

The panelists, by and large, chose anecdote over assessments of the ethical and historical implications of the development of nuclear energy. Wigner perhaps set the tone when he said, "We immediately recognized that it could mean very good things and very bad things," and left it at that.

An exception was Crawford H. Greenewalt, who went on from war work to become president and chairman of the board of DuPont. In what was almost an aside, Greenewalt said he disagreed with the remark attributed to Robert Oppenheimer that, with the detonation of the bomb, the physicists had known sin. Greenewalt said he rejected the idea that sin lay in the development of the technology of the bomb. His definition: "As long as you think that force is a legitimate solution to conflict, that is the path to destruction."—JOHN WALSH

Another Threat to Fetal Research

Antiabortion groups are pushing a proposal in Congress that could potentially prohibit all federally funded research on living fetuses, according to opponents of the measure. The proposal has already passed in the House and may be introduced in the Senate during the lame duck session. Representative William Dannemeyer (R-Calif.), who introduced the bill, says that its purpose is to prevent experimentation on fetuses—in the womb or after they are born—while they are still alive. Critics of the bill, such as the American Medical Association and the Association of American Medical Colleges, charge that existing regulations are adequate. They argue that the Dannemeyer measure is sloppily drafted and leaves room for troublesome interpretation. The Administration has taken a neutral position on the issue, according to a spokeswoman at the Department of Health and Human Services.

The Dannemeyer proposal, which was passed by the House as an amendment to the reauthorization bill for the National Institutes of Health (NIH), states that federally funded scientists shall not experiment on a "living human fetus or infant, whether before or after induced abortion, un-

less such research or experimentation is done for the purpose of insuring the survival of that fetus or infant." During floor debate, Dannemeyer cited past abuses in fetal research and then quoted from a history book that described Nazi experimentation. The allusion has outraged scientists and others.

Opponents contend that the Dannemeyer amendment, if taken literally, will halt beneficial research that is not immediately therapeutic to a fetus or infant. Representative Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), who opposed the amendment, has said "the Congress has been stampeded into adopting 'Right-to-Life' legislation that will result in continued infant disease, miscarriages and stillbirths."

NIH instituted regulations in 1973 governing fetal research, and no violations have been reported since. The rules state that experimentation on a living fetus after it is born can only be conducted under three circumstances: if the test does not require the infant to be sustained on life-support systems; if the research does not terminate the infant's heartbeat or respiration; or if the tests pose no additional risk to the infant and important biomedical knowledge cannot be obtained by other means. According to a Senate staff aide, the abuses which Dannemeyer cited during House floor debate all predate the 1973 rules.

Pro-life groups are looking to Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) and Jeremiah Denton (R-Ala.) to introduce the proposal as an amendment to the Senate's version of the NIH reauthorization bill. Hatch is chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee of which Denton is a member.

A committee staff aide said that Hatch has not decided whether to support the proposal. The aide said that, in his opinion, the measure would put into law what now exists as rules. On the other hand, he says that the language of the Dannemeyer amendment "can be cleaned up." The aide is hoping that a compromise can be worked out so that the pro-life groups are appeased and yet the NIH bill can be passed. Senate majority leader Howard Baker has warned the committee that he will not take up the reauthorization bill during the lame duck session if it contains anything controversial. Hatch has a strong desire to see the bill through because it

contains a provision, sponsored by Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), to create a new arthritis institute at NIH.

Some NIH officials have privately said that they prefer passage of a continuing resolution rather than a reauthorization bill. They are hoping that support for an arthritis institute and other provisions might fizzle in the next Congress.—MARJORIE SUN

Niederhauser Wins Battle for ACS Presidency

By a landslide margin (59 to 41 percent), Warren Niederhauser, director of pioneering research at the Rohm & Haas Company, was elected president of the American Chemical Society (ACS) on 15 November. He defeated his opponent, Texas A & M chemistry professor F. Albert Cotton, by 21,993 to 15,555 votes, collecting "the largest number of votes reported for anyone winning an ACS election," Niederhauser says. He thus becomes the first industrial chemist to head the ACS in 4 years.

The victory was particularly sweet for Niederhauser because he was the butt of a harshly worded campaign letter distributed by Cotton earlier this year (*Science*, 29 October, p. 455). Part of Cotton's strategy was to play upon differences between academic and industrial members of ACS, suggesting that Niederhauser was more interested in parochial concerns such as chemists' working conditions than in substantial scientific issues.

In the aftermath of the landslide, Niederhauser was quick to pass along the results of his own survey, indicating that he was popular among academics and corporate executives as well as the industrial rank and file. At least 13 of 15 ACS board members supported him, Niederhauser says, as did most former ACS presidents and 90 percent of university-based scientists interviewed in October by Rohm & Haas recruiters. The bruises of the campaign are still painful, but some ACS leaders have come forward with a healing proposal. As a gesture of goodwill, Niederhauser says, he and others are planning to nominate Cotton for a Nobel Prize. They hope this will end the bad feelings.

—ELIOT MARSHALL