

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **PRESIDENT'S SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:** President Nixon on 24 April announced the appointment of five new members to his 19-member President's Science Advisory Committee. The new members, who will serve 4-year terms, are John D. Balde-schwieler, professor of chemistry, Stan-ford University; Richard L. Garwin, director of the IBM Watson Labora-tory, Columbia University; Murray Gell-Mann, professor of theoretical physics, California Institute of Tech-nology; Patrick E. Haggerty, president of Texas Instruments, Inc., Dallas; and Gerald F. Tape, president of the Asso-ciated Universities, Inc. The President's Advisory Committee advises the Presi-dent on a broad range of government issues pertaining to science and technol-ogy. Lee A. DuBridge is chairman and Charles P. Slichter of the University of Illinois is vice chairman.

● **FERMI TO BE HONORED:** Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg has said that the AEC plans to name the National Accel-erator Laboratory at Batavia, Ill., after the late Enrico Fermi, the physicist who is credited with the first sustained nu-clear reaction. The new name, "The Enrico Fermi Laboratory," will not be official until construction is completed and the facility is operating. Comple-tion is scheduled for 1972.

● **NSF SPENDING CEILING:** The National Science Foundation announced on 5 May that it will impose expendi-ture ceilings on some 150 institutions during fiscal year 1970. The institutions that will be affected are those whose expenditures from NSF funds are ex-pected to exceed \$500,000 during the year. Specific ceilings will be trans-mitted to these institutions by mid-June. In some respects, the new plan for spending limitations seems milder than the one that was put into effect during the current fiscal year. For one thing, the new plan affects only about 150 institutions, whereas the old plan imposed ceilings on some 500 institu-tions whose annual NSF expenditures exceeded \$50,000 apiece. For another thing, knowledgeable officials don't expect that the percentage reduction required under the new plan will be quite as high as that required under the

old. The new plan specifically exempts various summer programs, traineeships, and individual fellowships and travel awards from the expenditure ceilings. But there may be worse news ahead. The new ceilings are merely intended to keep spending within the limits speci-fied for NSF in the Johnson and Nixon budgets. If Congress imposes a further mandatory spending reduction, as seems likely, NSF may have to revise its plans and tighten up even more.

● **SHOCKLEY PROPOSAL TABLED:** The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) in an almost unanimous decision voted to table a proposal to urge an expanded study of heredity aspects of national human quality. The proposal was made at the annual NAS meeting in Washington by Nobelist William Shockley, a professor of physics at Stanford University. Shockley, who has previously presented the proposal at two other NAS annual meetings, refers to a recent paper by Arthur R. Jensen of the University of California in the winter issue of the Harvard Educational Review, in which Jensen suggests intel-ligence may be determined largely by heredity and may not be altered signifi-cantly by improving environment. In clarifying the Academy's position, NAS President Frederick Seitz said, "There is a strong feeling within the Academy that social inequities make it impossible to do reasonable scientific research in this area. . . . In addition, the conduct of such research at the present would tend to heighten current social tensions to a very destructive degree."

● **SCIENTISTS' SALARIES:** A Na-tional Science Foundation (NSF) re-port shows that the median annual sal-ary of U.S. scientists in 1968 was about \$13,200, about 10 percent higher than in 1966. The NSF report, based on the responses of nearly 300,000 scientists to NSF's National Register, also shows that self-employed scientists earned the highest median salary, \$18,000, while scientists employed by industry or by nonprofit organizations were at the \$14,700 level, and university scientists paid on an academic year basis, had a median salary of \$11,000. The report indicates that 10 percent of all scientists earned more than \$21,500, and 10 per-cent earned less than \$8,500.

researchers, students, technicians, and nurses. At the same time, it was agreed that, pending completion of the group's work, voting rights on academic affairs would be extended to the 120 or so teaching staff members below the top-ranking professorial level.

Concessions to Reform

It is generally felt that the spread of the franchise has not produced any significant effects, but, while funda-mental reforms were being worked out by the Conseil, the move served to symbolize the fact that the *professeurs ordinaires* no longer were in their tradi-tionally unchallengeable position. And, as a further concession to reform, the university agreed to proceed with plans for an outpatient clinic, which was a long-sought-for objective of young fac-ulty members who regarded such a facility as an essential part of designs for a community health program—still another new departure for the medical school. "There is not the slightest doubt," says one of the planners of the clinic, "that, without the events of last May, we would have got absolutely nowhere in our attempts to get started on this project."

Nevertheless, if deep-down changes are to come about, they will have to come out of the work of the Conseil, for that body was charged with the basic task of redistributing the day-to-day control that traditionally had been held almost exclusively by the top-ranking professors. Whether such changes are actually going to take place is now the critical question, for the Conseil, after months of delibera-tions and widespread consultations with medical school authorities in Belgium and abroad, has at last agreed upon a new design for running the school—and, predictably, some of the senior staff is balking.

The proposals, which were com-pleted in mid-March, look tame from an American perspective. But there is no doubt that they cut right through to the center of the problem—the stranglehold that a relatively few peo-ple have been able to exercise over the school's basic affairs, with the result that curriculum reform, coordination of teaching programs, and the intro-duction of new equipment and tech-niques are matters of individual pref-erence rather than an attempt to run the school as a whole. Thus, in stating that there should be no necessary con-nection between functions and titles,