exclusive scientific mandate. It should make itself heard, and should be listened to, accordingly. . . . It is not clear from the record to date whether the Foundation is yet visualizing and preparing for the dynamic role which circumstances seem to be thrusting upon it. It appears doubtful. . . . It is the subcommittee's belief, with due respect for the merits of keeping basic science in the pure atmosphere of "pursuit of knowledge for its own sake," that science has nonetheless matured a great deal in recent years. We believe it can play in the political leagues without being corrupted or even unduly influenced by the character of the other players.

The subcommittee's specific recommendations for the Foundation are spelled out in a series of legislative proposals which are to be taken up in the new session of Congress, as well as a number of nonlegislative recommendations and observations. But what they all add up to is a design to cast NSF in a role of policy leadership that the Foundation has traditionally avoided. The 1950 Act establishing NSF directed the Foundation to "develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research" and "to evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal government. . . ." Alan T. Waterman, NSF's first director, concluded that it would be ruinous for his fledgling agency to be cast as judge of the work of such research giants as the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department, and he declined to exercise the authority.

In 1962 an executive order transferred the evaluation power to the newly established Office of Science and Technology in the White House; NSF retained authority, as President Kennedy put it, "to originate policy proposals and recommendations concerning the support of basic science," and to provide "studies and information for this purpose," but NSF was, and generally continues to be, uninterested in foraging for difficulties at the national policy level.

In the view of Daddario's committee, "The problem is to reassert and energize the function of the Foundation in creating and shaping a national policy for basic research and science education for the whole Government." To accomplish this it would strengthen NSF's top administration by providing for a deputy director and four assistant directors subject to presidential appointment and congressional confirmation. But, more significantly, it would enhance the role of NSF's top advisory body, the 24-member National Science Board, so that it would in effect serve as a counterpart of the President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC). The board, which now ranks in visibility somewhere between the National Monuments Commission and the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures, should have "a more lubricated and flexible position in governing NSF affairs," says the study. The committee notes that neither PSAC nor the executive branch's subcabinet for research, the Federal Council for Science and Technology, "has shown a disposition to work with Congress lacking a specific invitation." And it suggests that, if the Board were relieved of "routine administrative duties," given a small staff, and confined to broad policy questions, there would be encouragement for "both Congress and the Executive Office of the President to make use of the Board as an important added source of capable advice and independent viewpoint." "One can see the Board taking on science resource studies of the kind now handled by PSAC and OST," the report states. "Hence the Board can enable them to turn more of their attention to the applications of science, to scientific research in mission agencies, and to technology as these affect great national problems." The committee also proposes requiring the Board to make "an annual report on the status and health of science and its various disciplines. . . ."

These cheery portrayals of the Board's potential for service will probably be greeted with some skepticism in the environs of PSAC, where a goodly number of potential recruits have shied away from the schedule of 2 days of meetings per month, plus other duties that bring the total up to a commitment of some 40 days a year. Are there 24 qualified people who would be willing to provide the time and diligence necessary for a performance that would do better than add to the present abundance of confusion in science and government affairs? It's a big country and the ranks of senior and elder statesmen of science are growing, but it is perhaps worth noting that for the past 18 months the State Department has been looking without success for a full-time science adviser. The department, which is in somewhat low repute in the scientific community these days, has been aiming high, and this combination helps to explain failure to fill the position. But, in any case, there is no surfeit of highly qualified candidates for the frustrations of federal science policy and administration.

On the subject of NSF's alleged disposition to permit the incoming mail to determine its allocation of funds, the Daddario study charges that NSF "has not itself put a sustained effort into developing substance, form, and direction of the programs it supports. Once granted its annual budget, NSF has to a large extent followed a practice of waiting for talented outsiders to suggest appropriate projects on which to spend it." What should NSF do that it isn't doing? Among other things, the study suggests that NSF should be responsible for "directing, where indicated, some research—basic or otherwise, and including engineering—to help bring the scientific base for new and emerging technologies required in the national interest to the point where their development can proceed through other federal agencies and industry." Transportation, pollution, water supply, housing, and population were the examples offered. The report also recommended "channeling more effort for the development and refinement of institutions as such, with an eye for special help to those geographical areas presently at the low end of the academic spectrum." The

New FDA Commissioner Named

President Johnson announced Monday that James L. Goddard will become Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, succeeding George P. Larrick, who retired last month.

Goddard, 42 years old, is chief of the Public Health Service's Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Georgia. He will retain his PHS commission and rank of Assistant Surgeon General in the new post. He will be in charge of an agency with a current budget of $53 million, a responsibility for regulating the manufacture and sale of foods, drugs, and cosmetics, and a degree of responsibility for regulating agricultural pesticides.

Goddard, a native of Ohio, studied at Washington and Lee and at Temple universities, received his M.D. in 1949 from George Washington University, and the degree of master of public health in 1955 from Harvard.—M.K.Z.