

International Agricultural Research which has been organized under the auspices of the World Bank. He adds that Unesco could scan the horizon for future needs—typical projects, he says, might be an assessment of the population-carrying capacity of land, or the testing and evaluation of small-scale solar devices—

and then proceed to pilot projects, perhaps in cooperation with other, more specialized UN agencies.

Unesco officials say that such activities are already being supported, albeit on a limited scale. What King has in mind is something more ambitious, a target-oriented approach sufficient to re-

assert the whole identity of the organization. Despite King's assessment that Unesco appears to be "almost at the point of no return" and that its chances of survival in a viable form "are still only about 50-50," it now seems possible to see some glimmers of hope on the horizon.—DAVID DICKSON

## New Group Targets Political Bias on Campus

*Student volunteers to monitor courses and expose anti-American teaching; university groups say the tactics threaten academic freedom*

According to a new lobby—Accuracy in Academia (AIA)—there are 10,000 Marxist professors on U.S. college campuses who are instilling a leftist bias in young minds. AIA plans to recruit student volunteers to identify suspected leftists, audit their classes, and challenge them publicly if necessary.

The academic community is not thrilled about the avid new students it may have this fall. "The potential for abuse is immense," says Jordan Kurland, associate general secretary of the American Association of University Professors. "I can't imagine any way of having a code of conduct or approved procedures imposed on these [AIA] people. . . . God knows what's going to happen."

In theory, AIA will be an unbiased guardian of free speech. But in practice it is likely to reflect the views of its leaders, who see a greater threat from the political Left than from any other source. Some observers worry that AIA will spawn an intellectual vigilante squad, in itself a threat to academic freedom.

Since announcing its plans in early August, says AIA president Malcolm Lawrence, the group has been "networking," making lists of sympathetic contacts, spotting problem courses, and ordering college catalogs. Lawrence plans to get at least 100 course guides, covering all U.S. public colleges and a sample of private ones as well. Already \$22,000 has been collected. A mass appeal for contributions will be mailed to 250,000 people this fall. On 15 August the newly hired executive director, Laszlo Csorba III, moved into his office. Lawrence hopes to build to a staff of 15 in 3 years. But at present, most of the work will be done by Csorba, a 1985 graduate of the University of California at Davis with a B.A. in political science.

Lawrence says hard science and journalism courses will be omitted from scrutiny, and the emphasis will be on political science, economics, history, and sociology. One example of the kind of professor AIA would monitor is Bertell Ollman, a Marxist political scientist at New York University who failed to get a job at the University of Maryland after citizens raised a protest. Lawrence recently picked up the World Future Society's list of "peace studies," courses at U.S. universities, which he considers fertile grounds for his research. He is particularly irked by courses that make Americans "feel guilty" about hunger in Ethiopia. The problem there, he says, originates in the government.

---

"We don't see ourselves  
as a pressure group  
really going after people."

---

Csorba's list of typical candidates for monitoring includes Samuel Bowles of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Richard Fagen of Stanford, Salvador Luria of MIT, Cynthia McClintock of George Washington University, John Weeks of American University, John Womack and George Wald of Harvard, and Howard Zinn of Boston University. "A lot of these people should be congratulated because they're being honest," says Csorba, noting that they identify themselves as leftists, "but others are sneaking it by their students." His aim is to find out who the others are.

Lawrence says, "We don't see ourselves as a pressure group really going after people." Rather, AIA is "in the business of informing the public," which has been "intimidated by the higher edu-

cation community." The group will seek to bring "truth and balance to the classroom" whenever it finds a teacher running down the American system, whether by misstatement or omission of facts. Lawrence has no intention of criticizing professors for stating radical opinions, but he does mean to see that capitalism is given fair treatment in class discussions.

Lawrence has had little direct experience in the marketplace himself, having worked for 33 years as a government employee. After a stint in the Air Force during the Second World War, he joined the foreign service in 1950, serving as a specialist on trade promotion, narcotics problems, East-West trade, and other European and Caribbean matters until his retirement in 1978. He has a B.A. and M.A. from George Washington University in government and economic policy. He founded and organized an American school in Bern, Switzerland, and has put nine children of his own through school. Since 1974 Lawrence has lobbied for greater parental control over sex and social education programs in the Maryland schools. He also co-hosts a weekly Christian-oriented radio show on education.

Lawrence explains that AIA is a spin-off of its parent group, Accuracy in Media, a watchdog that searches out and criticizes liberal bias in the press. AIM's director, Reed Irvine, is convinced that press bias has its origin in the universities, and for many years he has wanted to root out the problem at its source. Now AIA will begin the task.

Before he came to AIA, Csorba was the leader of a group at Davis known as Students for a Better America. It won notoriety this year for tagging a visiting professor as a socialist and provoking a furor over academic rights of speech. The trouble began during the winter term, according to Csorba, when he

learned that leftist filmmaker Saul Landau was teaching two classes and showing films on campus. Csorba was particularly offended by the public showing of "Fidel," an uncritical profile of the Cuban dictator produced by Landau. "My group did some research on him in Washington, and we did an exposé of Mr. Landau based on some of his statements on socialism," Csorba says. They published a six-page pamphlet, wrote a letter to the editor, and staged a protest outside the film hall. Landau and Csorba traded charges and threatened to sue one another but later backed off.

