

British science will have to live with a great deal more centralized planning, the SRC believes that "we must continue to provide support for some scientists of ability and imagination whether they work in our selected areas or not." This will be achieved, he explained,

through a new fellowship scheme that will involve a smaller number of fellows but at higher salaries. "We shall watch the careers of these young men and women with more than avuncular interest."

From an American perspective, per-

haps the most notable aspect of Flowers' address is that it concentrates on getting the most out of the available resources, rather than on lamenting government's inscrutable unwillingness to give science all it seeks.

—D. S. GREENBERG

## Foundations: Taking Stock After the Tax Reform Bill

This is the season when the private foundations issue their annual reports, and the chief executives of the big foundations traditionally include their assessments of the year gone by. Foundation prose tends to be polished and polite, sometimes to the point of opacity, but there is no mistaking the fact that last year the great common experience of the philanthropies was the encounter with Congress which produced the Tax Reform Act's section taxing the foundations and regulating their operations.

In the current crop of reports a tone of reappraisal, not surprisingly, is pervasive. What lingers also in the foundation officers' statements is a sense of their shocked feeling that foundations are misunderstood and mistrusted to a degree they had never suspected. Among the larger foundations, however, there seems to be agreement that wholesale changes in program will not be necessary. In a fairly representative reference, Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy said the tax reform bill will "permit and protect the effective continuation of all basic programs of this foundation." On the other hand, the Carnegie Corporation's report led off with a speech which president Alan Pifer made while the tax bill was under debate, and thereby let stand his warning that the last year's "assault" on the foundations indicated that the traditional role of private philanthropic institutions in American society was "in jeopardy." Most foundations, however, are clearly learning to live with the new law. Privately, foundation officials say that the tax reform bill produced no panic in foundation offices, but that a new cautiousness is evident.

Caution, in fact, is almost obligatory in a period when regulations for the new law must be written and interpretations worked out, and foundation lawyers and their counterparts in the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service will join in a legal quadrille.

In forcing changes in the internal operations of private foundations the law is likely to have less impact on the larger, long-established foundations than on smaller ones. In addition to levying excise taxes on net investment income of foundations and requiring minimum distribution of assets or income for charitable purposes, the new law prescribes penalties for activities of two general kinds. The first is "self dealing"—that is, foundation transactions from which business advantage or financial benefit accrues to the donors of funds or to certain other people. The second proscribed activity is the exerting of political influence. Foundations must not, for example, support voter registration drives with limited targets or influence legislation. Penalties are in the form of taxes against foundations and foundation managers, which means both staff and trustees. Many small foundations have been run by the founders themselves or by members of the family, sometimes with the help of old retainers. In the past, charges of "self-dealing" have been aimed mainly at certain small foundations. Therefore, to avoid falling afoul of the new law either through "self dealing" or by failing to meet the fairly stiff requirements on fund management and program activities, many of the smaller foundations will have to alter their procedures and find full-time, well-informed staffs.

All foundations, large and small, face

a period of adjustment, however. And the tax reform bill is by no means the only thing shaking the foundations. The years after World War II were a period of rapid expansion in wealth and numbers for foundations. They also had to react to the flow of federal funds into areas of research, education, and social experimentation which had once been mainly the preserve of the private philanthropies. In most cases the foundations redesigned their programs so that they would complement government-funded activities, but recently cuts in federal budgets have resulted in new requests for support from some of the foundations' old clientele.

In the sixties, most foundations reset priorities in response to growing public concern with social problems. Much more attention was paid to such issues as poverty, population, and pollution, and the foundations became conscious, sometimes self-conscious, agents of social change.

The transformation in foundations is in many ways typified by the experience of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, established in the 1930's by the General Motors pioneer. The Sloan Foundation, with about \$300 million in assets, ranks as one of the larger American foundations, although it is dwarfed by Ford, the solitary superfoundation, with its \$2.5 billion in assets.

Until Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., died in 1966, the foundation operated largely as administrator of his personal philanthropies. The foundation's concentration on the fields of science, engineering technology, economics, management, and cancer research reflected the founder's interests. Fairly large grants were distributed to M.I.T., the separately endowed Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, and other worthy and well-known institutions. The pattern in awarding scholarship funds or research grants was to give assistance to those who had demonstrated promising qualities of leadership or intellect. Like many other foundations at the time, Sloan benefactions

to both individuals and institutions tended to support elites.

Sloan's death was followed by the naming of a new president (Nils Y. Wessel), expansion of the foundation's staff, and a reshaping of the program which is still in progress. The aim has been to combine the foundation's original commitment to science with its new concern about social problems.

This week, for example, the foundation announced some innovations in its own grant-making strategies and procedures. Activities will be divided between a "general" program, which apparently will reflect the foundation's traditional interests and approach, and new "particular" programs, based on a concentration of foundation resources to achieve clearly defined aims in a limited period. Two of the new particular programs are in the works. The first will be an effort to expand professional opportunities for medicine and management for blacks and members of other minorities.

