percent of direct costs. In an effort to seek an easy way around the horrendous bookkeeping tangles of direct and indirect costs, NIH has generally allowed a straight 20 percent, regardless of whether the costs actually were lower. At present, NIH is working hard and fast on procedures to keep the payments in line with the certifiable costs, but Fountain and his committee staff are on to some past cases that might prove difficult to explain, especially at a time when congressional friends of NIH are pushing for a bigger budget.

As of now, the Wooldridge committee report is up for review and comment along the chain of command of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and, as a consequence, public pronouncements are not in order along that route. But the committee's suggestion of "some decrease in the present proportion of intramural research" has understandably had something of a demoralizing effect on NIH's staff. The effect was such that last week NIH Director James Shannon met in closed session with the Bethesda staff to discuss the report. Shannon's remarks were off the record, but it is understood that he disagreed with some of the methodology of the Wooldridge study, and he is also reported to have questioned the committee's criticism of NIH's capacity for long-range planning. In any case, Shannon, Fogarty, and Hill constitute an enormously powerful and harmonious trio in government medical research, and as long as they hold office, it is unlikely that NIH is going to be changed in any way that they find distasteful.

Public reaction to the Wooldridge study has been limited in volume, probably as a consequence of a general lack of interest in the innards of research administration. However, the New York *Times* this past Sunday took exception to some key aspects of the study. Addressing itself to the issue of university- versus government-conducted research, it stated that "what is disturbing is that a majority of the Wooldridge committee consisted of persons having university affiliations. The group had not a single representative of Federal Government scientists. This circumstance must weaken the authority of a recommendation so intimately affecting the interests of the great university science research establishments."

—D. S. GREENBERG

Advisory Set: New Appointments Reduce Harvard-MIT Presence on President's Science Committee

Ever since Sputnik created a major demand for technical advice in Washington, scientists, engineers, and administrators from Cambridge, Massachusetts, have occupied a large proportion of the key advisory roles.

The first three of the four men to serve as presidential science adviser came from Harvard or M.I.T. And at the end of last year, six of the 18 members of the President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC)—the topmost science advisory body in the federal hierarchy—were based at those institutions. Inevitably, regions that have not fared well with government-granting agencies have charged that the so-called "Cambridge crowd" dominates White House science advice and sees to it that Harvard and M.I.T. are well cared for. The reply is that the government seeks the best advisers, and lots of them quite reasonably happen to be located at such outstanding institutions as Harvard and M.I.T.; in addition, it is argued that these universities merit their support on the basis of quality. And finally, advisers from Cambridge, and elsewhere, often point out that efforts to achieve geographical dispersion are often baffled by the refusal of nominees to accept a burden that cuts heavily into their professional and personal lives.

Whatever the case may be, the presence of Cambridge in high advisory circles seems to be diminishing considerably. Donald F. Hornig, who was appointed White House science adviser late in 1963, is a Princeton chemist, and last week five new appointments to PSAC left that body with only one Cambridge man, Edward Purcell of the Harvard physics department, although five Cantabrigians still remain associated with PSAC under the designation of consultants-at-large.

The PSAC appointments, for 4 years each, were made to fill a series of vacancies that occurred with the expiration of seven terms at the end of last year. Of these seven expirations, five were from Cambridge: Harvey Brooks, dean of engineering and applied physics, Harvard; Paul Doty, professor of chemistry, Harvard; Edwin R. Gilliland, professor of chemical engineering, M.I.T.; Jerome Wiesner, dean of science, M.I.T.; and Jerrold R. Zacharias, professor of physics, Harvard. Also expiring were the PSAC terms of Wolfgang Panofsky, director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator, and Colin M. MacLeod, who had been on PSAC while serving as deputy director of the White House Office of Science and Technology.

The new appointments bring to PSAC its first career government scientist, Lewis Branscomb, chairman of the Joint Institute for Laboratory Astrophysics, which the National Bureau of Standards operates at Boulder. In the past it was felt that the presence of a government scientist on PSAC might confuse lines of authority in the executive agencies. Just what promoted the innovation isn't clear, but it should be pleasing to those government scientists who have often complained that government-operated laboratories have not been adequately spoken for in the high councils.

The other new appointees are Marvin L. Goldberger, professor of physics, Princeton; Kenneth Pitzer, president of Rice University; George Pake, provost and professor of physics, Washington University; and Gordon MacDonald, of the Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Sciences, U.C.L.A. The newcomers to PSAC join the following: Melvin Calvin, Berkeley; Richard L. Garwin, Columbia; Philip Handler, Duke; Franklin A. Long, Cornell; William D. McElroy, Johns Hopkins; John R. Pierce, Bell Telephone; Herbert F. York, University of California; and Purcell. By custom, PSAC consists of 18 members, and if custom prevails, two additional appointments remain to be made.

The consultants-at-large are on call for particular problems but do not regularly participate in PSAC proceedings. They are, Detlev W. Bronk, Rockefeller Institute; James B. Fisk, Bell Telephone; James R. Killian, M.I.T.; George Kistiakowsky, Harvard; Edwin H. Land, Polaroid Corporation; Emanuel R. Piore, IBM; Isidor I. Rabi, Columbia; Wiesner; MacLeod; and Brooks.

The motivation for the shift away from the past emphasis on Cambridge is difficult to pinpoint. White House sources say that the new appointments do not arise from any specific presidential directive, but, as one of them explained, "geographical dispersion is in the air and the appointments reflect the situation."—D.S.G.