

Scientists Increasingly Protest HEW Investigation of Advisers

With the immobility of a mastodon frozen in place during a previous ice age, a body of security procedures crystallized during the period of Senator Joseph McCarthy still continues to bar some scientists from government service, even as part-time advisers.

Especially during the past year, the process for investigating prospective appointees for scientific advisory groups in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) has come under more scrutiny and protest. In the opinion of some concerned scientists, HEW's actions are objectionable on at least three counts: (i) grounds for rejection of appointees are veiled in secrecy; (ii) the rejections often appear arbitrary and based on irrelevant information; and (iii) there is no provision for appeal or for confrontation of the evidence which is being used to disqualify a scientific adviser.

HEW Bars Scientists

Since very few people ever discuss these secretive security systems, it is somewhat difficult to obtain information about those who have been rejected on nonscientific grounds. Nonetheless, *Science* has been able to find several explicit cases of professors barred from HEW panels, seemingly for political reasons. These cases, which involve noted scientists from the universities of Chicago, Michigan, Colorado, Yale, and M.I.T., are detailed later in this story.

In preparing this article, *Science* interviewed many relevant people who had served or are serving as HEW officials, and also interviewed many scientists who have had contact with HEW advisory groups. These men, both officials and outside scientists, overwhelmingly denounced the present security system. Typical of their comments was that made by Philip R. Lee, who served as HEW's Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs during the Johnson Administration: "The policy as it's practiced in HEW is wrong. These checks need to be cut

back to cover only those employed in sensitive positions."

One of the features of the security system is that it is extremely difficult for the officials in the health agencies, who usually make the recommendations about part-time panel members to the HEW central office, to find out why one of their recommended scientists has been rejected. Charles V. Kidd, a top-ranking official in the White House Office of Science and Technology, said that when he was at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) the security system "would drive me crazy. It was like feeling your way around a dark cellar."

In the opinion of several officials, the security check system provides a needless burden for HEW administrators. The main danger, however, is perceived to be the harm that the system does to the individual scientist. The scientist who knows that he has been rejected for membership on an HEW panel for security or suitability grounds feels that he has been subject to an arbitrary action for which he has no method of redress. He fears that the rejection may in some way hamper his career, especially in his often numerous dealings with the Federal government. Certainly, an invitation to serve on an HEW scientific advisory group is a mark of professional distinction for the man invited. As one scientist noted, "If you haven't been asked to be on one of these groups, it looks like you haven't really made it in your field." Furthermore, service on a scientific panel is regarded as a highly educational activity which gives a participant a uniquely intensive acquaintance with important new research in his discipline.

Like other government employees, part-time scientific advisers to the government can be barred on grounds of security (a "reasonable doubt" about their loyalty) or on grounds of "suitability." "Suitability" covers a wide and imprecise area. People can be barred from government service for "use of intoxicating beverages habitually to

excess"; for dismissal for delinquency or misconduct from a prior job; for intentional false statement; and for other reasons which give wide latitude to the government investigating apparatus, such as "criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral or notoriously disgraceful conduct."

Scientists' displeasure at the grab bag of reasons which can be used to disqualify them or their fellows from government service has received formal expression. On 24 June of last year, representatives of 25 scientific and medical organizations met in Washington to discuss asking HEW to abolish the preappointment clearance requirement for scientists on HEW advisory groups. HEW has about 430 of these groups in its constituent agencies such as NIH and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Many groups are composed of scientists from outside the government, often from universities; their function is to make decisions on what kinds of research are to be funded and to help decide questions on professional training and on the allocation of fellowships. The group members are paid a small fee (usually \$50 for each day the group is in session plus expenses); they customarily are employed for only a few days a year. In NIH and NIMH the work of these part-time consultants is concerned with nonsensitive, non-security subjects.

