

military and paramilitary scientists, to this end. After all, wars are not fought underground and there will be arguments that the antimissile missile must be tested in the atmosphere, if the nation is to be effectively protected.

Thus, fallout dangers will increase markedly, properly heightening worldwide fears and again raising the specter and voice of genetic doom.

According to Khrushchev, there is an out. In rejecting the proposal to ban atmospheric tests, he said, "It is possible to end nuclear tests . . . only on the basis of general and complete disarmament." This is a complete turnaround. It was the Soviets who originally insisted that nuclear testing be separated from general disarmament talks and the U.S. accommodated them in this. Whether the U.S. will again accommodate the Soviets remains to be seen. Hopefully, the channels for disarmament negotiation have not been closed. But there is little more than this to comfort an anxious world.—HOWARD SIMONS

*While Howard Margolis is on vacation, his section will be written by guest reporters. Howard Simons, this week's guest, is on the staff of the Washington Post.*

## Wilderness Protection

The Senate last week approved a bill to strengthen existing regulations against the intrusion of civilization upon millions of acres of federally owned wilderness. The bill, which is yet to be considered by the House, is of vast and far-reaching significance for the preservation of some of the nation's most splendid and untouched woodlands and mountains.

In passing the bill, the Senate recognized the pleas of conservationists who have long argued that now is the time for increased protection, before increased demand for space, timber, and minerals inevitably brings pressure against the boundaries of these huge, unpopulated, and unexploited areas. Under the bill, some 6.7 million acres would be placed at once in a National Wilderness Preservation System. In addition, another 60 million would be reviewed, and of these, it is expected, some 35 million, probably all in the West, would qualify for eventual inclusion.

The demand for additional protection

was heightened by a number of factors, all of which portend hazards for the preservation of these lands in their natural state.

One of the factors is the shrinkage of state, county, and municipal parklands, especially at the hands of road builders, who, following the line of least resistance in seeking rights-of-way, have found that citizens are more inclined to fight for their homes than for their parks. Another is the long-range, but growing interest in the commercial exploitation of wilderness resources. And still another is the boom in camping, which has resulted in what have been called camping slums in some of the more popular national parks.

### Restrictions

The Senate bill contains severe restrictions on the use of lands in the Wilderness Preservation System and reflects the conservationists' disillusionment with compromises that have resulted in encroachments upon many supposedly protected areas. Development in the wilderness is not a reversible process, at least over the short run, and each loss to the bulldozer is regarded as irretrievable.

The bill would, in effect, "lock up" wilderness areas by barring road construction and prohibiting motor travel, including aircraft and motorboats. The only access would be on foot or horseback, thus eliminating the likelihood of great encampments of tents and trailers, and attendant refuse, which have disillusioned some conservationists about the wisdom of opening the outdoors to the American public. Without exceptions granted by the President, no construction or exploitation of resources would be permitted. As was pointed out by the bill's opponents during the Senate debate, it would not be easy to obtain such exceptions.

The lands proposed for inclusion in the Wilderness Preservation System are all federally owned and are under the jurisdiction of agencies of the Interior and Agriculture departments. Their preservation in a wilderness state has, with a few exceptions, been the policy of both departments, but the matter is at the discretion of the Secretaries, and trends disturbing to conservationists have become apparent over recent years. Among these has been a steady increase of commercial interest in the potential of these lands, increased prospecting, which is lawful, and, perhaps most alarming, the disclosure that a

sizable number of oil leases were granted on Fish and Wildlife Service lands during the Eisenhower Administration while a moratorium supposedly was in effect.

A significant feature of the bill is that it would give the President, rather than the Interior and Agriculture secretaries, the authority to make exceptions to wilderness preservation. The change may appear to be a small one, but it is of great importance for the tactical problems that confront both the advocates and opponents of preservation. The departmental agencies that manage the lands, such as Interior's Park Service and Agriculture's Forest Service, are neither well publicized nor unsusceptible to congressional pressures. The White House, on the other hand, is strongly sympathetic to wilderness preservation, for the time being at least, and provides a well-illuminated arena for a great public row if the conservationists feel they are ill-treated.

The bill approved by the Senate also provides the President with authority to add federally held lands to the Wilderness Preservation System, unless there is an opposing resolution adopted by either house of Congress. Since it is generally easier to block than to achieve positive action on Capitol Hill, conservationists look upon the Senate bill as a route to great expansion of the wilderness system. In support of this optimism is the fact that "wilderness," like national defense and medical research, does not lend itself to easy opposition. Even the mining and timber interests which doggedly opposed Senate passage—Senator Humphrey declared that "the abuse from the vested interests has been unbelievable"—stressed that they are for wilderness preservation. They explained, however, that they opposed the bill because it created restrictions which they considered unnecessary in view of existing Interior and Agriculture department regulations.

The final vote was 78 to 8, with much of the expected conservative opposition failing to materialize. In part this was due to the fact that the wilderness concept not only is attractive to persons of all political persuasions, but also that it involves no expenditures, merely redesignation of existing federal holdings. In addition, while the long-range economic interests of mining and timber industries are clearly affected, the areas concerned are empty, and the opposition could call upon no constituency that would be aroused by the pros-

pect of the federal government blocking economic development.

