Euthanasia Education Council that is not legally enforceable, but which affirms a person's desire to dictate at what point in an illness life maintenance efforts should cease. Rosoff's paper included a brief review of legislative activity on "death with dignity" among the states, the implications of "right to die" legislation for physicians, and the prospective for legislative versus judicial authorization of public policy.

Perhaps the most complex facets of death and dying policy issues were broached in Veatch's paper, "Criteria for Determination of Death: An Evaluation." It was his assignment to review definitions of death and the difficulties implied in the task of standardizing policy for such definitions. Reviewing traditional touchstones—irreversible loss of flow of vital body fluids, the soul from the body, the capacity for bodily integration, and consciousness—Veatch made the point, finally, that although technology may be able to determine when a person's heart, lungs, or brain has stopped functioning, to identify any of these conditions in a human being is not to identify death. The problem remains of settling on a single definition of what death is and, from Veatch's point of view, technology cannot make the decision for us.

Other facets of the issue discussed by Veatch were the influence of new transplantation technology on death and dying policy, the application of definitions of death to the fetus, and the possible complications imposed thereby on the abortion issue.

Andre Hellegers closed the morning session of the program by commenting on each of the three preceding papers. He underscored the complexity of the "definition of death" versus the "right to die" problems by restating Veatch's contention that it is a philosophical dilemma; took a cautionary stand on "living wills," predicting unforeseen effects on family involvement and medical insurance costs; and called Taeuber's paper the most relevant of the three, in that it exposed the fact that public policy has the potential to dictate how we die as well as how we live.

Hellegers' closing words reflected both the complexity of integrating knowledge and opinion toward policy formulation and the need for more exposure of facts of the kind discussed during the AAAS/Georgetown University Health Policy Center seminar. "It suffices, today, for this one conference, to bring these facts to light, for ultimately decisions by the body politic are our decisions and we should be acting out of a lack of humaneness if we acted out of ignorance."

All seminar registrants were given the opportunity to informally discuss each of the four papers and to formulate recommendations for policy-makers during afternoon workshop sessions. The Georgetown University Health Policy Center, from whose research and analysis activity the seminar idea emerged, will compile the proceedings, including recommendations of the conference, and AAAS will publish the report in the late fall.

NANCY CAHILL JOYCE
Public Information Office

Congressional Science Fellows: Do They Make a Difference?

What difference does the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellow Program make? Guyford Stever, President Ford's choice to head the new White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, provided an interesting perspective on that question during testimony he gave in July before the Select Committee to Study the Senate Committee System.

Dr. Stever noted that changes have taken place in the Congress in recent years which enhance the ability of Congress to set the direction of the national science effort. Among these changes he cited four: establishment of the Office of Technology Assessment, implementation of the Budget Control and Impoundment Act, strengthening of the Congressional Research Service and the General Accounting Office, and initiation of Congressional Science Fellowships, such as the program developed by AAAS.

His remarks included the observation, "An increased number of scientifically and technically trained staff on congressional committees has given the committee hearing process itself the ability to probe more deeply into key science and technology issues. I believe that the programs of Congressional Fellowships that the scientific community has established have provided a reservoir of highly talented newcomers who have contributed greatly to the ability of Congress to deal with science and technology matters. Surely they've helped in designing many tough questions for agency heads like myself to answer."

Photo by Marvin Ickow

The 1976–77 Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows, including four sponsored by AAAS, participated in an intensive orientation program arranged by the Association, 7 to 17 September. They are, left to right: Kirby Holte (sponsored by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers), Lloyd Faulkner (Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology), Gary A. Ritchie (AAAS), Sara C. Schurr (American Psychological Association), Ronald Bruno (American Physical Society), George L. Jacobson (AAAS), Frank Hurley (American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics), Granville J. Smith (American Physical Society), E. William Colglazier, Jr. (AAAS), Michael D. Crisp (Optical Society of America), and Robert Darryl Banks (AAAS).