Meeting with HEW Secretary

In July of last year, eight representatives of the concerned organizations wrote to Wilbur J. Cohen, then HEW Secretary, stating their objections to his department's security procedures for members of HEW advisory groups. Their letter stated that "a number of eminent scientists have been rejected for appointment to Advisory Councils, study sections and review committees on the grounds of loyalty or suitability. Because such rejections may be based upon irrelevant or archaic considerations, it is possible that your Department has been denied the talents of men well qualified to serve while the scientists have lost both professional recognition and the opportunity to help their country." The group asked for abolition of security checks for nonsensitive advisory positions or, at the least, an opportunity for scientists to know and challenge the information being used against them.

The organization that took the lead in assembling other scientific organi-

NEWS IN BRIEF

● NIXON ORDERS CBW STUDY:

President Nixon on 18 June ordered a full-scale departmental study of the government's chemical and biological warfare policies, including a review of the U.S. position on arms control and the question of ratification of the 1925 Geneva Protocol which bans "first use" of poison gases. The President's decision was announced by Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) Director Gerard Smith in a letter to Representative Richard McCarthy (D-N.Y.), a congressional critic of CBW. The agencies conducting the study include the Defense Department, State Department, and the ACDA. The White House has announced there will be no moratorium on testing while the study is being conducted.

● INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES ADDS SOCIAL SCIENCES:

The Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton will add a new school of social sciences to its existing schools of mathematics, natural sciences, and historical studies. It plans to have about 8 permanent professors and annual groups of about 30 to 40 visiting scholars at the new social sciences school. The Institute presently has a total of 150 academic members, including visiting scholars. The new social sciences school will focus its early studies on comparative social change and information-processing and decision-making communications within social organizations. A \$1.5-million grant from Ford Foundation and a \$500,000 joint supporting grant from the Russell Sage Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation have been given to the new school. The Institute is presently directed by Carl Kaysen, a professor of political economy. It was founded in 1930 and is sustained by gifts totaling \$19 million from benefactors Louis Bamberger and his sister, Mrs. Felix Fuld.

● NADER TO STUDY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES:

Ralph Nader, who has gained national prominence for his work in consumer protection, has been named director of a study project, funded by the Carnegie Corporation, to investigate the operation and efficiency of government agencies in order to determine how private citizens and groups may participate more

fully in government decisions. Nader and a small staff will conduct the project for the Center for Study of Responsive Law in Washington, a private nonprofit institution. At Nader's own request, he is to receive no personal compensation from the \$55,000 grant set aside for the 2-year research project. Nader is expected to study and make recommendations on possible ways in which citizens can gain greater access to federal regulatory agencies.

● WATSON TO START TUMOR VIRUS RESEARCH CENTER:

Nobel laureate James Watson has been given a 5-year \$1.6-million grant by the National Cancer Institute to establish a tumor virus research center at the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory of Quantitative Biology in Long Island. Watson wears two hats as a Harvard professor and as director of the laboratory. The new center, which will have a staff of about 20 scientific personnel, will specifically conduct genetic and biochemical studies of the tumor viruses SV-40 and polyoma, which are small DNA viruses capable of causing tumors in animals and changes in the appearance of tumor cells in laboratory culture. The center will also investigate various aspects of the synthesis of viral specific DNA, RNA, and protein. The Cold Spring Laboratory is sponsored by 12 participating institutions, which include Harvard, M.I.T., and the University of Chicago. The private laboratory has been in operation since the 1890's and has been funded in the past by wealthy Long Island residents, including the Rockefeller and Morgan families.

● SMITHSONIAN MAGAZINE UNDER WAY:

The Smithsonian Institution is planning a new monthly magazine that will focus on the natural sciences, cultural history, and the fine arts. The new journal, which will deal with broad areas of Smithsonian interest, will be sent to Smithsonian Associates, a group of about 8000 members who participate in the Smithsonian's educational activities. The associates, who are located primarily in the Washington area, hope to enlarge the present program to a national level with the new magazine, which will be privately funded. The first issue is expected to appear in about a year.

zations to question HEW's security procedures was the American Orthopsychiatric Association, Inc., which was particularly inspired by its president, Dane G. Prugh of the University of Colorado medical center, and by its president-elect, David L. Bazelon, who is chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Representatives of seven other organizations in addition to the American Orthopsychiatric Association signed the letter and attended a 90-minute meeting on this subject with Secretary Cohen on 25 July.

