NEWS IN BRIEF

• **CUT BACK IN RESEARCH ABROAD:** Federal agencies have reduced their spending for scientific research and postgraduate study abroad by $4 million during the last 12 months, according to Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D–Wis.), chairman of the Research and Technical Programs subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. Reuss said that the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation have cut back the funds awarded for postgraduate study by $1.2 million. Reduction in funds spent on research activities reported to the subcommittee included: Defense Department, $2 million; Public Health Service, $798,000; Atomic Energy Commission, $103,000; National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $100,000; and National Science Foundation, $73,000. Reuss had earlier recommended that funds be cut from non-urgent and postponable research projects and that stricter criteria be applied in awarding the study grants. The agencies submitted the amounts of reductions to the subcommittee but did not indicate just where the cuts were made.

• **NIAID REORGANIZATIONS**: The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) has reorganized some of its intramural research work. The Laboratory of Infectious Diseases (LID), the largest of the NIAID research units, was renamed the Laboratory of Viral Diseases, retaining its chief, Robert J. Huebner. Roger M. Cole has been named chief of the newly created Laboratory of Microbiology, which will be responsible for research formerly conducted under LID. The Laboratory of Tropical Virology has been abolished. It "died a natural death," a NIAID spokesman said, because much of its work had already been taken over by other NIAID divisions.

• **NSF APPROPRIATION**: The House last week provided no grounds for cheer among the many scientists who have been contending that the National Science Foundation should become the principal fount of federal support for basic research and scientific training. In its budget for the coming fiscal year, the administration sought to increase the NSF budget by $31 million, to a total of $495 million. The size of the proposed increase was generally considered to be inadequate in terms of the demands being made on NSF's resources, but the House declined even to go along with that amount. When the verdict was in, NSF emerged with an increase of $15 million. The Senate now takes up the budget, but in recent years, it has tended to go along with the House on the NSF budget. Just how NSF will revise its plans in order to work with a lesser amount is not yet known. But under the original budget, it had intended to increase its research grants from 3600 to 3870, and it had planned to add $2.3 million to its present budget of $45.9 million for advanced training.

• **HIGHER EDUCATION SUPPORT**: Grants and loans of more than $100 million for institutions of higher learning were announced recently by the U.S. Office of Education. Under the "Strengthening Developing Institutions" title of the Higher Education Act of 1965, more than $22 million was awarded 325 institutions in 46 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico. Schools qualifying for the program, an Office of Education official said, are those that "are struggling for survival because of financial or other reasons such as geographical isolation." Included in the total were funds to establish 1213 National Teaching Fellowships under which junior faculty members and graduate students from established institutions will spend a year at a developing institution. Ten southern states accounted for more than half of the $22 million and approximately $10 million went to predominately Negro schools. A total of $30 million has been appropriated for the program this year, compared with $5 million last year when it was just beginning operation.

Under Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, grants totaling $52 million were awarded to 106 institutions to pay part of the cost of building or remodeling undergraduate facilities. A total of $460 million has been appropriated for the program this year, the same figure as last year. Under Title II of the same act, 29 colleges and universities received $30 million in construction loans, part of this year's appropriation of $200 million, up from $110 million last year.

ing in praise of the "spirit of Naples" and often express their feelings in testimonials to Dohrn.

Opinions on Dohrn's personality and his administration of the station will doubtless continue to differ. He is worn by the controversy and sometimes overreacts irritably to his critics. His style of life is hardly grand—he lives in a peasant house on the Sorrento peninsula, and he drives one of the smaller Fiats. As for his stewardship of the station, users say that the new library is well designed and well run. Handling of the major reconstruction job now in progress has drawn criticism from inside and outside the lab, in part, it seems, because of delays caused by efforts to stretch the lire. Nevertheless the work goes on. With regard to regular operations, cost effectiveness criteria are obviously hard to apply, but visiting biologists seem to think that the station gives more for its half-million-dollar annual budget than most places could.

What marks Dohrn most deeply is the intensity of commitment to the principle of "free science." He sees the mission of the station as providing "hospitality to intelligent science." No doubt he feels that he is the defender of the scientific faith and family tradition. He accepts as inevitable that the freedom he espouses will be linked with a good deal of uncertainty. There is no doubting his resolution and this is what, as much as anything, has so far prevented compromise.

To a significant number of foreign scientists, Dohrn symbolizes the station's international character. Without Dohrn, many Italians feel that, as one activist staff member said, the station would "fall under the risk of university dominance."

In some ways the Naples station has deviated from the main trends of modern biology. The organizational ideal in biology now seems to be the large, interdisciplinary laboratory where agglomerations of talent will permit efficiencies of scale. The ideal has been achieved in few places—even the Cambridge lab and Pasteur Institute have their strengths and weaknesses—but the way seems to lead to the "research factory" which the physicists pioneered. Whether there will be a place for a Naples station which attracts biologists who want to work only on the marine fauna and flora available there seems questionable. What happens at Naples may suggest the answer.

Other forces for change are work-