

to set up a third office in San Francisco, is furiously at work. Ideas for research projects generally originate within the staff. "We decide what we can do the best job on," says Alice Tepper. In the case of the paper industry, preliminary investigation suggested that companies were lagging, despite the fact that technology was available to clean up 95 percent of the pollution.

Eight Month's Work

The entire paper industry report was the result of 8 months' work by three women, with occasional help from five advisers. They devoted the first couple of months to educating themselves on all aspects of pulp pollution and technology. They then formulated a questionnaire for soliciting information about each mill's overall expenditures and annual production; the state of its primary, secondary, and tertiary water treatment equipment; the steps it had taken to combat odors and air pollution; and its conformance to antipollution regulations. These were sent, along with covering letters explaining what CEP was, to each of the 131 mills and 24 parent companies.

Questionnaires were also sent to the appropriate agency in each of the 27 states in which the mills are located in order to find out whether the mills obeyed state laws and the status of any legal proceedings against them.

The impact of the mills on their neighbors was also calculated by asking local conservation groups questions, the gist of which was, "Can you hang your washing outdoors?" and "Does your town stink?"

Of the 131 questionnaires sent to mills, only one or two were returned. Undaunted, the researchers followed up with a barrage of telephone calls, and the information gradually began to roll in. Financial limitations prevented the team from visiting every company, but, says Miss Underwood, who directed the study, personal interviews were conducted with officers and directors of more than half of the 24 parent companies. The investigators also made on-site visits to five or six of the mills.

The response of paper companies to CEP's investigators ranged from a wall of silence to enthusiastic cooperation. The trade press, too, reflected ambivalence on how to handle attempted encroachments on traditional areas of company privacy. A *Chem 26 Pulp and Paper Processing* editorial urged companies to open their doors: "it [CEP] is going to get the information

anyway . . . let's talk to these people and let them know what we are doing. Silence, in this case, is our worst enemy." But *Paper Trade Journal* came out with a hard-line editorial that was tinged with sexism. It charged that the investigation was given "attention in the news media out of all proportion to the importance of this handful of girl graduates aided by a few men." It referred disdainfully to "well-intentioned ladies" who "presume to understand the complexities" of pulp manufacture.

The women noticed a significant unbending of management as their work progressed, and in the end only a handful of companies remained uncooperative. To ensure that their report wouldn't be blown apart because of factual errors, the council sent data gathered from each mill to its parent company's technical director for signed verification. All statistics appearing in the report were thus approved. The entire report was then gone over, word by word, by legal counsel Thomas Asher, environmental specialist Hazel Henderson, and Barry Commoner.

"Paper Profits," released in the prestigious setting of a meeting of the New York Society of Research Analysts, has been praised by some members of the industry and scoffed at by others. The report contains some omissions (which several companies, uncooperative during the investigation, have since been hastening to fill), but its factual basis has, as yet, gone unchallenged.

The American Paper Institute (API) criticized the report for its "narrowness of vision." It objected that the council had not taken into account the industry's past efforts, the financial complexity of the problem, the time required to modernize old pulp mills, and other industry contributions to environmental protection. The API also claimed that the industry's planned antipollution expenditures were quite in accord with the figure of \$750 million recommended by CEP. The council promptly responded that API's figure included money for maintenance and for research and development within the entire industry, while the council was only talking about capital outlay for the 24 companies.

A spokesman for Diamond International, which got low marks in the report for cooperation as well as for pollution control, said the investigators had "twisted things around" and had not taken the trouble to get the facts. He added that the company would issue

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **UNITED STATES OPEN TO SCIENCE EXCHANGES:** Secretary of State William P. Rogers has told a panel of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics that the Administration is willing to exchange unclassified scientific information with any country "regardless of the state of our diplomatic relations with that country." This was the Administration's first public announcement of the consistent policy on international scientific information exchange which was formulated in mid-1969. The Secretary later said his remarks particularly pertained to Red China, with whom there have been virtually no scientific exchanges since the onset of the Cultural Revolution in 1965. However, Rogers' aides said his statements did not presage any new overtures to Peking.

● **SCIENCE ADVISERS:** President Nixon has named five new members to the President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC), a group of prominent men from public and private life who meet regularly to offer advice on technical matters. They are Lee A. DuBridge, who was Nixon's full-time science adviser until last fall; Herbert Friedman, chief scientist of the E. O. Hulbert Center for Space Research at the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory; Daniel P. Moynihan, professor at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and former Presidential counsellor; Kenneth Harry Olsen, president of Digital Equipment Corp. in Maynard, Massachusetts; and John G. Truxal, vice president of Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute. The terms run through 1974.

● **ROCKEFELLER FUND DRIVE:** Rockefeller University, which is devoted to research and graduate education in the sciences, has embarked on a \$118-million fund-raising campaign for a long-range development program. The university's president Frederick Seitz says that the funds are needed to strengthen existing programs, extend innovative multidisciplinary investigations, start new postdoctoral programs, and construct facilities. The university, which has no large body of alumni and no tuition income, expects most of the new money to come from foundations and corporations. The fund drive is the first in the history of the university, which was founded in 1901 by John D. Rockefeller.