Participants in the meeting said that Cohen appeared sympathetic to their requests but worried that a lapse in HEW investigating rigor might lead congressmen to try to cut HEW funds. In his October response to the scientists, Cohen said that he felt it necessary to retain the system of security checks but that he had changed the procedure to involve the HEW Assistant Secretary for Administration as well as the department's Director of Internal Security. (Secretary Cohen has been able to develop a more flexible position on this subject since leaving office this year. In an interview with *Science*, Cohen said that, although he favored continuation of security checks for appointment to HEW councils which helped advise on policy, he did not believe such checks were necessary for the "very scientific" advisory groups for agencies like NIH and NIMH.)

After receiving Cohen's formal reply, Dane G. Prugh wrote the interested organizations that Cohen's "answer must be read as a rejection of the position taken in our letter. . . . Individuals denied clearance still have no opportunity to confront the 'record' against them. There are still no stated standards for determining whether an appointee is clearable."

Most criticized Agency is HEW

The system of requiring security and suitability checks on employees is required throughout the federal government. Checks on part-time advisers are also done in other agencies, but in this writer's observation, the HEW checks seem to have elicited the most cries of anguish from the scientific community.

In preparing this story, *Science* talked to several professors who had learned that they were not "clearable" by HEW but who were at the same time serving on high-level Defense Department or National Science Foundation (NSF) panels. One NIMH official told *Science*

Three of the Scientists Barred from HEW Panels



Clement L. Markert, chairman of the biology department at Yale University, who was asked to serve on an NIH advisory group but who was not approved in the HEW security process. Although not clearable by HEW, Markert has been an adviser to NSF.



M. Brewster Smith, chairman of the psychology department at the University of Chicago, who was barred from HEW panels until recent years when he was taken off the "blacklist" by intervention of a senator and was appointed to an NIMH committee.



Stephan L. Chorover, an associate professor of psychology at M.I.T., was asked to serve on an NIMH panel in 1967 but was not cleared by the HEW security office. Continued efforts by Chorover's colleagues to overturn the HEW decision have been unsuccessful.

of cases where men who had a top-secret "Q" clearance from Defense could not obtain clearance from HEW. Irving J. Lewis, Deputy Administrator of HEW's Health Services and Mental Health Administration, comments: "Most of this stuff stinks, it's a lot of nonsense. . . . HEW is more security-minded than the Department of Defense."

One difference between HEW and other agencies may be that HEW seems to do more checking than some of the other agencies which employ part-time scientific advisers. The HEW Internal Security Office examines every name suggested for an HEW advisory group before the man is approached to see if he will take the position. The examination is performed by doing a "National Agency Check" on each person, examining all relevant federal and other files to see if derogatory information exists. In NSF, the agency security office does not do a National Agency Check until the end of a scientist's 1-year appointment to an advisory group. If sufficiently derogatory information is obtained at that time, the man is not reappointed but, by then, he has already had the year of service with NSF.

In any case, the scientific organizations have felt compelled to make their complaints solely about HEW, and that mammoth department is as important to scientists, especially those

in the biomedical and behavioral sciences, as any in the government.

HEW officials say that there is no "blacklist" of scientists who are prohibited from serving on the department's advisory groups, and that each man nominated is run through the checking process each time he is nominated even if his appointment has been blocked in the past. A memorandum prepared for the American Orthopsychiatric Association entitled "HEW Blacklisting" rules out the possibility of a permanent blacklist, but it does argue that "the NIMH does maintain a list which it has informally compiled of men who have been denied clearance in the past."

