that he would alter the present system of large-scale federal support for scientific research and related educational activities. Nevertheless, in conversations with many scientists who are contributing time and money to the Johnson cause, it is evident that there exists a great concern about what might happen to the federal-science relationship under Goldwater. When those who hold this concern are asked to point out anything that the Senator has said or done that might suggest hostility to the scientific community, or even lack of sensitivity to its interests, they are hard put to come up with anything significant. Often cited is a vote here or there against increased appropriations for a research-supporting agency, but the curious fact is that many of the scientific community's best congressional friends have for one reason or another cast economy votes on matters of money for science. Still, whatever the origins of its reaction to the Senator's candidacy, the scientific community equals and probably exceeds any other professional group in its feelings about the election. The cause of this intensity is not altogether clear, but it would seem to merit examination as an interesting and significant development in the life of the scientific community.

—D. S. GREENBERG

Elliott Committee: Latest Study Calls for Improvement in Data on Scientific Manpower Problems

The season is now at hand for a rush of reports and other publications from the two House committees that have spent the past year studying federal relations with science; these are Representative Carl Elliott's (D–Ala.) Select Committee on Government Research, and Representative Emilio Q. Daddario's subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

Last week, Elliott's committee released the second in a series of ten reports that it expects to publish before the committee's mandate expires in January. The latest report, *Manpower for Research and Development* (71 pp., available for 25 cents from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402), takes a look at the warmly contended question of the adequacy of the nation's supply of scientific and engineering manpower. The committee concludes that the subject is a difficult one, that not enough is being done to study it, but that, on the basis of the best available information, "it would appear that at this point in the mid-1960's the Nation is not suffering a severe general shortage of trained scientists and engineers." The committee added that it found "selective shortages (among them, college and university faculty)," and that "there is no field that can be said to be adequately staffed. But even this is not a static condition; 6 months may see a drastic shift."

Throughout its study the committee paid its respects to the difficulties of trying to match up far-off and uncertain scientific and technical goals with the lengthy educational process required for producing scientists and engineers. It warned that "there may be a tendency to generalize from some specific or selective shortages," and went on to caution that, "above all, we should be wary of leaping to a hasty conclusion that there is a crisis or that we are heading for a crisis."

Elliott's report tended to emphasize the uncertainties involved in manpower planning (it argued, for example, that "a change of as little as one-tenth of one percent in the estimated proportion of research and development spending to the gross national product would alter the number of personnel needed, say in 1970, by more than 20,000—almost three times the number of science and engineering doctorates granted in a single recent year"). Curiously, the report had nothing to say about an executive branch study that, as much as anything can, stands as the U.S. government's grand design for the federal role in developing scientific and engineering manpower. This is the so-called Gilliland Report, produced in 1962 under the chairmanship of Edwin R. Gilliland, of M.I.T., for the President's Science Advisory Committee. That report paid little heed to the uncertainties and came out emphatically for raising the annual production of engineering, mathematics, and physical science doctorates 150 percent by the end of this decade.

Elliott's group made no comment on this proposal—which, incidentally, has been incorporated in bits and pieces in the fellowship programs of various agencies; rather, the Elliott study limited its recommendations to proposing the establishment of a single agency to coordinate the manpower studies that are now conducted by the Department of Labor, the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Bureau of the Census, and a number of other offices in the federal government.

The proposal was not spelled out in detail, but, in general, it conforms to the sentiments of many government people who have been attempting to deal with scientific and engineering manpower problems, and it is possible that the idea will enlist the support necessary for its implementation.—D.S.G.

C. P. Snow: Corridors of Power Is Novel about Nuclear Policy and Politics, Closed and Open

With national elections imminent in both the United States and Britain and the nuclear question emerging as the livest issue so far in the presidential campaign, the American publishers of C. P. Snow's new novel, *Corridors of Power*,* should profit from coincidence or good timing.

The "corridors" of the title can be taken literally to refer to the halls of the government offices of Whitehall and the houses of Parliament or figuratively to mean the labyrinthine ways of "high politics." The novel is set in the years before and after the Suez crisis and centers on a young Tory politician's rise and at least temporary fall because of his attempt to alter British nuclear policy.

Corridors of Power is the ninth book in a planned sequence of 11 novels dealing with the life and times—from 1914 to the present—of Lewis Eliot, whose experience and views happen to have much in common with those of the author, who from provincial beginnings became a Cambridge scientist, a civil service commissioner, a company director, a successful man of letters, and a knight.

By now the reviewers have Snow bracketed as a novelist, and the notices of his latest book indicate that he is viewed with respect, gained partly by his "Two Cultures" lecture, but without excitement. It is a commonplace to compare him, in technique and tone, with the Victorians. Certainly he is without the implied anarchism of Britain's angry young authors or the angst of many contemporary American writers. Like the Victorian novelists, Snow is a storyteller. He has their keen interest in the effects of the class system on British life, and his characters tend to be social types. He even has some of the minor mannerisms of the Victori-

**Corridors of Power*, by C. P. Snow, Scribners, $5.95.