



William C. Foster [Department of State]

encourage anything that might be interpreted as an adventurous course. No opposition to Foster was anticipated, and none developed; but coincidentally or not, the agency's blossoming in the public view almost immediately followed confirmation.

Economic Study

The first step involved publication of a report which had been in the agency's hands for over 3 months—a study which concluded that a drastic reduction in U.S. armament spending need not bring serious economic difficulties to the country if the government “exercises a modicum of economic sense, foresight and courageous leadership.”

The report, which was produced by a panel headed by Emile Benoit, associate professor of international business at Columbia University, openly addressed itself to the economic concerns of the industrial-military complex in stating: “there exists a widespread and understandable fear, especially on the part of the defense industries and workers in these industries and in the armed forces, of economic disruptions connected with a disarmament agreement.”

Noting that the chief obstacles to a reduction in arms expenditures would be “political resistance rather than deficiencies in our economic knowledge,” the report added that “some of the most stubborn and difficult problems connected with disarmament will be those arising from the concentration of persons and productive resources in particular industries, areas, or vocational groups and from the difficulty of mak-

ing the necessary shifts in employment and resources.”

The recommendations offered by the panel include consideration of public works, strengthened unemployment compensation, retraining programs, reduced working hours, and, possibly, tax reductions. All of these have been raised before in various nongovernmental studies of the economics of disarmament, but their publication by the Disarmament Agency, despite a disclaimer that the panel's views are not necessarily the agency's views, elevates the subject in the public view and gives it the Administration's stamp of approval for serious consideration.

The agency's second venture into asserting its role came the day after the issuance of the disarmament report, and involved the signing of a \$150,000 research contract with the Bendix Corporation. The sum is a small one as government contracts go; the Defense Department normally would not consider a \$150,000 contract worthy of a two-sentence announcement, but the Bendix contract was the first awarded by the agency, and, in a way that suggested it was compensating for its past lack of publicity, it invited the press to a signing ceremony.

The job set forth in the contract, Foster explained, is the development of monitoring techniques that will permit effective inspection of arms production with a minimum of physical intrusion on Soviet territory.

Since the Soviets have equated inspection with espionage, the goal is to determine whether it is possible by checking a limited number of points in a nation's industrial establishment to determine compliance with an arms agreement.

Spokesman for Kennedy

The agency's third excursion into public view developed unexpectedly but illustrated the Administration's desire to upgrade the agency. The occasion was the appearance last week in the *Washington Post* of a letter signed by Foster, denying that Kennedy had introduced a “new element” into the nuclear inspection issue when he said at his press conference that the sudden resumption of testing by the Soviet Union created the need for “some assurance against a repetition of this summer's incident.”

The letter was drafted at the White House following the appearance in the *Post* of an article which contended that

Kennedy, in effect, had shifted his position from inspection for nuclear testing to inspection for test preparations; the latter might necessarily be the sort of detailed inspections to which the Russians have previously shown themselves adamantly opposed.

The denial, significantly, was carried over Foster's signature, although the White House could just as well have presented it in the name of any one of a number of officials.

A revealing test of the agency's strength will be held sometime during the next few months when its appropriation for the 1963 fiscal year comes up for consideration in Congress. The act establishing the agency provided for a \$10 million budget, with no time limit set on the expenditure. The Administration is currently seeking an appropriation of \$6.5 million, \$4 million of which is intended for outside research; the remainder is slated for personnel expansion, something that has been limited so far because of the tiny appropriation with which the agency was started.

From the 80 positions that it inherited from its predecessor, the State Department Disarmament Administration, the agency has expanded to approximately 100; its ultimate goal is 220. Progress toward this goal has also been impeded by the stringent security requirements that Congress imposed on the agency. These call for security clearance standards “not less stringent” than those of agencies with the highest security restrictions. The effect of this requirement has been to make hiring a long and tedious process, since the clearance generally takes at least a few months and can run sometimes over 6 months. The applications are now coming out of the security review mill, and the agency—if it gets the money it is seeking—expects to fill out its staff by next summer.—D.S.G.

Conflicts of Interest: White House Issues Policy Statement on Use of Outside Consultants

The Administration last week set forth a policy to govern conflicts of interest among the many specialists who serve the government on a part-time basis.

The demand for an explicit policy has grown with the government's increasing use of outside consultants, many of whom, especially in science

and engineering, find their services eagerly sought after by various federal agencies. A considerable part of the pressure for clear guidelines on conflicts of interest originated with these specialists because of their understandably unhappy feeling that their response to the government's appeal for their services might put them in a position where the propriety of their roles would appear questionable.

