

Society, and Mary Ann Warren, a professor at San Francisco State University who has called for using “lethal injections” on handicapped newborns.

Yet another panel avidly discussed the need to hold down medical costs by fostering the growth of such substandard substitutes for hospital care as hospices and Health Maintenance Organizations.

Not only is the U.S. scientific community helping to disarm America, but it is now helping to kill off its next generation. What more could the Kremlin ask?

AAAS pushes disarmament and infanticide

Among the many presentations attacking the Reagan administration's so-called “Star Wars” policy, and advocating a wide range of disarmament measures was a paper delivered by Hugh E. DeWitt titled “A View of Nuclear Policy from Inside a Weapons Laboratory.” Because DeWitt has spent the last 27 years as a physicist on the staff of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, one of the two nuclear weapons design laboratories of the United States, his remarks drew significant favorable media attention, including from the rabidly anti-beam defense New York Times. Excerpts from Dr. DeWitt's paper, which reveal how deeply the Pugwash orientation extends into the U.S. scientific and defense community, follow:

“. . . I have reached the conclusion that the scientists in the weapons laboratories play a major role in driving and perpetuating the nuclear arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. A basic reason behind this driving force and its great influence on national policy decisions is a strong belief . . . that high technology can provide for safety and national security in a dangerous world. Coupled with this belief in the efficacy of technological solutions as being paramount over political solutions there is also a high degree of enthusiasm for possible new technologies that will supposedly keep the U.S. militarily ahead of the U.S.S.R. . . .

“I feel that if the danger of nuclear war is to be reduced and if national security is to be improved, then political agreements between the nuclear powers are more conducive to safety than the current uninhibited technological race. Specifically, I believe a number of constructive steps can be taken, namely:

“1) Ratification at last of a number of useful arms control treaties of recent years such as SALT II and the Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974.

“2) Resumption of negotiations toward an end to nuclear weapons testing resulting in either a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. . . .

“3) Serious negotiations as soon as possible to ban further

development of anti-satellite weapons. This very dangerous possible new technology can be stopped now; in a couple of years it will be too late.

“4) The proposed massive new Strategic Defense Initiative—the Star Wars program described by President Reagan in his March 23, 1983 speech—should be stopped now so as to prevent a major new round of the arms race in space.

“5) Existing arms control treaties, such as the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, should be reaffirmed and strengthened.

“An end to nuclear weapons testing is in my mind the central point in the above list. . . . [it] would prevent the development of exotic new devices such as the nuclear pumped x-ray laser and other directed energy weapons concepts intended as part of Reagan's Star War proposals. . . .

“There is serious debate now in the American scientific community as to whether these new ideas for ‘defensive nuclear weapons’ can ever lead to any weapon system worth deploying. I share the skepticism of the Union of Concerned Scientists myself. . . . The momentum behind developing even ‘defensive’ nuclear weapons for use in space will almost certainly lead to the abrogation of the ABM Treaty. At that point the present fragile structure of arms control treaties is likely to become completely unravelled. The Soviets will certainly not stand still. . . . I find this prospect of an arms race in space to be very frightening. . . .

“For these and various reasons I feel that the exuberance and enthusiasm of the weapons labs for both old and new nuclear weapons technology should be curbed by the political leaders of this country. . . .”

The cover story of the May issue of Science 84, the official magazine of the AAAS, was entitled, “Infanticide: Why?” Written by Barbara Burke, the article drew upon evidence of infanticide among monkeys and other animals to justify the practice among the human “animal,” particularly under population pressures. Excerpts follow:

“Among some animal species, then, infant killing appears to be a natural practice. Could it be natural for humans, too—a trait inherited from our primate ancestors? When we hear that some mother has killed her own baby, we are horrified and assume she must be deranged. Some killers, of course, are sick. A recent study of Canadian homicide figures, showed, for example, that nearly half the parents convicted of killing their own children were mentally ill—though it is not clear whether this was the cause or effect of the killing.

“But human infanticide is too widespread historically and geographically to be explained away just as a pathology or the peculiarity of some aberrant culture. Charles Darwin noted in *The Descent of Man* that infanticide has been ‘probably the most important of all’ checks on population growth throughout most of human history. In fact, there is good evidence for infanticide in 100 hunter-gatherer and agricultural societies.”