

construction of new facilities. Virtually no new programs have been launched by the university, and it is thought very possible that by next September the university may not be able to maintain its vaunted tradition of never rejecting qualified candidates.

Criticism of waste and duplication attributed to the Master Plan is found increasingly in the press. Last year, for example, half the junior college districts are said to have had a quarter or more of their enrollment capacity unused. In the latest year for which figures are available, 1965-66, state colleges reportedly operated 13 master's degree programs in foreign languages. Although these programs averaged only 8.28 students per class, the colleges were seeking to create 18 more such programs.

More fundamental is the criticism that the Master Plan perpetuates institutional forms which may have been obsolescent when the plan was accepted. Critics ask whether it makes sense to try to multiply universities modeled on Berkeley and UCLA and to build an indefinite number of car-

bon-copy state colleges when the models may fail to meet the demands of today, not to speak of tomorrow. A greater variety of forms and a fairer and more imaginative use of resources is necessary, say the critics. And quite often in the university, where "decentralization" is much discussed these days, one hears the prophecy that the university will spawn no more conventional campuses.

Higher education in California seems to be suffering a kind of stasis caused by the cumulative effects of rapid expansion and steeply rising costs, campus disruptions, and differences over the social role of the university. And the effects are apparent inside and outside the university.

Californians, who, more than other Americans, have viewed education as an individual right and a public good, appear to be wavering a bit. With the vote on faculty appointments, a majority on the board of regents seemed to have formed behind Governor Reagan. The vote was widely attributed to the retention on the San Diego campus of Herbert Marcuse, whose

works are a fount of radical campus theory. The regents are considering the question of tuition for resident students, a matter of heavy symbolic significance in California, and the decision could well point the direction for high policy for higher education.

In fact the trouble seems to run fairly deep. Last year the voters turned down a \$125-million university bond issue considered very important to orderly expansion. Last month, in local elections, proposals for school tax increases and educational bond issues were almost uniformly rejected. Taxes are high and tax revolt is in the air, but what was different this time was not that education was being attacked, but that few seemed to be wholeheartedly pleading its case.

To put too much stress on the pathology of the present situation would be to slight the wealth, vitality, and confidence which produced the California system. But California has been a national bellwether in higher education, and other states may do well to look for symptoms of a similar malaise.—JOHN WALSH

HEW: Finch Tries To Gain Control over Department's Advisory Groups

In viewing this Administration, scientists have become a little edgy about the prominence which the White House has given to political considerations in filling major scientific posts. Some scientists have recently been given a similar, though much less dramatic, worry by learning that HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch has ordered a complete review of all his department's public advisory committees, has ordered a moratorium on the appointment of all new committee members through 31 August, and has affirmed his intention to keep the appointment power to HEW committees in the office of the Secretary.

No one disputes Finch's right to try to impose more order in HEW's sprawling advisory system which consists of some 430 committees. What scientists are worried about is that there

will be more attempts to install political appointees, not only on the advisory councils which advise on policy in the medical area, but also on the study sections which, in large part, determine how the research money will be allocated and what projects will be chosen for funding.

In the past, appointment to committees in such HEW agencies as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), especially to the scientific study sections, has been controlled largely by administrators in these agencies and by university scientists. Appointment to these groups has been nominally in the hands of the HEW Secretary, but the Secretary's office has done much more ratifying of agency suggestions than it has engaged in actually choosing committee members.

What HEW now wants to do is to better insure that "all committee selections will be made by the Secretary" in the words of HEW's 15 April policy guidelines for public advisory committees. On a draft memorandum outlining procedure for appointments to advisory committees, the appointment process begins by having an assistant to the HEW Secretary obtain relevant names from the White House Talent Bank. The next step involves sending a list of "must" and "recommended" names to the agency head who then compiles a list of recommended appointments. If the names are not satisfactory, they can be returned to the agency head for further action.

The final decision on procedures for appointing HEW advisory committees has not yet been completed, says David D. Kinley, the assistant to Finch who is working full time on the problem of HEW's committees. Kinley did make clear that the HEW Secretary wants the ultimate power to appoint committees and that he "wants to get into the selection process before the paper work is all done." Kinley said that names both from the White House Talent Bank and names recommended by congressmen would be included in the names sent to the agencies for appoint-

ment to HEW advisory committees.