One university professor interviewed by *Science*, who said that he knew that he had been refused clearance for participation on an NIMH panel, said that he had surreptitiously been given a list of people who also were not eligible for NIMH advising. This list, a copy of which is now in the possession of *Science*, has 37 names marked "currently ineligible" and 11 additional names marked "not nominated recently but ineligible in the past." The professor noted that many of the names on the list were older, established psychologists who are active in the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI). An NIMH official also speculated that activity in SPSSI might have been a factor in keeping some

people from being cleared. There are, however, some SPSSI leaders who are members of HEW panels. Many of the nation's leading social psychologists are active in SPSSI, a group founded to facilitate application of the findings of the social sciences to the solution of social problems.

At NIH, the leadership thinks there may be about 200 scientists who are not clearable for advisory groups for that agency. The leaders added, however, that there seemed to be an effort at HEW to cut down the size of this list. Several prominent scientists interviewed suspected that they had not been cleared by HEW, a suspicion shared by some of their colleagues, but possessed no concrete evidence of a security office turndown.

Other scientists, however, have been able to establish that they have been rejected for security or suitability reasons from being participants in HEW panels. The cases of these men were learned from scientific colleagues and were given further confirmation by the scientists directly affected. Brief descriptions of a few such cases follow: ► M. Brewster Smith, chairman of the psychology department at the University of Chicago and a director of the American Psychological Association (APA), explained that he was on a "front office blacklist" at HEW for many years but was removed in the mid-1960's by the somewhat accidental

Guidance for Graduate Draftees

Graduates who have been inducted into the Army or are facing induction may be assisted in finding military slots in which they will be able to utilize their scientific and technical training. The Scientific Manpower Commission (SMC) is working with the Department of Defense to match graduates' educational skills with the technical needs of the service. Although the number of graduates far exceeds the number of openings, SMC can sometimes help in matching men with jobs if special trainings and educational experiences are known prior to actual service entry. As soon as date and place of induction are known, potential Army inductees may contact SMC, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. (202-223-6995 or 961-1550) for assistance.

intervention of a senator important to the welfare of HEW. "There is such a list" (of unacceptables), Smith argued, "and HEW officials are under pledge to dissimulate about it." Smith said that after he was taken off the list he was immediately put on the training review committee at NIMH on which he now serves as chairman. Smith thinks he originally was on the HEW "blacklist" because he had been a member of a leftist student organization during his sophomore and junior years at Reed College, an affiliation which he never again renewed.

► Clement L. Markert, the chairman of Yale's biology department, said that he knows that he has been suggested for NIH panels but has been consistently turned down because he couldn't get a security clearance from HEW. Markert explains that he once "took the Fifth Amendment" before a House committee during the McCarthy period. Markert added that even though he has not served on NIH panels he did serve on the NSF developmental biology panel from 1960 to 1964. In the case of HEW, Markert thinks that the judgment on him was made on non-scientific grounds, a practice he believes to be "evil" and "foolish." Markert has served in several leading scientific positions, including the presidency of the American Institute of Biological Sciences in 1966.

► Theodore M. Newcomb, a University of Michigan psychologist and a former A.P.A. president, was informally proposed for an NIH panel in the late 1950's, he said, but was turned down on security grounds. Newcomb points out that, even though he was not cleared by HEW, he served as chairman of the psychology board for the Office of Naval Research and also received a Fulbright fellowship.

► Stuart W. Cook, former chairman of the psychology department at the University of Colorado, learned about 5 years ago from an HEW official that he was nonclearable for HEW panels. Cook notes that he has received Defense Department clearance and has served on the scientific advisory committee for the Veterans Administration.

► Stephan L. Chorover is a 36-year-old associate professor in psychology at M.I.T. His is one of the best documented recent stories concerning a man barred from a HEW panel on non-scientific grounds, and is regarded as something of a "test case" by those interested in changing the system.

