

AAAS Colloquium on R&D Policy

19–20 June 1980

The Shoreham Hotel
Washington, DC

This highly successful Colloquium, sponsored by the AAAS Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy, will bring together leaders in government, industry, and the scientific and technical communities to address issues relating to R&D and public policy making in an inflationary environment. Topics will include:

- *Federal R&D Issues in the FY 1981 Budget* • the original FY 1981 budget and the budget revision • impact of inflation;
- *Industry R&D and the Economy* • problems of R&D in industry • implementing federal policies on innovation • coping with inflation;
- *Science and Research at Universities* • outlook for federal funding of research • impact of demographic changes on university needs and capabilities • federal policies and priorities • public accountability;
- *State and Local Interests in R&D* • federal R&D and state and local needs • state and local funding of R&D • technology transfer.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: AAAS REPORT V, by Willis H. Shapley, Albert H. Teich, Gail J. Breslow, and Charles V. Kidd, will be provided to Colloquium registrants. The *Report* covers R&D in the federal budget and other topics relating to R&D and public policy. Registrants will also receive the published proceedings of the conference.

For program and registration information, write:

R&D Colloquium
AAAS Office of Public Sector
Programs
1776 Massachusetts Ave., NW
8th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

LETTERS

Creationism in Iowa

Efforts to require equal time in the public schools for the teaching of "scientific creationism" and evolution are currently under way in Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, New York, Virginia, Georgia, Tennessee, California, and Florida. The issue may be expected to surface in other states as well. People concerned with the question continue to inquire about recent handling of the controversy in Iowa.

In February 1977, a bill was introduced in the lower house of the Iowa legislature that read as follows (1):

If a public school district offers courses which teach pupils about the origin of humankind and which include scientific theories relating to the origin, instruction shall include consideration of the creation theory as supported by modern science.

The bill was killed in committee.

In May 1977, a local school district asked the Iowa Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to consult with experts in the scientific community to determine if the evidence used to support the creationist theory was scientifically credible and should be made available to students to exemplify good scientific investigation. Also, a member of the Iowa legislature asked the DPI to study the status of the teaching of creationism in the public schools of other states.

In June 1977, DPI State Superintendent Robert D. Benton directed the DPI science consultant to thoroughly study the issue. A questionnaire was sent to the departments of education of all 50 states. Forty-five responded. It was found that few states have guidelines for dealing with the controversy. The methods used generally involve either neutrality, or selection or screening of instructional materials by a state committee. Six states require, either by legislation or by departmental regulation, some form of recognition of creationism.

After careful review of activity in other states, it was decided that a DPI position paper would be preferable to legislative mandates or state board rulings. This approach would encourage schools to exercise independent control of educational issues. DPI also sent inquiries to two dozen scientific, educational, civic, or creationist societies; church organizations; and most Iowa colleges. Several hundred scientists, teachers, school administrators, clergymen, philosophers, parents, textbook authors, and lay people were contacted. Relevant legal literature was researched. A position paper was finally prepared that supports

evolution as a valid scientific theory but does not mandate the teaching of either evolution or creationism. The decision about what to teach is left in the hands of local school boards. The paper has been reprinted in several journals (2), and copies have been requested by approximately 500 persons or organizations in various states.

During 1978 and 1979, various meetings dealing with the controversy were held at universities, colleges, the Capitol Building, and elsewhere in the state. The *Des Moines Register*, which has a statewide circulation, carried a large and continuing volume of correspondence. The *Register* reported that it was receiving a disproportionate number of letters supporting creationism versus those supporting the teaching of evolution. But the newspaper printed approximately equal numbers of letters on both sides. The letters pretty well covered all aspects of the issue. Editorially the *Register* supported evolution and opposed equal time (3).

In February 1979, a new bill was introduced in the Iowa State Senate calling for the following (4):

Whenever the origin of man or the origin of the earth is alluded to or taught in the educational program of public schools of this state, the concept of creation as supported by scientific evidence shall be taught as one theory.

