who are close to students, feel the same way. Demands for in-city training programs increase; urban research needs pyramid. Extracurricular activities, for both students and faculty, follow the same patterns. City governments are also exerting more pressure on the university; they find growing uses for the expertise of academics and the prestige of a big-university name, which can make politically unpalatable decisions seem more respectable.

Most of these projects live and die with little guidance from the central university administration. The implication is that, whatever the central administration does, Harvard's involvement in urban problems will depend primarily on the attitudes of the individual faculties. (The committee did suggest that urban projects would have the best chances of survival if they successfully combined service goals with the central training and research functions of the university.)

One reason for the committee's caution—apart from its respect for the fragmentation of decision-making—was internal disagreement over just what good the university *can* do. The prevailing tone was set by the chairman, James Q. Wilson, a professor of government who did most of the writing. The following passage, which bears his imprint, characterized the report:

> The intellectual disciplines are concerned with discovering what is generally true about human affairs, not what is true in the specific case . . . with simplifying our ways of describing or measuring complex situations, not remaining *au courant* about the details of current affairs. Occasionally, such intellectual knowledge is of value, but just as often it is not relevant to the particular political judgments that are vital to the direction of public policy. . . . Even the best social scientists rarely answer, expertly, a question put to them by a public official; typically, they tell the public official that he is asking the wrong question.

NSF: Funds Augmented, but Uncertainties Linger On

The budgetary fortunes of the National Science Foundation (NSF) brightened a bit more last week when President Nixon personally announced a $10-million elevation of the ceiling on spending which was imposed on NSF last spring. The latest increase brings the amount NSF can spend during fiscal year 1969, which ends on 30 June, to about $490 million. This is some $30 million less than the $520 million in spending authority NSF anticipated before congressional budget cuts and administration spending limits were applied last spring. The Nixon action was the second emergency transfusion. In November, the Johnson Administration had released $17 million in "rescue" funds to cushion the effect of spending restraints which seem to have fallen most heavily on NSF's university clients (*Science*, 22 November 1967), many of whom counted on receiving money granted in past years.

NSF director Leland J. Haworth said last week that the additional funds would be used first "to take care of the most critical situations that we know still exist among our grantee institutions." No details of the distribution of the new funds are yet available.

Nixon, who was accompanied by his science adviser, Lee A. DuBridge, when he made his announcement of the release of funds at the White House, said he had directed White House officials "to examine other research and development programs to ascertain where offsetting savings can be obtained," but he did not specify where. Nixon also noted that he felt the preceding administration had made a "serious error" in limiting NSF expenditures so severely.

If some observers saw in the President's remarks hints of happier days for NSF, it must be said that currently a number of uncertainties beset the foundation, and that some of these uncertainties stem from unmade decisions awaiting action in the President's "in" basket.

A leading question is that of the NSF directorship. Haworth's term expires on 30 June, when he will have passed his 65th birthday. Neither Haworth nor the Administration have indicated what their plans are, but many observers expect a change. And there has been a totally unconfirmed but unusually strong rumor on the Washington science grapevine which touts Emanuel R. Piore as successor to Haworth. Piore, 60, is an IBM vice president and chief scientist, and a former chief scientist of the Office of Naval Research. He is a member of the inner circle of national scientific leaders and is probably best known for leading rescue operations when the scientific community's fat is in the fire. Piore, for example, helped to liquidate Project Mohole, which was acutely embarrassing NSF, and played a key role in defusing the controversy over selection of a site for the proposed 200-Gev accelerator.

While the question of NSF directorship remains hanging, it seems evident that the whole top echelon of NSF positions will also remain unfilled. The amendments to the NSF basic law passed last spring provide that the NSF director's five top aides—the deputy director and four assistant directors who will occupy newly created posts—be Presidential appointees. Formerly only the director was the President's appointee. The five jobs have been kept open for more than 6 months, so changes in policies and programs as well as in top personnel await the President's pleasure.

Also, as a result of the amendments fostered by Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D–Conn.), NSF faces its first authorization hearings. Until this year the foundation had operated under a continuing authorization, and its officials were required only to make annual appearances—usually brief, if sometimes in an uncongenial atmosphere—before House and Senate appropriations subcommittees. For the first time the agency is facing a program-by-program examination of its activities, to gain an authorization for its fiscal 1970 appropriation. The foundation appears to be taking the prospect very seriously, and an agency-wide committee has been preparing testimony.

In the House, NSF will face the Science and Astronautics Committee's subcommittee on science, research, and development, headed by Daddario, who is likely to be a friendly, but well-informed and inquisitive, auditor, anxious to know what NSF has done to implement congressional imperatives in the Daddario bill to extend such NSF programs as those in applied science and the social sciences.—JOHN WALSH