Contrary to the usual practice of checking out a prospective panel member with the HEW security office before inviting him to serve, an NIMH official asked Chorover if he wished to serve on the Neuropsychology Research Review committee in August of 1967. Chorover participated in the work of the committee in August and September of that year and was invited to attend the February 1968 meeting of the panel. However, at that time, he was told that his appointment was not approved. *Science* has talked to many members of this panel; they say that Chorover was a brilliant and irreplaceable member of the group. The panel members agree with Chorover's analysis that "I was left with the clear impression that political considerations played a prominent (if not exclusive) role in this decision."

The members of the neuropsychology review group have discussed resigning en masse from their NIMH advisory group to protest the veto of Chorover. However, they have, for the present, delayed this alternative in order to try to overturn Chorover's

rejection within the system. To date, they are much discouraged by their lack of progress.

In May of last year the panel wrote NIMH Director Stanley F. Yolles protesting the decision and noting that "the action was taken on evidence of which Dr. Chorover was not informed and against which he can not defend himself." Yolles replied that he had attempted through administrative channels to have Chorover's appointment reconsidered but that "unfortunately, my recommendation was not accepted and the administrative means for redress in this instance have been exhausted." In January of this year, the neuropsychology panel again wrote a letter of protest to Yolles.

Chorover does not know why he was excluded by the HEW security process; he suspects it was because of left-wing political activities such as organizing anti-Vietnam war statements among Boston area faculty members. Chorover was one of a group of scientists who visited scientific installations in Cuba in January of 1968, but he is almost certain that he had already been vetoed in HEW by that date. (However, an NIMH official notes that another of the scientists who went to Cuba has also been declared nonclearable by HEW.) Chorover believes that the system that has been devised for the overseeing of the federal funding of scientific research is an excellent one and wants "to avoid throwing the baby out with the bath water" in trying to get rid of the security check requirement.

Right-Wingers Not Eliminated

Robert H. Felix, head of NIMH until 1964, said in an interview that he did not know of any scientists denied access to HEW panels for right-wing views, although left-wing political opinions were another matter. Felix told of one case where "a good scientist, as loyal as George Washington," was barred from an NIMH panel because he had been arrested after demonstrating to integrate a swimming pool. In another case, "an elder statesman who was loved and respected" was barred because his wife had belonged to left-wing political groups.

Philip R. Lee, formerly of HEW but now chancellor of the University of California Medical Center at San Francisco, said that "a person can get a black mark because his next door neighbor subscribed to the *Daily Worker*." One case that came to

the attention of Lee's office involved a scientist excluded from a HEW panel because his father-in-law had subscribed to a Jewish Communist newspaper in the time before his daughter was married to the scientist.

According to other accounts, a good many of the people barred from panels are older scientists who were politically active in the 1930's, some of whom were members of student or other groups later put on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. There are also people reported to have been barred from panels because of political activities of their parents or other relatives.

Frederick H. Schmidt, the HEW Internal Security Director, explained that his office relies on the FBI for loyalty or security investigations and on the Civil Service Commission for investigations on questions of suitability. He explained that his office has a staff of only 16 people for a department with 100,000 employees. Schmidt said there were no written guidelines for the HEW investigating staff which made "primarily a common sense judgment" in dealing with cases. When asked if his office would make actual recommendations about whether a scientist should be cleared for a panel, he said, "I'm primarily a fact-finding organization but I will still make recommendations."

A key man in the HEW security and suitability review process is Bernard Sisco, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration. Sisco meets every Friday with Schmidt to discuss personnel cases. If he thinks the case is questionable, Sisco will take it to the HEW Under Secretary. (Apparently, cases involving HEW panel members rarely, if ever, are taken all the way up to the HEW Secretary.)

Sisco, who has served in his present position since last September, said that he didn't know of anyone who had been denied panel membership on political grounds. "Just because a man is a liberal doesn't mean that there's anything against him," he commented, "there are all kinds of liberals." Sisco said that Socialist party members or past members of the Communist party could be appointed but that he could not appoint current members of the Communist or Fascist parties or anyone else who believes in violent overthrow of the government. Sisco said that HEW was checking more for "suitability" than for security. He said that if it was decided that

an individual should not be approached, HEW would in the great majority of cases turn to someone else rather than try to elicit more clarifying information about the unsatisfactory individual. Other HEW officials also said that the general practice is to appoint acceptable scientists rather than trying to fight through an effort to clear a scientist who had been rejected for security or suitability reasons.