The bill stimulated renewed discussion throughout Iowa, both among professionals and lay people.


In April 1979, Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray said he was against a state mandate that public schools in Iowa also teach the creation theory if the evolution theory is taught. In a news conference Ray stated that school officials already have the flexibility to address the subject of creation and should continue to have control (5).

Also in April, voting members of the board of directors of the Iowa Academy of Science adopted the following statement:


As scientists we object to Senate bill #458 which proposes to equate "scientific creationism" and evolution as scientific theories. We object primarily because "creationism" is not science but "religious" metaphor clothed as "scientific" fact. There is an overwhelming acceptance by knowledgeable scientists of all disciplines that evolution is consistent with the weight of demonstrable evidence. We feel that Iowa students deserve an education consistent with views of legitimate scientists and that "creationist" views have no proper place in the science classroom. We fully respect the religious views of all persons but we object to attempts to require any religious teachings as science.

The academy statement was distributed to members of the state senate on the


Fraction collectors from LKB span a range of capability and cost— every one provides LKB reliability



RediRac: portable—
economical—variable
tube size



MultiRac: overhead
microprocessor—
programmable—solvent
resistant



UltoRac: rugged—easy
to use—200 tube capacity

The three fraction collectors LKB makes today range from a portable circular unit to one with microprocessor control that can collect from microliters to gallons. Each is engineered from a bench worker's viewpoint—a fact of life for us from the time we made equipment for Svedberg and Tiselius.

Some say LKB uses circuitry, mechanical systems, materials of construction and QC methods which far exceed normal requirements. *Nostra culpa*. We believe in giving good value for money no matter how simple or sophisticated the instrument. Far better than compromising quality for price.

And if you ever need service, you get it fast from LKB without having to ship your unit back to us. (Money-saving service contracts are available.) Even better—we can furnish in-depth training for *your own* service people.

Reliability of design, reliability of manufacture, reliability of service: they all add up to reliability of performance. Is it prudent to settle for anything less? Contact LKB today for information on RediRac®, UltoRac® and MultiRac™ fraction collectors.



LKB Instruments Inc.
12221 Parklawn Drive, Rockville, MD 20852
301: 881-2510

Circle No. 405 on Readers' Service Card

83A-316

day of a public hearing on the bill before the Senate Education Committee. It also appeared in the press and apparently had substantial effect. Attendance at the committee hearing by both senators and the public was good. Media coverage was extensive. Students in favor of creationism from Iowa State University held orderly demonstrations. After the hearing, the equal-time bill was referred to the finance committee, where it was held without being taken to the floor.

Several factors probably contributed to the bill's failure to progress. They include the required expense, the substantial discussions of the controversy in the newspapers and elsewhere, The Register's editorial position, Governor Ray's stand, DPI's position paper, the intercession of the Iowa Academy of Science, and the management by State Senator Arthur A. Small, Jr., who led the opposition. Especially important was the involvement of a large number of evolutionary scientists, both in generating pro-evolution publicity and in speaking at the Senate hearing and at other meetings.

The Iowa Academy of Science is appointing members of a panel willing to assist teachers who encounter difficulties because of teaching evolution. The DPI will inform teachers throughout the state of the existence, membership, and charge of this panel. The Social Implications of Science Committee of the academy endorses this action and will respond to this and other controversies as the need arises.

During the summer of 1979, an interim study committee of the Iowa legislature was directed to review the controversy and make recommendations to the full legislature. The study committee decided not to recommend a creationist bill to the 1980 legislature.

Also during the summer one of the sponsors of the 1979 Senate bill queried the state attorney general's office concerning purported discrimination against creationism in the schools. The opinion of the assistant attorney general was that "nothing in Iowa law requires the teaching of the creationist model in public school science courses" (6).

In January 1980, a new creationist initiative resulted in the proposal of another version of the 1979 bill that says: "Whenever the origin of humankind or the origin of the earth is alluded to or taught in the educational program of the public school corporations of this state, the concept of creation as supported by scientific evidence may be included." The 1980 bill would seem to apply to all levels of state-controlled institutions of education.

