head of the department of surgery, Jefferson Medical College, and attending surgeon-in-chief at Jefferson Hospital. . . . **Thomas J. King**, chairman of the embryology department, Institute for Cancer Research, to professor of biology, Georgetown University. . . . **G. Whitlock**, chairman of the department of anatomy, State University of New York Upstate Medical Center, to chairman of the department of anatomy, University of Colorado Medical School. . . . **Myron Kratzer**, director of the Division of International Affairs, Atomic Energy Commission, to assistant general manager for International Activities. . . . **Leslie Williams**, former deputy chairman of Imperial Chemical Industries, England, to president of the Royal Institute of Chemistry, England. . . . **Dexter Hanley**, professor of law, Georgetown University, to adviser to the U.S. Delegation to the U.N. Economic and Social Council. . . . **Elmo R. Morgan**, a vice president of the University of California, and **S. Fred Singer**, dean of the School of Environmental and Planetary Sciences, University of Miami, to deputy assistant secretaries of the Interior for water pollution control. . . . **Frederick O. Diercks**, director of the U.S. Army Coastal Engineering Research Center, to associate director for aeronautical charting and cartography, ESSA-Coast and Geodetic Survey. . . . **Harold Margulies**, associate director of the Division of Internal Medical Education, Association of American Medical Colleges, to assistant director of the AMA's Division of Socio-Economic Activities.