facturers' intentions is taken by Martin Danziger, assistant administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). Asked if there were a real need for nonlethal weapons, Danziger observed that "the business community has taken substantial interest in them and I have faith in their judgment." But the LEAA, through the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, of which Danziger is director, is also conducting its own analysis of police needs for new equipment, including nonlethal weapons. In addition, Danziger plans to let a multimillion dollar contract for the development of new nonlethal weapons. Last week Danziger's institute awarded a \$250,000 contract to the U.S. Army Land Warfare Laboratory to test and evaluate existing nonlethal weapons proposed for police use. The weapons to be tested include kinetic weapons such as beanbags and the stun-gun, chemical weapons, the taser, and miscellaneous devices such as instant cocoon and instant banana peel. The newfound interest of the LEAA in nonlethal weapons postdates the initiation of the Security Planning Corporation Study by the

With the LEAA now pressing ahead on nonlethal weapons, the future involvement of the NSF is unclear. Coates told *Science* that the social context in which a policeman might need to use a nonlethal weapon—the "behavior day" of the policeman—might be a suitable subject of study for the NSF's RANN program to fund.

Staff aides to Senator Kennedy-who is chairman of the Senate committee that authorizes appropriations for the NSF-indicate that Kennedy is interested in seeing the foundation actively involved in the area. One staff aide criticized the NSF for having produced a report with too narrow a scope: "There was no awareness that this is fundamentally a sociological problemthat was made clear in our original request but doesn't seem to have penetrated . . . ," he said. Kennedy's May 1971 letter to the NSF director states that, besides technical knowledge, there is also a need "for increasing our knowledge of the sociological and psychological aspects of police use of nonlethal weapons."

But the NSF seems to have had in mind the specific charge in his letter, which was "to develop a research program that would produce effective and reliable nonlethal devices for police and other protective and defense purposes." The report prepared by the Security Planning Corporation, which concentrates on the specific types of nonlethal weapons that should be developed, represents the first step toward fulfilling this directive.

While the NSF does not endorse the

report, its sponsorship of the project in obedience to Kennedy's behest has invited criticism from those who question the need to develop nonlethal weapons in the first place. According to Joseph Page, a law professor at Georgetown University who attended the conference held by the Security

DOD Research Stony Brook Issue

On 25 April the faculty senate of the State University of New York at Stony Brook voted to end Department of Defense (DOD) sponsored research at the university. Stony Brook president John S. Toll responded by declaring that before he comments publicly on the matter some procedural issues have to be clarified and, at least until then, there will be no change in university policy on research.

The amount of DOD-sponsored research has declined at Stony Brook in recent years; DOD research grants and contracts now amount to about \$200,000 of a total of about \$17 million in federally sponsored research at the university.

Wording of the motion passed at the meeting was as follows: "We demand an end to university complicity, both explicit and implicit, with the military: specifically, we call for the prohibition of any applications for new or renewed DOD grants and contracts." The motion carried 70 to 31.

A procedural question arose because the motion was proposed from the floor as an amendment to a resolution urging immediate withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Southeast Asia. The objection was that the motion on DOD-sponsored research was not included in the agenda circulated before the meeting, as required by faculty senate rules. Partisans of the motion argued that the meeting was called to discuss issues raised by a student strike in protest against the war and that the motion was therefore within the boundaries set for the meeting.

Some faculty members have noted that only about 100 of the approximately 850 faculty members eligible to vote in the faculty senate actually did vote on the question, and they express doubt that so important an issue should be decided by such a small vote. Those backing the motion reply that senate rules require a quorum of 75 and that, until such time as the rules are altered, actions of the senate should stand. Under the rules that govern the state university system in New York, the president of the individual university campus wields ultimate authority over matters such as research policy.

The motion to phase out military-sponsored research at Stony Brook has a history going back to the spring of 1970. The U.S. incursion into Laos and Cambodia occasioned a faculty senate vote to discontinue DOD research. That summer, when the question of renewal of DOD work arose, Toll consulted the graduate council, a subgroup of the senate, and was advised to proceed as usual. That autumn, the ban on DOD-sponsored research was rejected in a mail vote by 270 to 188.

This time proponents of the ban appear to be better organized to bring pressure on Toll to implement the ban. A letter was sent asking him to make public his decision by 4 May. When he declined to do so, a petition backing the ban was circulated and is now said to have some 225 faculty signatures.

Toll at this point has indicated that he will consult university groups, including the Stony Brook council, which acts as a local board of trustees, on the matter. But it is clear that at issue at Stony Brook is not only the future of DOD-sponsored research there, but the thorny question of the power of the faculty to influence operating policy.—J.W.