The furor exploded when California State Senator H. L. Richardson, a Republican from Los Angeles, decided to mount an investigation of the state university's hiring policies. This triggered another demonstration by students who charged that the state was interfering in academic affairs. Csorba says: "It was never the case that we wanted Landau removed. We didn't. . . . We just wanted someone as noted as he to represent the conservative side." In the end, the investigation and protest were dropped, overshadowed by other protests on South Africa. Landau retreated to his home at the University of California at Santa Cruz. He is on leave and could not be reached for comment.

It is not clear how the volunteer monitoring system will work. Many students have telephoned Lawrence, and he says, "we recognize that we have to be careful doing this," particularly to weed out grudges. The intelligence from student monitors will be seasoned with information from older people, whom Lawrence expects to recruit as well. He points out that in many cases, older citizens may take courses free of charge at state schools. When AIA finds a problem, it will first ask the professor to add balance to the course or bring in someone to present another point of view. If this fails, AIA may write up its findings in a newsletter, hoping to arouse the interest of alumni, influential taxpayers, and school trustees.

A few professors and several university organizations have denounced this campaign already, inchoate as it is. However, Kurland of the American Association of University Professors says: "It's hard to say in advance what this will turn out to be. We expect some vigilante action." But he adds, "You can be assured that Harvard, Yale, and Princeton are not quaking." The impact is likely to be felt most by "some obscure guy at a university you haven't heard of before." And for that person, it may be hard.—ELIOT MARSHALL

---

## Vacuum Ultraviolet Synchrotron Confusion

---

Despite at least three major studies in the last 2 years aimed at sorting out what new synchrotron light sources are needed and when they should be built, federal officials remain uncertain about what to do. So, yet one more panel has been assembled, this one to counsel Alvin Trivelpiece, the director of energy research at the Department of Energy (DOE), and Erich Bloch, the director of the National Science Foundation (NSF). The six-man group, headed by Dean Eastman of the IBM Yorktown Heights Laboratory, is to deliver an oral briefing giving its recommendations next month.

Previous studies dealing with synchrotron light sources generally agreed on priorities: first is to complete the commissioning of existing facilities, second is to build an advanced ultrahigh-brightness x-ray source, and third is to construct a vacuum ultraviolet source of comparable capability. One sticky point is the Aladdin facility at the University of Wisconsin's Synchrotron Research Center in Stoughton, for which the sponsoring agency, NSF, decided to discontinue funding in fiscal year 1986 after 4 years of delays in getting on-line (*Science*, 21 June, p. 1410).

Without Aladdin, which could potentially serve about half of American vacuum ultraviolet users, there would not be enough facilities available to fill all the demand for synchrotron light in this wavelength region. Last May, DOE's Energy Research Advisory Board said that the need for an advanced vacuum ultraviolet synchrotron source would become more urgent, if Aladdin were not completed. It did not, however, recommend reversing the priorities set earlier.

In the meantime, Aladdin's performance has progressed to the point where, if it remains considerably below the design specifications, it is already a brighter source than the old Tantalus facility that currently serves vacuum ultraviolet users at Wisconsin. At a Synchrotron Radiation Center users' meeting held on 22 July, a majority of those present signed a statement urging NSF to restore funding to operate Aladdin in its current configuration without the \$25-million

upgrade that had once been planned. Aladdin would then replace Tantalus, with the potential of serving five times the number of researchers for about twice the operating expense.

—ARTHUR L. ROBINSON

---

## Administration Divided Over OECD Biotech Plan

---

A proposal to set up an international set of guidelines to regulate biotechnology has hit some snags because several U.S. federal agencies are deeply divided over the details about how to achieve the goals. The State Department has now taken the lead to try to bring them into harmony. A State Department source says, "It's important to us that the U.S. doesn't appear to be dragging its feet. This project is important to a lot of countries."

For the past 2 years, members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which includes the United States, most of its European allies, and Japan, have been discussing how to set up guidelines to regulate the emerging industry. One of the underlying reasons is to develop a uniform approach so that no one country in the group will become a haven to biotechnology businesses.

In May, after experts from a few of the member countries, including the United States, had helped to compose the document, the first draft of the regulatory guidelines was circulated at a meeting in Paris. It immediately got off to a shaky start. According to a State Department source, many countries felt that the definition of biotechnology was inconsistent and confusing. Members of the American delegation disagreed among themselves about the draft's contents. After 3 days of discussion, the document was revised and sent home with representatives for additional consideration.

The revised draft, which was obtained by *Science*, is called "Safety and Regulations in Biotechnology," and has several parts. It starts off with an upbeat description of biotechnology and its potential applications; discusses the potential risks of the technology, generally viewing the hazard as minimal, while saying it is impossi-