The issue of economic effects was considerably befogged during the Senate hearings and debates by mining and timber interests which contended that the wilderness system would have a harmful effect on employment in the West. The fact, however, is that there is no lumbering at present on the lands involved, and only eight mining operations are under way, all of which would be permitted to continue. Cattlemen for a time showed some opposition to the bill, but their interest waned when it was stipulated that the relatively little grazing now permitted in wilderness areas would be allowed to continue.

With the rush under way to end the current session, the House is not expected to act on a similar bill this year. Its Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, however, is considering hearings sometime before the start of the next session.—D.S.G.

### Overhead Allowance Unchanged

A Senate-House conference last week voted against raising the 15 percent overhead allowance in research grants and contracts awarded to universities by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The conference action settles the matter for the current session of Congress.

As in past years, the Senate Appropriations Committee recognized the pleas of university spokesmen and voted for 100-percent payment of overhead costs. However, the House Appropriations Committee has never been receptive to an upward revision of the allowance. A principal source of opposition has been Rep. John E. Fogarty, the Rhode Island Democrat who is chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee that passes on funds for HEW.

It is Fogarty's view that since the government provides 100 percent of the direct costs on HEW research grants and contracts, the recipients are not unfairly burdened by the requirement that they meet part of the indirect, or overhead, costs. Direct costs include salaries, equipment, and supplies, which are easily visible items in any project, while the indirect costs are in the less obvious, but still burdensome, categories of maintenance, depreciation, library services, and physical space in university buildings.

At hearings last April, Randall M.

Whaley, vice president for graduate studies and research at Wayne State University, told Fogarty's committee that some of Wayne State's departments were declining HEW grants and contracts because of the limitation on overhead cost payments. The committee was also told that the average of overhead costs at 50 small institutions was 42 percent of project costs, while at 10 larger ones it was 34 percent. And it was pointed out that a formula suggested by the Bureau of the Budget provides for overhead allowances considerably higher than 15 percent.

Fogarty, however, feels that the limitation cannot be a serious drawback in view of what he regards as general receptivity among universities to accept research funds from HEW.

The Administration came out in favor of the government meeting full overhead costs, but it did not convey to the conferees any sense of great concern about the problem. Its budget request of \$2 million for higher payments would provide an increase of less than 1 percent.

### School Aid Maneuvering

Senate backers of the President's school aid program failed this week in an attempt to use fragments salvaged from the defeated Administration bill as a wedge for reopening the fight next year. Their efforts were directed at limiting renewal of aid to impacted areas to just 1 year, which would have assured the issue of federal aid a place on next year's congressional agenda.

The politically-popular impacted aid program, which the House renewed last week for 2 years, provides assistance for school districts whose enrollments are increased by federal activities. The ease with which it has been passed previously led the Administration to tie it into the omnibus education bill as a lure for votes, and when that bill met defeat, to propose that impacted aid should be restricted to 1 year to serve as a vehicle for renewing the fight next year. The need for such a vehicle was deemed especially important because of considerable sentiment, especially in the House, against reopening the school-aid battle in an election year. Despite a last-minute personal plea from President Kennedy, the Senate voted 45 to 40 for a 1-year renewal.

## Announcements

A 5-year experimental program to determine the part cholesterol plays in heart disease will begin this fall in Boston, Baltimore, Chicago, Minneapolis, and Oakland (Calif.). The National Heart Institute will choose 250 males in each city to participate in 6- to 12-month pilot studies. The program is expected to involve as many as 400,000 Americans before its completion.

A technical review of the nation's **space-flight effort** will be presented from 9 to 15 October in New York. The meeting, sponsored by the American Rocket Society, will consist of sessions of technical papers outlining work in the rocket, missile, and space-flight fields; panel discussions on space vehicles, space missions, and the global aspects of space flight; an exhibition, open to the public; and evening programs (probably to be televised nationally) which will review the complete U.S. and U.S.S.R. space programs. (Roderick L. Hohl, American Rocket Society, 500 Fifth Ave., New York 36, N.Y.)

A list of 679 **paperbound science books**, recommended for high school students, college undergraduates, teachers, and the educated general public, is contained in the 5th annual edition of *An Inexpensive Science Library*. The new edition consists of a selected list of books recommended in former editions, older books overlooked in previous editions, and newer books available in the United States up to 31 July 1961. The catalog, published by the AAAS's Science Library Program administered under a grant from the National Science Foundation, also contains title and author indexes, names and addresses of publishers, and a list of dealers in paperbound books. (AAAS Publications, 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington 5, D.C. \$0.25)

An article on the **ecology of space flight**, translated from a recent issue of the U.S.S.R.'s *Physiology Journal*, complains that Western scientists have given little attention "to the interrelationships of the [astronaut's] basic nervous processes." Citing the results of U.S. isolation tests, the article concludes that the U.S. experiments suppress "social reflexes" and the astronaut's "awareness of danger" and fail to make