The guidelines that existed up to this week were based largely on an 1864 statute which had nothing to say about part-time employees and which sought to deal with conditions utterly remote from the intimate relationship that has developed between the federal government and industry, science, and education. Thus, under the basic statute, any government employee is prohibited from receiving compensation from *anyone* doing business with the government; this was modified in legislation applying to a number of agencies, including the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission, to prohibit a consultant from advising an agency on matters in which he has an interest. Defense, which is the largest purchaser of consulting services, has let its need for expert advice outweigh its interest in compliance with all the niceties of the regulations; the AEC, on the other hand, has hewed strictly to the rule, with the result that its advisers may not serve as consultants to firms doing business with the commission.

Under the policy issued by the Administration, the agency directors bear the burden of assuring compliance with the regulations. These specifically prohibit a consultant from performing any governmental duty involving firms from which he draws compensation or in which he has any financial interest; nor may he give any advice, presumably to the government or a firm in which he has an interest, which will have a "direct and predictable effect upon the interests" of the firm.

The policy prohibits a consultant from exploiting "inside information" for personal gain or from accepting employment offers that he has reason to believe are motivated by his government position, unless he resigns that position.

Finally, consultants, when they are first employed by the government, must furnish a statement of their financial interests and must keep the statement up to date.—D.S.G.

Announcements

A **neurological and sensory disease service** has been established by the U.S. Public Health Service to develop and support community activities in the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation of patients with central nervous system disorders. Under the direction of Eugene H. Guthrie, of the PHS bureau of state services, the new unit will provide consultation, demonstration, and education services to communities, directly and through grants; and will conduct surveys on the personnel and facilities needed to promote the use of techniques employed in handling such disorders.

A bibliography on the **effects of nuclear explosions** on structures and protective construction has been compiled by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. References to literature on structures in Hiroshima and Nagasaki are included. (Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D.C. Order TID-3092. \$1.50)

The Republic of Ghana and the U.S. Public Health Service have completed plans to establish a joint **medical research laboratory**. Ghana's National Institute of Health and Medical Research will provide housing and laboratory facilities for U.S. scientific and technical personnel, who will concentrate on Ghana's major disease problems—malaria, tuberculosis, leprosy, malnutrition, tropical anemias, hypertension, and cancer.

Courses

An undergraduate summer institute in **space physics**, sponsored by Columbia University, will be held from 2 July to 10 August in New York. Selected applicants, predominantly students entering their senior year, will receive scholarships covering tuition, subsistence, and travel expenses, through a Federal Space Agency grant. Deadline: *1 March*. (Robert Jastrow, Summer Institute for Space Physics, Columbia University, New York 27)

Intensive laboratory courses in **bacterial genetics**, **bacteriophage**, and **animal viruses** will be offered at Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y., during the summer of 1962. Postdoctoral fellows, re-

search workers in other fields, and advanced graduate students are eligible. Screening of applicants will begin in April. (Director, Long Island Biological Association, Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.)

Meeting Notes

A symposium and workshop on **biologistics for space systems**, sponsored by the Air Force Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories, will be held in Dayton, Ohio, from 1 to 3 May. Technical sessions will cover algal gas exchange systems, higher plants and nutritional support in bioregenerating systems, photosynthetic mechanisms, and waste regeneration. (Col. Andres I. Karstens, AMRL, Aeronautical Systems Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio)

A symposium on recent advances in **acarology** will be held from 26 to 29 March in Ithaca, N.Y. The program will cover acarine physiology, biochemistry, bionomics and control, and toxicology; disease transmission; behavior; and techniques for the handling, rearing, and testing of the acarina. (J. Naegele, Department of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.)

Grants, Fellowships, and Awards

The National Association of Biology Teachers has initiated a national award for **high school biology teachers**. Each state winner will be a nominee for one of nine regional awards to be made. Deadline for applications submitted to the appropriate NABT state director: *15 March*. State selections will be made by 25 April, regional by 15 May. (Paul Klinge, Jordan Hall, Indiana University, Bloomington)

Applications are being accepted for a postdoctoral research associateship in **solar energy conversion**, sponsored by the Air Force Office of Aerospace Research. The award carries a stipend of \$8955 for a 1-year period, to begin after 1 July, and is renewable. The recipient will be employed at the Scientific Laboratory of the Air Force Directorate of Research Analysis at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico. (Fellowship Office, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington 25, D.C.)