

a turbulent period when people did not clearly understand what they were voting for. He believes that restructuring proposals emanating from the faculty consistently underrate the importance of a strong executive, and that if the faculty followed its own prescription it would spend all its time on university government. "The historic reasons for faculty withdrawal from

administration still exist," he commented in a recent interview with *Science*, and he fears the faculty may set up a governing apparatus it will later abandon.

Between Truman and some members of the Executive Committee there is a feeling that the other is trying to cloak what is really an attempt to maintain or obtain power. There is also a feel-

ing, on the part of some faculty, that the administration has tried to undercut the Executive Committee by reactivating long-extinct advisory bodies and assembling informal boards of personal advisers. The lines are still fluid; some of the senior faculty known to be Truman supporters are also on the Executive Committee. But the tension between Truman and the committee as an institution appears real. Each distrusts the other's intention. (Cordier, on the other hand, meets daily with a representative of the committee, and, on that front, relations seem harmonious indeed.)

Nor is the rest of the university community entirely pleased with the functioning of the Executive Committee. Quite a few people agree that what is going on is a thinly disguised power grab; rightly or wrongly, a number of Executive Committee members are suspected of wanting the presidency themselves. The depth of their commitment to reform is frequently questioned, and their reform proposal—for a university senate heavily dominated by senior faculty—is seen as particularly self-serving.

Among students, and among some junior faculty, there is considerable resentment over the procedures being followed in the restructuring hearings. "They operate just like Grayson Kirk," complained one scientist, "from the top down, with no participation." At first the committee's plan of operation seemed intended to limit scrutiny to its own proposal and to ignore more radical proposals developed with greater student participation. While this is no longer technically true, the spirit of the criticism—frequently heard—is accurate: the Executive Committee has no intention of vastly increasing the students' role in running the university. What concessions to student interests are being made—and these are, in some instances, substantial—are emerging not on the level controlled by the committee but within the separate departments and schools.

Unease about the Executive Committee is enhanced by general uncertainty about how reforms will be implemented. "College affairs used to be run by a small clique," complained one professor, "but at least everyone knew who they were. Now no one knows who is running what."

In fact it is no secret. Final authority on structural changes still rests with the university's absentee landlords, the Trustees. Faculty and student en-

## NSF "Rescue" Fund Augmented

The budget pinch has eased slightly for the National Science Foundation and for some of its grantee institutions.

Informed Washington sources report that the Bureau of the Budget has recently ruled that NSF can increase its spending during fiscal year 1969 by about \$17 million above the previously announced ceiling of \$462.5 million. As a result, NSF will have considerably more money available to alleviate sharp distress caused in the scientific community by this year's budget cuts. The Foundation had previously held about \$10 million in reserve to ease the most severe problems caused by assignment of spending ceilings to some 500 institutions receiving NSF funds. This previous relief fund, coupled with the new money released by the Budget Bureau, thus gives NSF a total of about \$27 million for "rescue" purposes.

The Foundation has already adjusted the ceilings of about 50 institutions by a total of a few million dollars in order to alleviate extreme hardship, or remedy clear injustice. Such adjustments have been made in cases where (i) NSF clearly made a computational error in calculating an institution's ceiling; (ii) an institution had already spent more than its ceiling allowed, and the institution would thus have "owed" NSF money (these are generally small institutions); and (iii) unusual circumstances, such as a large construction program or an abnormally high rate of growth, made it unfair to treat an institution in accord with a nationally applied formula.

Among the institutions receiving quick emergency relief was the University of Massachusetts, a rapidly expanding research center that has been experiencing great financial difficulty (*Science*, 15 November). University officials report that NSF has boosted the spending ceiling at Massachusetts to \$1.3 million, up from the previous ceiling of \$996,000 and almost identical with last year's spending rate, but still well below the \$2 million in NSF expenditures that would normally have been made at the university this year.

The additional spending authority will allow Massachusetts to meet its salary commitments to graduate students and postdoctorates, and will provide roughly \$100,000 in addition to buy supplies and equipment, pay the salaries of technicians, and meet other research costs. The university had previously put a virtually complete freeze on all NSF spending except salary support for graduate students and postdocs. University officials say they still need at least \$277,000 more in NSF spending authority to operate at a "marginal research level." Foundation officials say the emergency increase granted to Massachusetts was intended to bring the university even with "the level of suffering of the rest of the country."

Meanwhile, NSF has received almost 200 appeals from institutions requesting increases in their spending ceilings. The increases sought range from a few thousand dollars to the \$1- to \$2-million level. Foundation officials hope to complete a review of the appeals and to make adjustments within a couple of weeks. Institutions, such as Massachusetts, which were given a stopgap, emergency boost in their spending ceilings, are eligible for still further adjustments.—P.M.B.