

point out, put a modest sum into SRI and was paid back fully, with some \$800,000 added in SRI contributions to the university; it was the skill and hard work of the SRI staff, they maintain, that multiplied SRI's worth.

The Stanford name makes it easier to attract staff and customers but is probably less important than it was in earlier days. Library privileges at Stanford and the joint use of some equipment and facilities make life personally and professionally more agreeable for SRI staff. But while there would no doubt be regrets and, in some cases, real losses, there is general confidence that SRI can make it on its own.

Many feel that not much will change because SRI has not really had a symbiotic relationship with Stanford. The direct Stanford involvement, by SRI reckoning, comes to 53 Stanford faculty members listed as SRI consultants, 14 SRI staff members teaching at the university, and some 67 Stanford undergraduates working at SRI.

More significant, SRI's ties to Stanford's engineering and science departments are really less intimate than are those of the high-technology companies which have grown up within the Stanford pale. Former Stanford provost F. E. Terman was the central force in making Stanford engineering the pater familias of electronics and aerospace subcontracting firms in the Stanford area. The pattern was set before World War II, with Terman students establishing firms such as Hewlett-Packard and Varian Associates. After the war Stanford continued to spin off new enterprises, and the roster of executives of the local high-technology industry reads like the membership list of a Stanford alumni club.

SRI, on the other hand, was the brainchild of two Stanford chemistry professors and a Stanford alumnus, but many of its early officers happen not to have been Stanford men. They brought in their own friends and colleagues from elsewhere and developed a national clientele, so the interests of the university actually mesh more closely with local industry than with the research institute.

The militant effort to control SRI, if radical literature portrays militant priorities accurately, is simply an intermediate objective. As one statement of the campus April 3 Movement puts it, "The important question is whether the members of the Stanford-Midpeninsula community treat their opposition to Stanford and SRI's war research as a

NEWS IN BRIEF

● NAS TO REVIEW ARMY PLAN

TO DUMP GAS: The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) has been asked by the Defense Department to review an Army plan to dump 27,000 tons of surplus war gas in the Atlantic Ocean about 250 miles east of Atlantic City, N.J. The Army has agreed to halt its disposal plans until NAS has conducted a full review of the safety aspects of transporting the poisonous gas across country and the ecological effects of dumping the gas in the deep-sea ocean. The Army, which contends that dumping in the ocean is the safest and most expedient method of disposal, consented to allow civilian scientists to review its plan after congressmen, led by Representatives Richard McCarthy (D-N.Y.) and Cornelius Gallagher (D-N.J.), opposed the move and prompted a congressional investigation. In hearings recently before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Interior Department announced its opposition to the plan because of possible unknown hazards to sealife. Other critics opposed the sea-burial proposal on the grounds that the Army's selected dumping site is clearly beyond U.S. territorial jurisdiction. A group of six Washington University scientists, led by biologist Barry Commoner, have urged that alternate methods of disposal be considered.

● ATOMS FOR PEACE AWARDS:

This year seven scientists—an unusually large number—have been named to receive Atoms for Peace Awards in what may be the last year in which prizes are given. In announcing the award, Atoms for Peace, Inc. officials said that unless additional funds are received, this will be the last set of awards granted through the nearly depleted \$1 million memorial fund, established 14 years ago by the Ford Motor Company. This year's Atoms for Peace awards are accompanied by a \$15,000 honorarium for each recipient. The scientists honored for their contributions in developing peaceful uses for the atom are Floyd L. Culler, Jr., assistant director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory; Henry S. Kaplan, head of the Radiology Department, Stanford University School of Medicine; Anthony L. Turkevich, professor of chemistry, University of Chicago; Aage N. Bohr, director of

the Nordic Institute for Theoretical Atomic Physics in Copenhagen; Ben R. Mottelson, also of the Nordic Institute; M. S. Ioffe of the I. V. Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy in Moscow; and Compton A. Rennie, former head of the High Temperature Reactor Project of the Organization for European Cooperation and Development. A \$50,000 award has also been presented in honor of the late Dwight D. Eisenhower. M.I.T. Corporation chairman James R. Killian, Jr., is chairman of the trustees for the Atoms for Peace, Inc.

● MIT FACULTY REFUSES TO ABOLISH ROTC:

The faculty of Massachusetts Institute of Technology on 14 May soundly defeated a proposal to abolish MIT's Reserve Officers Training Program (ROTC), but has agreed to consider a series of proposals to study ROTC, some of which would redirect its structure with respect to academic credit and other matters.

● PANEL ON SANTA BARBARA

OIL SPILL: Presidential Science Adviser Lee A. DuBridge has appointed a special panel to make recommendations on the future of the Union Oil Company lease in the Santa Barbara channel. A blowout in a Union Company well in the channel in January caused serious oil pollution of the surrounding waters and coastal areas. The panel, which includes experts in geology, petroleum engineering, and reservoir management, are to assess the technical situation. The 11-member panel is chaired by John Calhoun, Jr., who is vice president of Texas A&M University.

● **GAO REPORT:** The General Accounting Office (GAO) has issued a report charging that Defense Department contractors have apparently been using government procurement funds for research and development (R&D) activities. Noting congressional interest in the funding of R&D and of the possible harmful effects on the management and control of R&D activities, the GAO singled out Air Force contracts for MINUTEMAN missile motors that may have involved a misuse of nearly \$22.5 million in funds, and then proposed that full disclosures be made in program budget submissions to show how funds are being used.