

Scientists and Engineers for McCarthy

A group of Massachusetts academicians and industrialists last week expressed opposition to the renomination of President Johnson by announcing the formation of Scientists and Engineers for McCarthy.

The group, which will work in behalf of Senator Eugene McCarthy, the Minnesota Democrat who is a very long-shot contender for the Democratic presidential nomination, includes many members of the 1964 Scientists and Engineers for Johnson-Humphrey movement. Spokesmen for the new group said they are abandoning the President this time around because of his Vietnam policies and what they consider his neglect of urgent domestic problems. In 1964, explained Nobel laureate Edward M. Purcell, "we had an incumbent who wanted peace. Now we have an incumbent who wants war."

About 65 scientists and engineers had joined the movement as of last week, including five Nobel laureates and 16 members of the National Academy of Sciences. The Nobelists, in addition to Purcell, are Konrad Bloch, Albert Szent-Györgyi, George Wald, and James D. Watson.

Significantly, the group includes two men who have served on the President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC) under President Johnson (though both were appointed under earlier presidents). They are Jerrold R. Zacharias, who served from 1952 to 1958 and from 1961 to 1964, and who is still chairman of PSAC's Panel on Educational Innovation, and Purcell, who served from 1957 to 1960 and from 1962 to 1965, and who is still a panel consultant.

There was no indication last week whether such key members of the 1964 Johnson-Humphrey support group as Jerome B. Weisner and George B. Kistiakowsky, both former presidential science advisers, will join the McCarthy group.

Scientists and Engineers for McCarthy seems to have been slapped together in somewhat disorganized fashion after a lunch staged by McCarthy's Bay State supporters for some 50 academics at the Harvard Club of Boston. The scientists announced the formation of their new group last week in a quarter-page ad in the Boston *Globe* and at a press conference. Purcell told reporters no real effort had been made to recruit members. Most of the original 65 come from M.I.T. and Harvard, with a scattering from other academic institutions, research facilities, and industries throughout the state.

The name—Scientists and Engineers for McCarthy—was deliberately chosen to evoke memories and suggest how much the situation has changed since the 1964 Scientists and Engineers for Johnson-Humphrey campaign. Purcell said he would like to give the President the following message: "We were all for you then. We're not now. It isn't we that have changed."

Salvador Luria, M.I.T. biologist, said on behalf of the group: "The insistence on military victory in Vietnam, and the low priority given to the fight against poverty and urban decay at home, have produced a deep frustration and a sense of loss of national purpose. A new leadership is needed."

The organization's newspaper ad urged "a redirection of our national efforts: *away* from the inexorable pursuit of military victory in Vietnam; *towards* a more constructive role in world affairs; *towards* the mobilization of resources for the solution of pressing national problems."

Ascher H. Shapiro, head of the department of mechanical engineering at M.I.T. and a principal organizer of the group, predicted that a national Scientists and Engineers for McCarthy organization would be established in the near future. Luria said he has already received calls from interested people in Wisconsin and California, two states in which Senator McCarthy plans to oppose the President in next spring's primaries.—P.M.B.

experience or did you form it from reading technical literature?

A. I read it. I formed it from reading literature . . .

Q All right. Now, what technical literature did you base it on?

A. I couldn't give it to you. I don't know.

The trial ended shortly after the defense agreed to stipulate to the court that DDT is harmful to fish and wildlife. Judge Jack Stanislaw, who had received the great mass of technical testimony with forbearance, took the case under advisement. He did not rule until a few weeks ago, when he lifted the ban on using DDT for mosquito control. The ban was reinstated shortly thereafter when Yannacone petitioned for further hearings in the case.

Early this fall, while a decision in the Suffolk County case was still pending, Yannacone and his scientist friends set up EDF and filed more court suits. Speaking in October before the National Audubon Society convention, Yannacone proposed the establishment of a legal action group dedicated to defense of the environment. "Conservationists should look to the 50-year history of the human rights struggle in the American courts," he said. "Somebody had to sue somebody before the legislature acted." The Audubon convention adopted a motion approving the EDF concept and referred it to the society's board of directors.

However, Yannacone and his friends proceeded on their own, moving immediately to have EDF incorporated as a nonprofit, tax-exempt membership group established for scientific and educational purposes. In addition to the Yannacones and the three Long Island scientists mentioned above, there were five other founding trustees, among them Robert E. Smolker, an embryologist at Stony Brook; Anthony S. Taormina, a wildlife biologist and Long Island regional supervisor for the New York department of conservation; and H. Lewis Batts, Jr., a biologist at Kalamazoo College, who was the first to propose to the Audubon convention that an environmental defense fund be created. The Audubon Society has since contributed about \$7600 to EDF to cover the cost of reproducing the trial record in the Suffolk County case.

In November, EDF brought its first court action in its own name. It sought to prevent the use of dieldrin in a cooperative Japanese-beetle-control proj-