

in those industrial groups that have been relatively inactive or stagnant technologically. In effect, these most efficient producers would be taxed to pay for the technological advancement of their most inefficient competitors. This comes about as close to destruction of the free-enterprise concept as anything can get."

When the appropriations subcommittee issued its report, it was apparent that Bow's doubts had infected his colleagues. The textile industry, which has been so severely hit by foreign competition that it is not averse to accepting any helping hand, had strongly identified itself with the CIT program, and a new appropriation of \$1 million, plus \$625,000 from an earlier supplemental appropriation, was made available "for the completion of the textile research program." The subcommittee stated explicitly, though, that the rest of the CIT program was dead. "No funds," it reported, "have been allowed for any other purpose," thus writing off—unless a reversal comes about—programs on building and machine-tool technology, and a broad program covering leather, lumber, and foundries and castings. In explaining its action, the subcommittee stated that "this request would be but the beginning of another large and costly research program" (which CIT officials privately admit is exactly their intention); and that when the post of assistant secretary for science and technology was authorized for the Commerce Department, "it is doubtful that such a program as this, including the technology of building which is being condemned both by labor and industry, was then contemplated."

At the moment, the best that can be said about the CIT program is that it is still breathing. Holloman's office is currently working to obtain a favorable reception in the Senate. The Senate and House versions would then be brought together for compromise, and out of this, they hope, something better than \$1 million will result. CIT officials concede, however, that a realistic appraisal of the situation does not produce grounds for very much optimism. A program of this sort obviously cannot be rammed down industry's throat, and until it is recast to assure prosperous firms that they are not being asked to finance trouble for themselves, it is unlikely that they will feel any more warmly toward CIT.

—D. S. GREENBERG

AMA: Convention Accents Positive by Announcing Research Institute, Reshaping Scientific Sections

The American Medical Association, which in recent years has most often made the news as a political action group opposing medical care under Social Security, last week chose the forum of its national convention to call the attention of its members and the public to organized medicine's relation to science.

At the convention in Atlantic City, the AMA's Education and Research Foundation announced plans to establish and operate a new Institute for Biomedical Research. The governing House of Delegates also took steps intended to improve the AMA's own scientific program, which is based primarily on scientific sections organized according to medical specialties, and which, by most accounts, has been in the doldrums.

The proposed research institute would be located, initially at least, in a new building the AMA plans to complete in 1965 in Chicago, its headquarters city. The institute would be devoted to basic research in the field of biomedicine and would provide neither clinical service to patients nor formal graduate training leading to degrees.

The institute is to be financed and administered under the association's Education and Research Foundation, whose main activities now are to conduct the AMA's programs of financial support for medical schools, loan guarantees for medical students, research grants, and support for research in medical journalism.

In a statement accompanying the announcement of plans to establish the institute, Raymond McKeown, president of the AMA-ERF and secretary-treasurer of the AMA board of trustees, said, "The institute will concern itself with intensive and fundamental study of life processes particularly as related to intracellular mechanisms. The institute will be composed of dedicated, imaginative workers who are capable of significant achievements through the interaction of their intellects and experiences, with unmatched facilities and maximum freedom from external pressures."

Plans call for the eventual establishment of about five basic research units in such fields as molecular biology, immunology, biochemistry, neurology, and physiology. Each group would

form around six or more "eminent researchers," who would be permanent members of the staff, while qualified physicians and other scientists would be eligible for "prestige post-doctoral fellowships." The first research unit is scheduled to be in action by 1966, but the AMA has hedged a bit about committing itself irrevocably to the institute project. The reservation reads, "development of the institute is contingent upon the successful recruiting of outstanding medical scientists."

The potential pitfall in the path of the institute organizers is the difficulty of recruiting "dedicated and imaginative workers" in a field toward which foundation and, particularly, government funds have been directed so enthusiastically that it is hardly an exaggeration to say that money pursues the first-class investigator rather than the reverse. But the AMA is apparently counting on competing successfully by obtaining adequate funds and offering "maximum freedom."

Motives Set Forth

On the question of whether or not the new institute should accept federal research funds, an uncertainty which appeared to exist at the beginning of the convention was dispelled by sentiment in the House of Delegates in favor of a policy to accept funds only from private sources—AMA members, industry, and other individuals.

The AMA's official motives in launching the institute at this time were outlined by McKeown as follows.

"Through the history of medicine, improved diagnostic and therapeutic tools have been fathered by basic investigation. America's physicians have a responsibility to advance scientific knowledge. The AMA, because of its traditional leadership role in medicine, has both the responsibility and the opportunity to make a unique contribution to medical research."

Since the AMA has never had a research arm of its own (although it once operated a "seal of approval" drug-testing service), it has been suggested that the association is seeking to alter a public image of the AMA as an organization keyed to a particular line of action on legislative and socioeconomic matters.

McKeown was quoted as having told reporters at a news conference, "The AMA has been too strongly associated in the public mind with social and economic issues and not enough with sci-

ence," and as having indicated that an important reason for founding the institute, although not the only one, was to redress the balance.