Opinion on Security System

The scientists and scientific agency officials interviewed on the HEW check for advisers were almost unanimous in criticizing the system. "I've talked to Secretary Finch about this; I've expressed our serious concern over this practice on NIH," said NIH Direc-

tor Robert Q. Marston, "... our business is getting the best scientific advice we can. Anything that gets in the way of that, we're against." NIH Deputy Director John F. Sherman said: "It is a serious impediment. I know of no case where a man's political actions would have any bearing on his work. What bothers me is the sub-rosa, un-American character of this system."

When queried by *Science*, HEW Secretary Robert Finch said that he was "looking into" the matter of security and suitability checks for HEW advisory groups and that he would like to do away with security procedures for employees in some parts of HEW. However, this seems like it may be merely one of the hundreds of things a new HEW Secretary has to look

HEW Examines Cancer Institute Report

Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch may be taking a hard look at a National Cancer Institute (NCI) research report on an investigation of the long-term role of a number of pesticide chemicals, including DDT, on tumor formation in mice. An advance copy of the report, soon to be released in the June issue of the *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, was rushed to Finch last week. Observers say that the study could possibly trigger the invoking of the Delaney Amendment to effectively limit or ban the use of DDT.

The Delaney Amendment, sponsored by Rep. James Delaney (D-N.Y.), which, so far, has never been successfully applied to remove pesticide chemicals from the market, was passed by Congress in 1958. It gives the HEW Secretary authority to rule that no food additives can be deemed safe if they have been found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animals. Authorities in this case say the real question is whether the National Cancer Institute report provides substantial evidence to link DDT pesticides with carcinomas, and whether Finch will be disposed to use the study to invoke the Delaney Amendment. If such should be the case, Food and Drug Administration Commissioner Herbert L. Ley would be delegated responsibility for enforcing the ruling.

The study, under way since 1964, tested the long-term toxic effects of some 130 chemical compounds, at

high dosages, on approximately 20,000 mice. An analysis suggests that some of these compounds at these high dosages, were associated with a significant elevation in tumor development, particularly in the liver, and, to a lesser extent, in the lung and in lymphoid organs.

Evaluation of the results of oral administration of certain of these compounds revealed that 11 were "clearly tumorigenic," at high dosages, for the strains of mice used; results for another group of 20 compounds are still inconclusive and will require further evaluation. Eighty-nine compounds did not give significant indication of tumorigenicity.

In the report, National Cancer Institute scientists indicate that major evidence of tumorigenicity in animals exposed to experimental compounds raises a number of significant and not easily answered questions. It is often difficult to determine whether the tumors are malignant or benign. It is not easy to judge experimental data unless several species of animals are used. It is difficult to interpret tests on the effects of single chemicals when man's environment includes a highly complex series of chemicals.

While NCI scientists indicate that their study does not produce conclusive evidence, it seems likely that the study will generate considerable interest, particularly if it paves the way for regulation of the use of DDT.

—MARTI MUELLER

into; there is no evidence that any intensive review of this process is going on in Finch's department.

In light of the many expressions of discontent about the HEW security check system, it is natural to ask why so little has been done to change it. One succinct reason is offered by HEW's Irving Lewis, who said: "Most officials take the course of least resistance; we don't have enough people with guts in government." Robert Felix said that many people in government do not protest the security system for fear that the security people will start to wonder about them. "People run scared," Felix said.

Another reason is that the whole system has received very little public attention and criticism. The protests which have been made to HEW have generally been private ones, and the great bulk of the scientific community and even of government officialdom has no real idea of how this highly secretive process works.