There have been some sharp reactions to the HEW efforts to change the committee appointment process. One of the leading statesmen of science, former NIH director James A. Shannon, is alarmed about the possible changes that might occur in the method of choosing these advisory groups. "If names for scientific study sections are going to have to come from the White House Talent Bank," he argued, "no good can come of it." Although Shannon concedes that names suggested for advisory councils will doubtless be affected by political considerations, he would draw the line when it comes to appointment to scientific study sections, fellowship granting groups and training committees. "It could have dreadful consequences" to subject these appointments to the political process, Shannon told *Science*. "If Congress learns that it can play politics with these committees, they'll be in with both feet," he predicted, noting that NIH had been able to keep appointment to these groups outside of partisan politics. Shannon added that an infusion of politics into these committees would make scientists skeptical of the objectivity of the system which had been evolved for the support of research and training.

Will Dirksen Appoint?

Robert J. Weiss, chairman of psychiatry at the Dartmouth medical school, expressed his severe disapproval of the proposed changes. In a telephone interview, Weiss said that the proposed changes "are the first political incursion into the procedure of the initial review bodies. Introducing this political element would destroy free inquiry and research." Weiss believes that the proposed changes raise the specter of "men like Dirksen putting people on committees." Weiss also said that scientists might refuse to serve on scientific review bodies for HEW if political considerations came to be a factor in appointments.

One health official said that he was "very concerned" about the proposed changes and said that they would "substantially diminish the role of the agencies" in making appointments. Mike Gorman, a member of NIMH's National Mental Health Advisory Council, said that "I hope to hell it doesn't become a political process . . . which affects study sections examining a research project or a training project.

Now, councils are a different matter; they are involved in politics."

Although some officials in the health agencies are concerned about changes in the way committees are appointed, others are not worried by the new proposals. "This is not quite as shocking as it might appear," says one NIMH official. Although HEW officials are generally unwilling to have their names used in discussions on this matter, some attributed Finch's concern over committees to "part of the conventional political game": the attempt of every new administration to try to gain control of the bureaucracy.

One veteran Federal scientific official broke the problem of appointment to HEW advisory groups into two parts: "First," he said, "It would be a grave error to subject scientific and technical groups to political appointments. Secondly, on the matter of the councils, earlier HEW Secretaries have been remiss in not bringing these policy committees under closer political supervision." This official indicated that there had been not entirely successful attempts to make HEW advisory groups more politically responsive in earlier administrations.

"There are some good people in charge of HEW now," comments one longtime health official, "but they are a very, very uninitiated bunch. They want to know what all these committees do. I guess that I would too if I were in their shoes."

In an effort to find out what the clusters of HEW committees actually do, each head of an HEW agency is being required to submit an inventory of members on all committees and must also submit an analysis of whether such committees can be eliminated. Until 31 August, no new public advisory committees may be created in HEW and no new members may be appointed to existing committees. Since the end of the terms for many committee members is the end of June, this moratorium on new appointments may cause inconvenience to some groups.

Other guidelines which are being established for public advisory committees include:

- A continuing evaluation of the usefulness and effectiveness of each committee will be conducted by the Office of the Secretary.
- The number of committees will be kept to a minimum.
- Agencies should make a thorough

annual evaluation of a member's performance before his reappointment is recommended.

► Multiple memberships on committees will be avoided.

Kinley said that HEW is now determined to eliminate multiple memberships on committees and says that it has been a common practice for one person to serve on several HEW committees. Kinley explained that part of the reorganization of procedures for selecting committee members is being prompted by a desire to avoid Congressional criticism of the committee selection process such as that made by Rep. L. H. Fountain's House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

Achieving a "Meld"

Kinley also said that the Secretary's office was in no position to judge candidates for the more scientific and technical advisory committees and that he thought that the Secretary's office would have to rely largely on the agencies to recommend members for such groups. "We want to achieve a meld," Kinley said, "of professional judgment and that of the Secretary." Kinley added that Finch believed that the caliber of advice which HEW receives from its more than 5000 outside advisers was one of the "great assets" of the department.

There is nothing very new in the idea that HEW advisory groups might be made more politically responsive to the Administration in power. A good many people have been appointed to NIH and NIMH advisory councils in the past for political reasons, and this practice seems to have increased during the Johnson Administration. At present, there is a great deal of respect for Finch in HEW and a belief among many people that he would not take steps to impair the integrity of the HEW advisory system. There is some concern, however, that a new method for selecting HEW advisory committee members might be put into effect which would eventually work to the disadvantage of such agencies as NIH and NIMH. The final regulations governing HEW advisory group selection will probably be published by June. If these regulations represent a drastic revision of the way things have been done in the past, it may still take several years to assess the effect that such changes will make in the character of the scientific advice offered to the health agencies.—BRYCE NELSON