

particularly in regard to matters dealing with science resources. Far from hindering PSAC in its functions, such a service by the Board might relieve PSAC of some of its numerous burdens and permit it to concentrate on specific, important, practical missions.

We have recommended more support for institutional and developmental grants. But let me emphasize that we recommend this with the reservation that the project-grant system not be downgraded as a consequence. We are projecting a situation in which NSF budgets will be expanded to permit acceleration of institutional aid without damage to established project research.

We have recommended a more active role for NSF in international affairs and in the support of international scientific activities.

We have also suggested that science

attachés abroad be provided and budgeted in whole or in part by the National Science Foundation, although they might work with and within the foreign service system and be responsible organizationally to the State Department. This procedure seems worth exploring, since it would encourage closer relationships between the State Department and the Foundation and perhaps give a boost to a program which is suffering from personnel and financial anemia.

We are hopeful that the Department will bolster its international science office, give it sufficient backing and funds to develop a comprehensive, useful program. The program should be responsive (i) to the political and mission needs of the Department, and (ii) to the needs of the American scientific community. We see no reason why NSF-provided science representatives

could not handle one or both functions while attached to the State Department's foreign service, assuming adequate staffing and financing. This latter seems likely to come about more readily with NSF as a partner in the arrangement than if the State Department is obliged to carry the entire program alone.

Certainly the better scientific people we have, the more effective they will be in either capacity. And from the standpoint of an adequately continuing or uniform career, NSF may be in the better position to provide such personnel.

References

1. House Report No. 1236, "The National Science Foundation—Its Present and Future."
2. House Report No. 1219, "The National Science Foundation—A General Review of Its First 15 Years."
3. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962 and Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1965.

NEWS AND COMMENT

Exporting the Great Society: Funds Are a Limiting Factor

In a speech at the Smithsonian Bicentennial Celebration last September, President Johnson got off one of his more arresting public phrases when he said, "we mean to show that this Nation's dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge," and went on to assert, "It is not just an American dream. All are welcome to share in it. All are invited to contribute."

The President was in an expansive mood and justifiably so since Congress was in the final phase of a 2-year outpouring of education, health, and other Great Society legislation. His proposals in the Smithsonian speech, titled "The Noble Adventure," were stated in the most general terms, but he made two main pledges: "to assist the education effort of developing nations" and regions and to help schools and universities in the United States "to increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it."

Early in February the President sent

to Congress a message on international education and health which was a sequel to the Smithsonian speech and filled in some of the blanks. While the message attested to the President's commitment to the idea, it also reflected fiscal stringencies imposed by the costs of the war in Vietnam and the coming due of early payments on major Great Society programs.

Like the President's message on domestic education and health, the international message calls for some new legislation but relies fairly heavily for impact on revised priorities and changed orientations in existing programs through administrative action. Affected are both our activities in international organizations such as the World Health Organization and unilateral programs such as those operated by AID.

The United States, it must be noted, has never really had a program in either international health or international education. Rather, we have spon-

sored a multiplicity of separate programs operated by a variety of agencies. American commitments abroad in health and education have grown greatly since World War II, but they have grown untidily, and, because of bureaucratic separatism gap and overlap have been familiar phenomena.

By talking about international education and health programs in terms of integrated, long-term policy, in a special message, the President gave public prominence to the subject. At the same time, there is plenty of evidence that the White House is pushing for action in the agencies to improve both the coherence and the coordination of these programs.

Likely to be most affected by the new effort is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In his message the President asked Congress, among other things, to declare that "the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is charged with a broad authority to help strengthen our country's capacity to carry on this noble adventure."

HEW is directly—it appears, exclusively—involved in the only legislation so far put forward specifically to implement the message. These are administration-inspired bills on education and health. The new international education bill has been introduced by Senator Wayne Morse (D-Ore.), chairman of the Senate subcommittee on education, and by Representative Adam

Clayton Powell (D-N.Y.) and John Brademas (D-Ind.). The House bills are the identical H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452.

Under the proposed legislation, the HEW secretary would be empowered to make grants to a single institution or group of institutions for the establishment and operation of research and training centers in international studies at the graduate level. Costs of programs to bring visiting scholars and faculty to the centers and costs of travel of staff abroad could be covered. A parallel program of grants would be provided to assist institutions of higher education in strengthening international studies at the undergraduate level. Emphasis would be on support of planning, training of faculty members in foreign countries, and expansion of foreign language courses. Funds in this international education bill would be spent, for the most part, here at home.

