

with Administration R & D requests for the Defense Department, it would be wrong to think that many important congressmen are not looking at military R & D with a critical eye. For instance, Senator John Stennis (D-Miss.), who managed the military procurement bill on the Senate floor in April and who is likely to become the chairman of the Armed Services Committee next year, admitted that he had favored a 10-percent cut in military R & D this year, although other members of his committee had prevailed in refusing to enact such a large cut. Stennis, like other members, was especially critical of Defense Department spending in the social sciences. He said that the 3-percent reduction passed by the Senate could be applied "liberally" in social science research, which he called "the softest spot in all the research and development program."

The most recent indication of the rising senatorial discontent about Defense Department research came with the release, on 21 May, of testimony from a Senate Foreign Relations Committee closed hearing at which John S. Foster, Jr., the director of Defense, Research and Engineering, testified.* The senators' doubts about the value of military research fell into three main categories: (i) the propriety of Defense Department sponsorship of social science research; (ii) the kinds of research that are sponsored by the Defense Department in foreign countries, in both the natural and the social sciences; and (iii) the value of Federal Contract Research centers, such as the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) and RAND, which, although technically private corporations, are subsidized almost entirely with Department of Defense contracts.

Committee chairman J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) began the hearings by noting that the Defense Department will spend \$27 million this year on foreign-policy-oriented research and nearly \$40 million on research in foreign countries, while the State Department would spend only \$5 million. "The committee," Fulbright told Foster, "would like to have your views on the justification for the Defense Department to involve itself so deeply in non-military research."

Foster argued that it was difficult

Department of Defense—Funding of Federal Contract Research Centers. [From transcript of Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on research, released 21 May]

Center	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969 (requested)
1. Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin	\$1,350,000	\$1,350,000
2. Human Resources Research Office, George Washington University	3,262,000	3,449,000
3. Center for Research in Social Systems, American University	1,900,000	1,960,000
4. Hudson Laboratory, Columbia University	4,800,000	4,800,000
5. Ordnance Research Laboratories, Penn State	9,557,000	9,758,000
6. Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washington	3,127,000	3,202,000
7. Applied Physics Laboratory, Johns Hopkins	43,359,000	45,067,000
8. Lincoln Laboratories, M.I.T.	65,980,000	68,278,000
9. MITRE	32,949,000	32,900,000
10. Aerospace	72,220,000	72,220,000
11. Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA)	10,593,000	10,776,000
12. RAND	20,447,000	21,490,000
13. Research Analysis Corp.	9,992,000	10,141,000
14. Analytic Services, Inc.	1,500,000	1,500,000
15. Center for Naval Analyses	8,890,000	9,400,000
16. Illinois Institute of Technology, Research Institute	4,500,000	4,500,000

to draw a line circumscribing those matters which might be relevant for the Department of Defense or for potential military operations. After citing a Defense Department sponsored study on "Witchcraft, sorcery, magic and other psychological phenomena" in the Congo, Fulbright said, in his most acid manner, "Everything in a country could be said to be of some significance if you intend to occupy it, couldn't it?"

"Yes, sir, everything," Foster replied, and explained that he did not think that the witchcraft study was based on such an unlikely prospect. Foster also said he

would be "perfectly happy" to have another agency initiate some of this social science research.

"It comes back again, I suppose, to this matter of money," Fulbright answered; "Nobody has as much money as you have to spend in this and other areas. Is that the main reason you feel they are not doing it adequately and do not do this under the existing exchange program?" Foster replied that he thought the money shortage in other federal agencies was "part of the difficulty."

Later in the hearing Fulbright and other committee members zeroed in on

New National Science Board Members

Last week President Johnson announced his intention to nominate eight scientists and educators to 6-year terms on the National Science Board (NSB), the top policy-making board of the National Science Foundation. Approval of the nominations by the Senate is considered automatic.

Two of the nominees have just completed 6-year terms and were renominated. They are Philip Handler, chairman of the department of biochemistry at Duke University Medical Center, who has served as chairman of NSB for the past 2 years; and Harvey Brooks, dean of engineering and applied physics at Harvard.

The six other nominees include: R. H. Bing, chairman of the department of mathematics at the University of Wisconsin; William A. Fowler, professor of physics at Caltech; Norman Hackerman, president of the University of Texas at Austin; James G. March, dean of social sciences at the University of California at Irvine; Grover Murray, president of Texas Technological College; and Frederick E. Smith, professor of zoology at the University of Michigan.

The board meets about eight times a year and each of its four committees holds several additional meetings a year. Board members are paid \$50 a day while they are employed on board business, plus travel expenses. The board, which consists of 24 members plus the director of NSF sitting ex officio, is expected to elect a chairman and vice-chairman at a meeting in June.—P.M.B.

* Copies of the 98-page transcript of the hearing may be obtained without charge from the Documents Room, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.