

## A New Ocean of NASA Publications

NASA's reputation as the government's leading producer of press releases and after-dinner speeches has been given further confirmation with the recent publication of a 767-page volume titled *Index to NASA News Releases and Speeches: 1963-1966*. In this mammoth soft-cover book, NASA publicity is listed under six headings: subject, personal names, news release number, accession number, speeches, and news releases. This volume supersedes the *Index to NASA News Releases and Speeches 1963-1965* and is available from Scientific and Technical Information Division, Code USS-A, NASA Headquarters, Washington, D.C. 20546.

Two NASA-subsidized hard-cover books have been published recently: *An Administrative History of NASA, 1958-1963* (\$4.00) and *This New Ocean: A History of Project Mercury* (\$5.50). (The latter volume was reviewed in the 12 May issue of *Science*.) Both books can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

According to a recent estimate by the Government Printing Office (GPO), 337 copies of *An Administrative History of NASA* and 180 copies of *This New Ocean* have been sold. "It looks like we could use a plug for *This New Ocean*," a GPO official commented. NASA historians are currently at work on chronologies of Project Gemini and Project Apollo and are scheduled to write a full history of Project Gemini.—B.N.

matter and objected to other points in Montalenti's letter. He said he felt he could not attend the meeting unless an agenda was circulated and a new chairman named. After this, Montalenti resigned not only his chairmanship of the IUBS group but also his membership on the Station's administrative council and on the Italian committee which allocates table space at the station to researchers.

The Ministry's request for a revision was prompted primarily by demands from the station's unionized staff, particularly members of the professional scientific staff. It is here that another theme in the richly orchestrated complexities of the situation is introduced. The station has about 90 employees. As is the pattern in Italy, most of these are members of either of two unions, one White (Catholic) and the other Red (Communist-led). The Leftist Italian General Labor Confederation has been more active in recent years in the underorganized south of Italy and has been the more aggressive at the station. The union has sought higher pay for station staff—pay is low at the station and in Naples in general—and has also pushed for more tenure positions for the employees; about a third now hold permanent jobs. Tenure is an important matter in Italy where security of employment compensates somewhat for low wages. Unquestionably, there was some re-

sentment, particularly among younger employees, toward the Dohrn "dynasty" and what some viewed as a survival of a seigneurial system. Last year there were a couple of short strikes.

In addition to economic demands, the union has also pushed for participation of the staff in the making of policy. Scientific staff members felt, for example, that they have not been consulted sufficiently on reconstruction plans. But the main point at issue is the staff's desire to have their right to conduct independent research formally recognized in the new statutes.

One staff member, who has been perhaps the most active in seeking this statutory change, said that the station "is just one of the situations in Italy with basically the same problem." In the universities, scientists with research aspirations often find that the path to independent research is blocked. The greater freedom now enjoyed by physicists, in part as a result of the Fermi revolution more than a generation ago, and opportunities outside the university structure afforded by such new institutions as the International Laboratory of Genetics and Biophysics in Naples, directed by Adriano Buzzati Traverso, are cited as hopeful examples.

At the Naples station, the proponents of radical change argue that the concept of the station as a "scientific hotel" and of staff members as primarily as-

sistants to visitors is obsolete, if only because of developments in the technology of biology since the war. To make proper use of sophisticated instruments—an electron microscope, for example—a scientist rather than a technician must be on the permanent staff. No competent scientist, they contend, will be willing to forego his own research simply to provide a service to visitors.

These points are arguable and are being argued. Among the assistants themselves, there is a split. Some feel that assisting visitors at the station can be combined with research as successfully as teaching and research are combined in many European and American universities. They maintain that it is assumed that in practice the assistant at Naples will have half his time free to devote to his own work; they point out that the careers of distinguished alumni of the station were not blighted by lack of statutory sanction for their research efforts at Naples.

The views of the revisionists were given pointed expression, however, when four members of the scientific staff appealed in October to the Ministry asking that the staff and the union participate in the reform of the station to resolve a "grave administrative, scientific, and organizational crisis."

It is on the matter of policy that Dohrn has been adamant. He says that he sympathizes with staff demand for better pay and improved working conditions, but he feels that staff participation in policymaking and the granting of formal rights to perform independent research would destroy the original character of the station. The union has backed the proposal that the functions of scientific director and administrator be separated. Dohrn argues that having a scientific director implies a planned program which contradicts the basic principle of "free research." Dohrn has taken the position that the staff under the prevailing rules should not have direct access to the administrative council, and this has added to tensions.

The administrative council, historically, has never played a decisive role in station affairs, and, in the present circumstances, some of the members may well be suffering from conflicts of interest and loyalty. On the council now, in addition to Peter Dohrn, are the Mayor of Naples, Dr. K. Dohrn, who is a Frankfurt banker, treasurer of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, and a Dohrn cousin, and four