The President also urged that a Center of Educational Cooperation be set up in HEW, with a council of distinguished citizens to advise the center. The center would be expected to perform a variety of functions in keeping communications channels open between segments of the educational community here and abroad and in giving direction to HEW international programs. The President also asked for a corps of education officers in the Foreign Service, and he launched such ideas as the establishment of a voluntary "school-to-school partnership" program with a goal of 1000 partnership arrangements. (The program would be administered by the Peace Corps in cooperation with AID.) Establishment of an Exchange Peace Corps of foreign volunteers with special skills who would serve in this country was also mooted. A volunteer would teach his native language and culture in American schools and colleges. A goal of 5000 recruits would be set initially.

Other recommendations amounted generally to a call for the expansion and elaboration of student- and teacher-exchange and educational-assistance programs now in being, many of them sponsored by AID.

On the health side of the message, the President's leading proposal was for the creation of an international career service in health. He proposed establishment of an "International Corps" in the Public Health Service and initiation of measures to increase the supply of Americans with appropriate training and long-term commit-

ment to careers in the international health field. He suggested grants to universities and professional schools to increase the number of graduate students preparing to participate in international health activities and encouragement in other forms to provide incentives for qualified Americans to remain in this field. These proposals are contained in an international health bill (H.R. 12453) introduced by House Commerce Committee chairman Harley O. Staggers (D-W. Va.)

On 17 March the Staggers bill, which had been reported out of the Commerce Committee, struck a reef when the House Rules Committee declined to schedule the bill for floor action. The Rules Committee appears to have felt that it would be unwise to support a program which would result in the export of health personnel when there is a shortage at home. The reversal is viewed by Hill observers as one that makes passage of the legislation unlikely in the near future.

Expanding Present Programs

The President proposed other measures to carry forward work already being done overseas to fight malnutrition, to advance programs for control and eradication of disease, and to give assistance in population control measures to nations which ask for it.

Total funds for international health and education programs requested by the President amount to \$524 million for fiscal 1967. Of the total, aid programs would get \$354 million; HEW programs, \$103 million; the Peace Corps, \$11 million; and the State Department, \$56 million (this includes funds for cultural as well as educational programs).

In Congress, the problems of implementing the President's proposals for education will be examined by a task force of the House Education and Labor Committee. With Brademas as chairman, the group will hold hearings on the proposed administration bill, but it will almost certainly look into the broader questions raised by the message and could come up with some recommendations and perhaps some legislation of its own. Hearings, with top HEW officials leading off, were scheduled to begin Wednesday after this issue went to press.

The government's current reexamination of U.S. policies and performance in the fields of international education

and health was foreshadowed by a number of studies and reports which in turn reflected mounting dissatisfaction among knowledgeable people inside and outside government.

One prime source of comment has been Education and World Affairs (EWA), a nonprofit research and information organization supported by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. EWA has been devoted, since its establishment in 1962, to the development of American competence in world affairs.

Of renewed interest now is the report titled "Organization of the Office of Education: A New International Dimension," based on a study by a committee headed by Indiana University president emeritus Herman Wells, who is chairman of the EWA board of trustees.

In the report the rather feeble past record in international activities of the Office of Education is examined, and recommendations are made for strengthening the Bureau of International Affairs (the smallest and weakest of the three main branches of OE) and also for countering the effects of the chronic fragmentation of international programs.

More notice was attracted by another report bearing the EWA imprint, "AID and the Universities," when it was published, also in 1964. Author of the report was John W. Gardner, then president of the Carnegie Corporation. At the request of AID administrator David E. Bell, Gardner had headed a study committee and written a report on AID-university relationships. The research was done largely by EWA staff members.

Universities have been deeply involved in foreign aid operations since World War II, particularly in the educational and technical assistance programs. The typical arrangement has been the contract, between foreign aid agency and university, providing for advice and services over a specific period. The universities have complained of a lack of federal support for research, particularly on problems of economic development. Both universities and government have complained about the effects of characteristic short-term rather than long-term commitments. The Gardner report emphasized the need to revise contracting practices to make it possible for those under contract to work effectively toward long-term as well as short-term goals.

