George B. Kistiakowsky, chairman, NAS Committee on Science and Public Policy

carries with it the possibility of a bloody nose, the Academy had previously followed the practice of venturing no closer than necessary to matters of public controversy. It based this policy on the argument that its charter specified that it was to speak only when spoken to by government agencies seeking its assistance. The charter has not changed, but since science has grown to a point where it is a legitimate subject for public policy debate, events have led the Academy to a new conception of its role. And with formation of the Science and Public Policy committee, under the chairmanship of George B. Kistiakowsky, it has been demonstrated that if the Academy wishes to speak out on a subject, it is not difficult to elicit an invitation. In the case of the current report, the invitation came from the American Society of Biological Chemists, but it is clear that Kistiakowsky felt the study was long overdue, and clear that if that particular society, or the several others that later issued similar invitations, had not invited the study, one means or another would have been found to bring the Academy to grips with the subject.—D. S. GREENBERG

Fermi Prize Money: Congressional Committee Takes Steps To Assume Control of Annual $50,000 Award

The congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has quietly moved to assert its control over the $50,000 prize that accompanies the Enrico Fermi award.

The award, which honors "specially meritorious contribution to the development, use, or control of atomic energy," would still be given annually by the President upon the recommendation of the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission. But the prize money either would be substantially reduced or, if maintained at the present sum, would be awarded only with specific congressional approval.

The committee's move, which was first revealed by the New York *Times*, comes from a combination of diverse motives. First of all, the committee is currently incensed by the administration's seeming preference for supporting basic research at the expense of developmental research (*Science*, 13 March, p. 1149), and, in its pique, it has noted that basic researchers have predominated among bestowers and recipients of the award. (The latter have been John von Neumann, Ernest O. Lawrence, Eugene T. Wigner, Glenn T. Seaborg, Hans A. Bethe, Edward Teller, and J. Robert Oppenheimer.) It would like to see the honor go to some of the people involved in nuclear engineering developments, among them Admiral Hyman G. Rickover.

An Alumni Prize?

Furthermore, the committee has chosen to view as conspiratorial the fact that five of the Fermi recipients were, at one time or another, members of the nine-man General Advisory Committee whose nominations have governed the award. "They just give it to each other," was the analysis of one member of Congress.

The size of the award is also something that has impressed the money-minded members of Congress. The $50,000, which is tax free, is the largest monetary award regularly given by the U.S. Government. Congressmen have noted that the Nobel Prize is generally about $40,000 and is often shared by several recipients.

Finally, complementing the committee's general inclination to take control of the prize is a small undercurrent of hostility toward last year's award to Oppenheimer. It is worth noting, though, that this hostility alone probably could not carry the issue. Before the award was made to Oppenheimer the committee informally indicated its assent, and several members of the committee were on hand last December, happily beaming, when President Johnson carried through President Kennedy's plan to present the award personally to Oppenheimer at the White House.

The most conspicuous source of discontent with the selection of Oppenheimer was the committee's senior Republican senator, Bourke Hickenlooper, of Iowa, who does not share the view that the Oppenheimer security case was a sorry chapter in the nation's intellectual history. Hickenlooper declined to attend the White House ceremony for Oppenheimer, and since then has freely used words such as "revolting" and "shocking" in reference to the Oppenheimer selection. It does not appear that many of Hickenlooper's committee colleagues share his sentiments, but when the diverse motivations are put together, they add up to a consensus for giving the committee control over the prize money.

It is the money, incidentally, that seems to have caught the committee's attention. Hickenlooper himself commented in an interview last week that "since the prize is a technical one, it should be given by technical people. But the money part should be decided in congress."

The committee has not yet completed action on the prize money, but it has agreed informally either to cut down the monetary award or, if the amount is kept at $50,000, to make the award contingent upon congressional approval, which means its approval, since the Joint Committee is the fount of virtually all legislation concerning atomic energy.—D.S.G.

Stanford: Boom in Electronics in the San Francisco Bay Area Was Ignited Down on "the Farm"

Palo Alto. Stanford's central quadrangles, with their vaguely Romanesque "mission" architecture and cloistered calm, present a pleasantly anachronistic picture for a university which is generally regarded as a powerhouse of industrial development on the San Francisco peninsula.

Stanford and the University of California at Berkeley get credit for doing, by a kind of symbiosis, for "high technology" industry in the San Francisco region what M.I.T. and Harvard have done for the Boston–Cambridge area. And Stanford is viewed as the chief begetter of an electronics industry