Self-criticism of another sort was reflected in action on recommendations of an ad hoc committee set up to study the AMA's scientific sections and scientific program and relations with outside specialty organizations.

A board of trustees report published in the *AMA Journal* on 18 May noted that the "AMA's scientific program has suffered from the splintering effects of specialization and the competition from numerous other scientific meetings" and recommended a number of changes in rules and organization in the sections.

The scientific sections, taken together, comprise the AMA's Scientific Assembly, which was established in 1859. In earlier days, the papers and essays presented at the section meetings "provided the exclusive or principal forum for specialty postgraduate medical education," said the committee. But the report went on to note that attendance at section meetings has been dwindling markedly and suggested four causes: (i) "intensified competition from an increasing number of specialty societies; (ii) presentation of section programs of limited interest and debatable quality; (iii) inadequate administrative machinery to handle section activities; (iv) insufficient authority in the Council on Scientific Assembly to direct and control the planning, publicizing and staging of section programs."

What seems to have precipitated the reappraisal in the past year was the tendency of some sections to operate independently of the parent organization and to issue policy statements without consulting the House of Delegates or obtaining its approval. Membership in the sections has not been limited to those qualified on rigorous terms, and business sessions of some sections had been so poorly attended that control of the sections in a few instances had been taken over by "outsiders."

The ad hoc committee recommended that the control issue be solved by empowering the AMA board of trustees to appoint section officers. The House of Delegates turned down this recommendation but acted favorably on other changes, such as one that would restrict membership in sections to those clearly qualified in the specialties, and others that would strengthen the ties with the parent organization and im-

prove liaison with specialty organizations.

The effect of this action has been to leave the basic organization of the scientific sections much as it was, but to serve notice on section officers that unless they rejuvenate their scientific programs and tighten the reins on procedures, more changes will be made.

—JOHN WALSH

American Council on Education: Conference Designed to Illuminate The Ins and Outs of Grantsmanship

Last week in Washington the American Council on Education sponsored a Conference on Federal Programs for Colleges and Universities which, in essence, provided a basic training course for institutions not currently involved extensively in these programs but interested in learning how to do it themselves.

Upward of 450 college and university administrators, business officers, and faculty members attended the 2 days of meetings at the Mayflower Hotel, and council officials estimate that half of these represented institutions with decidedly limited experience in the art of federal grantsmanship.

A fair estimate seems to be that 90 percent of federal funds for research and fellowships go to 100 institutions among the 2000-odd universities and colleges (including junior colleges) in the United States. Federal money for fellowships, research, and faculty development is concentrated in those institutions which offer graduate programs. But many colleges which provide only undergraduate training have participated in the program of federal loans for college dormitories and the National Defense Education Act's undergraduate loan program and would like to explore further opportunities.

Lack of helpful information on opportunities to participate in federal programs has been one problem facing the novices, and the ACE conference, organized by the council's commission on federal relations, was designed to mitigate that problem.

The stress was on practice rather than theory in such panel discussions as the one forthrightly titled "developing effective proposals for submission by institutions and individual faculty members." In ten subdivided information groups the conferees were able to confront representatives from the agen-

cies that finance the government's major programs affecting higher education. The main speeches were given by Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel and, fittingly, by Representative John E. Fogarty (D.-R.I.), who presides over the House Appropriations Subcommittee, the fount from which have flowed the funds to make the National Institutes of Health a billion-dollar-a-year research and education operation.

No definite plans have been made, but council officials say it is likely that the proceedings of the conference will be published this fall.—J.W.

Krebiozen: Nearly a Decade of Controversy Spent in Pursuit of "Fair", Government-Sponsored Test

This is the second of three articles on the Krebiozen controversy.

From 1951 to 1954, Krebiozen, as an experimental drug, had been distributed free to physicians requesting it for use on patients with advanced cancer. In April 1954, the drug's producers—at that time the Duga Biological Institute, later Promak Laboratories, both principally owned by Steven Durovic—moved to get commercial status by filing a New Drug Application with the Food and Drug Administration. Krebiozen's first run-in with the government not only reflected the ambiguities of its past but presaged the complexities of its future.

The application was denied, partly on the grounds that it was incomplete, but mainly on the argument that Krebiozen was a biological rather than a hormone, and thus subject to the licensing provisions of the Division of Biologic Standards of the Public Health Service rather than to FDA. The importance of the difference is that FDA at the time required only proof of safety, not of efficacy, while the PHS (which has jurisdiction over viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products) requires both, and that unlike FDA's rulings, PHS rulings cannot be appealed. Krebiozen's sponsors disagreed on scientific grounds with this classification of the drug and have never applied to Biologic Standards. The jurisdictional uncertainties, never resolved, were mainly responsible for the blank check that FDA has given Krebiozen during the intervening years and which its sponsors now claim amounts, in effect, to a sanction.