Universities would be encouraged to develop new arrangements such that involvement of their faculty and staff in foreign aid projects would not be typically an in-and-out affair.

Gardner's appointment to the HEW secretaryship, of course, transforms him from critic and adviser to a federal administrator responsible for the new initiatives in international health and education that President Johnson has called for from HEW. Gardner's survey mission to Saigon in advance of an expansion of health and education activities seems to be evidence of the President's confidence in Gardner and faith in education and health programs.

Inside HEW, former Education Commissioner Francis Keppel has recently moved into the post of HEW Assistant Secretary for education and has indicated he will give much attention to international education.

Another advocate of reform who is no longer on the outside looking in is Charles Frankel, new Assistant Secretary of State for educational and cultural affairs. Until last September he was a philosophy professor at Columbia, with special interests which led

him to write a book, published in January, titled *The Neglected Aspect of Foreign Affairs* and subtitled "American Educational and Cultural Policy Abroad." In his book, based on a study made for the Brookings Institution, Frankel recommended the creation of a corps of education officers to serve abroad and made a number of other suggestions which appear to be in accord with presidential inclinations.

A Gardner-Keppel-Frankel axis on international education policy could well offset some of the complications in efforts to coordinate programs operated by a number of agencies. Frankel now heads an interagency council on educational and cultural affairs which includes representatives from agencies involved in programs in this field. (In addition to State and HEW, the U.S. Information Agency, AID, the Peace Corps, and the Defense Department are represented, as are other interested agencies and organizations, such as the Bureau of the Budget and the Smithsonian.) The council has not been particularly potent as a coordinating force in its 3 years of existence, but there are reportedly signs of new vigor.

The problem of coordinating health programs is not so formidable, since the Public Health Service figures in almost all overseas activities either as a principal or as a contracting agency. The question of how a supercoordinating center for international education located in HEW would affect the picture—whether such a center might have jurisdiction over education in health fields and thereby incite some conflicts—simply has not been clarified.

In broader context, the efforts at reappraisal of international health activities is part of a larger effort to rethink and reform our foreign assistance programs in light of a conclusion that "outputs" have been unsatisfactory because "inputs" have been incorrect.

The administration appears intent on giving a new look and a new momentum to international education and health activities, and it may succeed in doing so. Experience indicates, however, that, where federal programs are concerned, hearty congressional cooperation and a sizable infusion of funds is usually required to close the gap between intention and implementation.

—JOHN WALSH

Auto Safety: Nader vs. General Motors

Ralph Nader, the young Washington attorney whose book, *Unsafe At Any Speed*, exposed the auto industry's indifference to safe design, has now exposed one of its other sides as well (*Science*, 26 November). The Senate hearing held last week on General Motors' confessed investigation into the private life of its most formidable critic was something of a sideshow in the annals of industrial intelligence. It did not tell us how routine such business snooping—or, for that matter, governmental snooping—has become. But it does tell us that, when confronted with a serious analyst trying to bring basic questions of science, technology, and public policy into the public arena, the response of General Motors is

straight out of movieland: "Follow that man."

The events in the investigation of Nader appear to have been something like this. Last November, about the time Nader's book was published, Aloysius Power, GM's general counsel, conceived the idea that Nader might be connected with the 106 damage suits now pending against GM's Chevrolet Corvair, 1960-1963 models. (He isn't.) Nader's opening chapter is devoted to the Corvair, and he had previously published articles on the subject. A preliminary investigation failed to turn up any information, and on 22 December, one of Power's associates on the legal staff got in touch with Richard Danner, a Washington lawyer, asking him to

find a suitable agent for a more intensive probe. Danner contacted Vincent Gillen, a former FBI agent who runs a detective agency in New York. Gillen took the job, and in turn contracted with smaller operators in Washington and Boston to handle some of the field work. The investigation began in January and apparently continued even after 4 March, when an issue of the *New Republic* (dated 12 March) was published containing an article by James Ridgeway detailing the harassment to which Nader was being subjected. This included surveillance, late night telephone calls, and apparent efforts to lure Nader into compromising situations with young women.

The *New Republic* article was widely quoted in the press across the country, and it—and articles based on it—received immediate attention. In Washington two Senators requested a Justice Department investigation. In Detroit, the Ford Motor Company issued a denial that it was in any way involved. In the offices of General Motors, things went a little differently. As GM president James Roche testified before the Government Operations subcommittee