Unified action by scientists, through such organizations as the academies of science, and clearly defined positions taken by education departments appear to be appropriate means for handling such controversies.

JACK A. GERLOVICH
*Iowa Department of Public Instruction,
Des Moines 50319*

KARL E. GOELLNER
*Department of Biology, Coe College,
Cedar Rapids 52402, and Iowa Academy
of Science, Cedar Falls 50613*

STANLEY C. GRANT
*Iowa Geology Survey,
Iowa City 52242*

ROBERT W. HANSON
*Iowa Academy of Science and
Department of Chemistry, University
of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls 50613*

DONALD M. HUFFMAN
*Iowa Academy of Science and
Department of Biology,
Central College, Pella 50219*

CLIFFORD G. MCCOLLUM
*Iowa Academy of Science and Office of
the Dean, College of Natural Sciences,
University of Northern Iowa*

LOIS H. TIFFANY
*Iowa Academy of Science and
Department of Botany,
Iowa State University of Science
and Technology, Ames 50011*

STANLEY L. WEINBERG
Ottumwa, Iowa 52501

References

1. H. Daggett, "Iowa House file 254" (bill filed with the Iowa General Assembly, Des Moines, February 1977).
2. J. Gerlovich, *Iowa Sci. Teach. J.* 15, 2 (September 1978); *Capsule XII*, 1 (March 1978); *NABT: News and Views* 22, 2 (April 1978); *Sci. Ed. News* (summer 1978).
3. Des Moines Register, 21 February 1979, p. 10A; *ibid.* 29 March 1979, p. 16A.
4. J. Jensen et al., "Iowa Senate file 261" (bill filed with the Iowa General Assembly, Des Moines, 16 February 1979).
5. S. Walters, Des Moines Register, 5 April 1979, p. 1.
6. H. D. Hagen, "Response to Senator B. Van Gilst" (Office of Iowa Attorney General, Des Moines, 28 August 1979).

Administration of Research

Philip H. Abelson's editorial (25 Apr., p. 353) on the "Diversion of funds from research" prompts me to respond. In the editorial, Abelson suggests that university presidents who are close to the situation and who have responsibility to act have been relatively inert. As a recently retired university president, I have some suggestions.

For the past 1½ years I have served on the National Commission on Research, whose report "Accountability: Restoring the quality of the partnership"

NEW for HP Desk Top Computer Users

If you use HP 9800* series Desk Top Computers you should get to know Infotek. We are now in our fifth year of producing powerful enhancements for the HP 9825, 9830 and 9831.

Infotek now introduces add-in memory and floppy disk systems for the HP 9835 and 9845.

As always, Infotek's add-in memory is fully compatible to your HP Desk Top system. The only differences are **immediate availability, lower cost and a one year warranty.**

Infotek's new floppy disk system for the HP 9825, 9835 and 9845 is similar to HP's 9885* in two ways, quality and 100% software compatibility—but that's where the similarity ends. And...you'll like the differences.

First, the Infotek FD 9885 Floppy System is several times **faster**, and has **more storage capacity**. Next, it does things like **duplication, verification** and **diagnostics** by itself so you get a lot more work out of your computer during these operations. Also, Infotek's floppy systems provide you with three **I/O ports** so you actually gain two more I/O ports when using our system.

Contact Infotek NOW for a demonstration of this very extraordinary disk system. You will be amazed at the computing power you gain.



**Infotek
Systems**

1400 North Baxter Street
Anaheim, California 92806
(714) 956-9300/Telex 182283

Circle No. 409 on Readers' Service Card

*PRODUCTS OF HEWLETT-PACKARD CO.

Tell me more about INFOTEK products. I have the following mainframe:

- ☐ 9825; number of systems _____
☐ 9835; number of systems _____
☐ 9845; number of systems _____

NAME _____

COMPANY _____

STREET _____


CITY _____

STATE _____

ZIP _____

COUNTRY _____

PHONE _____



SC1/80