

Hornig wanted to leave government some time ago to accept a private job offer. He only stayed on because he feared that the scientific community might suffer greatly if he departed. Several well-placed sources report that, when soundings were taken to determine whom the President would name to replace Hornig, it seemed likely that Johnson would either appoint a poorly qualified crony, or might not appoint another science adviser at all. As a result, according to well-informed sources, Hornig decided to remain in office until the end of the administration. It was not until a month ago that Hornig, now 48 years old, finally left government and accepted an executive position with the Eastman Kodak Company, of Rochester, N.Y.

One of the most significant developments during Hornig's tenure was an expansion and diversification of the White House science advisory apparatus. Under Hornig's leadership, the Office of Science and Technology (OST) doubled its budget, from \$900,000 to \$1.8 million, and increased the size of its full-time professional staff, from 15 to 21. The President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC), a group of scientists who advise the government on a part-time basis, was diversified to include representatives from new disciplines, professional backgrounds, and geographic areas, in line with the President's desires. And the whole science advisory apparatus continued to expand its interests and responsibilities. Whereas the first three science advisers were primarily concerned with matters of national security or arms control (though Wiesner branched out into domestic areas), Hornig, a loyal servant of the Great Society, focused attention on such civilian problems as environmental pollution, energy policy, housing, transportation, food supplies, and law enforcement. Hornig estimates that the total time and effort devoted to national security matters by OST staffers and PSAC panels has not changed much over the years, but the addition of new civilian responsibilities has produced a "growth away from defense problems."

Foreign Affairs Role

Hornig also opened up a new international role for the science adviser, a development in which he expresses "a great deal of satisfaction." At the request of President Johnson, he undertook missions to Korea, Pakistan,

India, Taiwan, Libya, Australia, South America, and various European nations. The missions are said to have been partly substantive, in that Hornig spurred technological developments in several nations, and partly ceremonial. "It got to be a joke around here," says one government official, "that when critical things were happening, Hornig was off in some other country, attending Mickey-Mouse tea ceremonies."

Not everyone believes the expanding size and role of the science advisory apparatus has been a good thing. Some observers fear that the President's Science Advisory Committee and Office of Science and Technology are losing effectiveness as their interests become more diffuse and their resources are stretched thin. Others suspect that bureaucratic rigidity is setting in, and there is some suspicion of empire-building.

Hornig and his staff were involved in so many issues that it is difficult to convey a complete picture of their ac-

tivities. White House staffers say Hornig played a major role on the task forces that shaped the Johnson administration's legislative programs in areas relating to science and technology. And Budget Bureau officials say Hornig's office helped shape hundreds of budget decisions. Bennett, Hornig's deputy, believes the office "played a major part in guiding the thinking of government. You can't say we did it single-handedly, but there were dozens and dozens of issues where we had our input. Actually, more was accomplished by modifying than by initiating. A lot of it was putting out small fires before they got big."

To cite just a few examples, Hornig's operation is given major credit for sparking federal research programs in housing and transportation; for developing a new law designed to encourage medical schools to expand their production of doctors; for shaping the administration's bill (introduced but not yet passed) to ensure the reliability of

Afro-American Studies Programs

Faculty committee reports at both Harvard University and the University of California at Berkeley recommend the establishment of full degree-granting programs in American Negro studies at both institutions. At Berkeley, the Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Sciences on 17 January approved, in theory, the establishment of an Afro-American studies program leading to a B.A. degree. The administration has indicated that it will consider elevating such a program to a department level within the college of arts and sciences.

At Harvard, a faculty committee, chaired by Henry Rosovsky, professor of economics, recommended on 21 January that Harvard establish a full degree program in American Negro studies, to be integrated with other disciplines, but to be on a par with them. In a 50-page report, the eight-member committee concludes that the absence of satisfactory Afro-American courses is "the single most potent source of black students' discontent at Harvard." The committee believes that a Negro studies program constitutes an intellectually valid academic discipline at Harvard; it urges the university to offer more scholarships for Blacks, to appoint specialists in Negro studies, and to increase the number of blacks on Harvard's teaching, research, and administrative staffs. The report also calls for a vigorous recruitment of Black graduate students and the establishment of 15 to 20 fellowships to be given annually. (The committee claims that Harvard has graduated an estimated eight Black Ph.D.'s in the last 10 years.) In addition, the report also recommended that Harvard reevaluate its investment policies and community relations with an aim to improving the status and economic opportunities of Negroes. The report's academic recommendations, which have already been approved by Harvard's Committee on Educational Policy, will be considered by the full faculty on 11 February. These recommendations are not binding, but university officials indicate that the administration is prepared to act on them.—MARTI MUELLER