Former NIH director James A. Shannon is just one of those who make the point that it is very difficult for agency heads to deal with the security system because relevant officials are unable to get a full account of why various scientists have been rejected as prospective appointees by HEW. If

the agency heads do not know what information the security office possesses about a man, they are reluctant to totally commit themselves to try to overturn his rejection. Shannon also said that the exclusion of certain people was more of an "irritant" than a real hindrance to the working of his agency and noted that an agency head always has more pressing problems on which he needs positive action from the HEW Secretary and other high department officials. "Administrators don't spend capital with the Secretary lightly," Shannon points out.

There is worry both among outside scientists and among government officials that these security checks eliminate some of the more adventurous and imaginative scientists from advisory appointments. There is also a fear that the investigation system will make scientists cautious about expressing their political views. "Knowing what happened to Steve Chorover," one member of the NIMH neuropsychology panel told *Science*, "I wondered whether I should endanger my career by marching in a Vietnam protest a couple of weeks ago."

Those interested in changing the present investigatory system often wonder what can be done. Obviously, nothing is likely to be done without a con-

tinuation of the kind of organized protest initiated by the American Orthopsychiatric Association last year. That organization has obtained support from eleven other scientific organizations, including APA, continues to urge other groups to join its effort, and has hired a Washington lawyer to represent it in this matter. The group is trying to arrange a meeting between scientific organizations and Secretary Finch in the near future.

HEW could doubtless lessen the checking it presently does for part-time advisers in nonsensitive areas. There does not seem to be great pressure from outside the department for rigorous checks of these advisers, and HEW might meet outside expectations if it relied only on the comments and recommendations of scientific colleagues, comments which are usually obtained before the name is sent to the HEW security office for clearance.

Of course, with some display of interest from Secretary Finch or from the White House, the whole system of security checks for part-time advisers in nonsensitive areas could be thoroughly reviewed and revised. Such a revision could yield an inexpensive dividend of political goodwill toward the Nixon Administration from the academic community.—BRYCE NELSON

McElroy Proposed To Head NSF; Branscomb, Bureau of Standards

The Nixon administration announced its nominees for two major scientific posts last week. The President chose William D. McElroy, 52, chairman of the biology department at Johns Hopkins University, to head the troubled National Science Foundation (NSF), and Lewis M. Branscomb, 42, a career federal scientist, to direct the relatively placid National Bureau of Standards. Both appointments are subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The choice of McElroy was particularly interesting because it seemed to carry out a pledge made by Nixon on 28 April that politics would play no part in the selection of a new NSF director. McElroy is a registered Democrat who participated actively in the

1964 Scientists and Engineers for Johnson campaign and who was one of ten cochairmen of the 1968 Scientists and Engineers for Humphrey-Muskie campaign, a fact which is said to have been brought to Nixon's attention.

However, McElroy told *Science* he is "not a political type." He said he tends to vote independently and has taken no position on the antiballistic missile (ABM), an issue that embroiled the NSF directorship in political controversy last April.

The choice of McElroy, a distinguished biologist, was greeted with enthusiastic praise and a sigh of relief by leaders of the scientific community, for it has not been easy to find a scientist willing to take the \$42,500-

a-year NSF post. Asked what attracted him to the job, McElroy replied: "I don't know that I was attracted. I had my arm twisted by Phil Handler [chairman of the National Science Board, which nominates candidates for the NSF directorship]. It got to the point where I began to worry about the future of science and of the country as a whole, so I said, 'All right.'"

McElroy's name came up during the third major effort this year to find a new NSF director to succeed Leland J. Haworth, whose term expires on 30 June. The first two talent hunts ended in failure or fiasco. Initially, the Science Board proposed Emanuel R. Piore, vice-president of IBM, and H. Guyford Stever, president of Carnegie-Mellon University, but both men, after negotiating with Lee A. DuBridge, Nixon's science adviser, withdrew their names from consideration.

In a second effort, the board then nominated Franklin A. Long, vice-president of Cornell University, and another man, whose identity is not