

ganization and financing of fundamental research in France, Germany, and the United Kingdom.

The idea for the study was germinated during discussions on the technology gap, but the project was carried through at a time when concern in Europe and the United States had shifted to a quest for ways to link science and technology more directly to the accomplishment of social and economic objectives. And a major premise of the report is that support of fundamental research is increasingly based on evidence that such research will contribute to achieving these objectives. Or as one author of the report told *Science*, "You can no longer speak of research without taking into account social demand."

The survey is actually part 1 of a scheduled three-part effort. Part 2 is to deal with smaller European countries, and part 3 to compare the situation in Europe with that in Canada, Japan, and the United States.

The first report is really an examination of the web of relationships connecting industry, government, and the universities in scientific matters. As a comparative study, it bounces around, sometimes disconcertingly, from industry to university to government and from country to country. Its chief virtue is that its authors, members of a multidisciplinary team headed by J. J. Salomon of the OECD directorate for scientific affairs, give the impression of being in direct touch with their sources of information, of writing with less attention to diplomatic politesse than is often the case in the reports of international organizations, and of being willing to question the assumptions that govern science policy. If one thing marks the report as a product of the 1970's rather than of the 1960's it is that the authors have concluded that the major obstacles to fundamental research in the countries under study are structural rather than financial.

The report is up-to-date in the sense that it takes into account "dislocations" in the scientific community, which are making it increasingly difficult for able young scientists to find employment either in universities or in research jobs outside university walls. At the same time, the report finds that, despite new conditions, research institutions, particularly universities, have not changed significantly in character. European universities have not reached the "advanced stage of scientific col-

Keeping an Eye on SESPA

Boston. The American Chemical Society braced itself for protest demonstrations at its national meeting in Boston this week after an unexpected phone call from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The FBI's Boston office warned the ACS to expect disruptions at a session last Sunday evening, then helpfully supplied the names of half a dozen persons who might be expected to lead them.

As it turned out, the trouble failed to materialize at the predicted hour, but ACS officials indicated that they were nonetheless grateful for the FBI's help. Along the way, it became evident that the FBI follows in some detail the activities of Scientists and Engineers for Social and Political Action (SESPA), a loosely knit group who publish a magazine of radical bent called *Science for the People*, and who are perhaps best known for demonstrations that they have staged at AAAS meetings. A SESPA spokesman interviewed by *Science* said he was surprised and dismayed that the FBI should be interested in the group, and he said the FBI's apparent surveillance amounted to a form of intimidation. Neither the Justice Department nor FBI offices in Boston and Washington would comment.

The chemical society's national meetings manager, A. T. Winstead, at first denied any knowledge of possible disruptions, then conceded that the FBI had indeed called. "We really wanted to keep this hushed up," he said, adding that the ACS had quickly arranged for a number of uniformed and plainclothes security guards to hover around the meeting at the Sheraton Boston Hotel. "We'd been expecting trouble for the past several years, and we were prepared," Winstead said. "But this year we hadn't bothered until the last minute."

What changed the minds of ACS officials was a telephone call last Friday noon from Bernard McCabe, a supervisor in the Boston FBI office, to Arnet L. Powell, a former chairman of the society's northeast section. Powell said agent McCabe told him the Boston police had been advised that SESPA might "march on" the ACS meeting, and would he pass the word along? Powell, a chemist at the Office of Naval Research, emphasized that his only previous contact with the FBI was in the course of routine security clearance checks.

Some weeks before the Boston meeting, SESPA members asked the ACS for permission to set up a table to distribute literature and for the use of a small meeting room. The ACS board of directors turned down the room request but allowed the table. Last Sunday afternoon, several neatly dressed young men and women attending the table in a bustling lobby said Winstead apparently had a list of names of SESPA people that went well beyond any mentioned in correspondence with the ACS. "I wondered how he knew so many names," one graduate student from M.I.T. said. Others in the group seemed both surprised and a little awed that the FBI should be interested in them.

Joe Richmond, who said he is a postdoctoral chemist at Harvard, and who was among those named on the FBI list, conceded that SESPA members had talked about plastering posters around the ACS meeting and staging a guerilla theater skit during one session, but that too few members had shown up on Sunday to make this possible. Richmond said SESPA's objective was not to disrupt the meeting but to draw attention to what it felt were urgent issues of ethics and unemployment facing chemists and which the ACS leadership was ignoring.

In general, the SESPA members who did show up at the ACS meeting Sunday seemed less bellicose than many who have appeared at AAAS meetings. It is worth noting that, since SESPA tries hard not to develop a strong central leadership, its character may be expected to change from one week to the next and from one place to another. In Boston this week, Joe Richmond said "We aren't trying to alienate. We are genuinely trying to reach out and communicate." Nevertheless, the ACS is on its guard, thanks to the FBI.—R.G.