Funds will be earmarked for use in medical schools and graduate schools of management, but attention will also be paid to finding ways to increase the motivation for young people from minority groups to seek professional training and, once trained, find more satisfactory means of entry into active professional careers.

The other sector singled out for a particular program is neuroscience. Sloan's aim is to encourage interdisciplinary efforts on research to relate brain functions to human behavior. The precedent is the postwar history of molecular biology, and the hope is for a comparable scientific yield in neuroscience in the years ahead.

Sloan's plans also call for greater staff efforts at systematic evaluation of projects funded by the foundation. Evaluation has been a particularly weak point in research in the social-action and education sectors, and this has been true of government- as well as foundation-supported projects. Sloan apparently hopes to use evaluations not only to strengthen quality control on work in progress but also to improve the grant-making process itself.

For some time, now, the trend in the larger foundations has been away from an older style of operation in which foundation staff administered established programs designed to encourage merit within fairly narrowly defined lines. Instead of playing a relatively passive part by selecting projects presented to the foundation, staff mem-

bers now often define and sometimes generate the projects which are to be supported. The result has been not only a redefinition of foundation philanthropy but marked changes in the role of the foundation professional.

Smaller foundations tend to follow the lead of the larger ones. The tax reform bill is now exerting a double pressure on many smaller foundations—first, to make a more rapid disbursal of their funds, and second, to manage their affairs more tightly. Many of the smaller foundations are reported to be having difficulty in finding really good projects to support. The answer to this may be the recruiting of well-trained professionals. Or perhaps some sort of clearinghouse will be developed to give the smaller foundations sound advice on the conduct of their affairs and to act as broker helping the foundation and the worthy applicant to find each other. At any rate, one unlooked-for effect of the tax bill may well be an expanding job market for foundation staff.—JOHN WALSH

---

## APPOINTMENTS

---

**James A. Shannon**, special advisor to the president of the National Academy of Sciences and former director, National Institutes of Health, to professor and special assistant to the president of Rockefeller University. . . . At the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, **Wernher von Braun**, director, NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, to the new position of deputy associate administrator for plans and **Eberhard Rees**, deputy director, Marshall Space Flight Center, to director. . . . **Benjamin B. Graves**, president of Millsaps College, to president of the University of Alabama, Huntsville. . . . **Solomon Garb**, professor of pharmacology and associate professor of community health, University of Missouri School of Medicine, to scientific director, American Medical Center, Denver. . . . **Bryce Douglas**, director, research-macrobiology, Smith French & Kline Laboratories, to director of research at the laboratories. . . . **John H. Vaughan**, professor of medicine, School of Medicine, University of Rochester, to the new position of chairman, clinical divisions, Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation, Calif. . . . **Douglas E. Kelly**, associate professor in the biological structure department,

University of Washington School of Medicine, to chairman, anatomy department, University of Miami School of Medicine. . . . **Gail S. Young**, professor of mathematics, Tulane University, to chairman, mathematics department, University of Rochester. . . . At the University City Science Center in Philadelphia, Pa., **Randall M. Whaley**, educational consultant, Cresap, McCormick and Paget, Inc., to director of the center, and **Lysle H. Peterson**, executive vice president of the center, named president, University City Science Institute.

---

## RECENT DEATHS

---

**Robert A. Artman**, 54; professor of physics, Bucknell University; 15 February.

**Hall Bartlett**, 69; professor of education, C. W. Post College, Long Island University; 27 February.

**Stanhope Bayne-Jones**, 81; former dean, Yale University Medical School; 20 February.

**Mary E. Collett**, 80; former associate professor of biology, Case Western Reserve University; 28 June.

**David E. Fink**, 89; former entomologist, U.S. Department of Agriculture; 28 February.

**Moses L. Isaacs**, 70; former dean and professor emeritus of chemistry, Yeshiva University; 12 February.

**Glenn Koehler**, 75; former professor of electrical engineering, University of Wisconsin; 10 February.

**William C. Knopf, Jr.**, 59; dean, school of engineering, University of Miami; 6 February.

**Peyton Rous**, 90; professor emeritus of medicine, Rockefeller University; 16 February.

**Arthur J. Scavella**, 36; chairman, mathematics department, Tuskegee Institute; 5 February.

**Reuben Z. Schulz**, 70; former professor of pathology, Harvard University; 9 February.

**Guy L. Shadinger**, 92; former chairman, chemistry department, Butler University; 6 February.

**E. Richard Weinerman**, 52; professor of public health, Yale University; 21 February.

**Ernest Witebsky**, 68; professor of bacteriology and immunology and director, Center for Immunology, State University of New York, Buffalo; 7 December.