of the minority members will say, 'It goes too far,' or 'We haven't had enough hearings,' and then the senator will say, 'I believe it's in the national interest—now let's vote on it' and it'll pass the subcommittee." Goldman also predicted the Kennedy bill's easy passage in the full Senate, as well as its acceptance by the House and White House.* But things did not turn out that way.

The final bill, as one Hill staffer put it, emerged from a process that was at once "rational and irrational, cordial and bitter." Throughout it all, the medical schools lobbied to get as much money for as little in federal oversight as possible and sometimes talked as if the sky were falling. From their point of view, it did a little.

Medical World News, 19 July 1974.

Geographic Maldistribution

In the House, Representative Paul G. Rogers (D–Fla.), chairman of the health subcommittee, wanted to go after the maldistribution problems by establishing various voluntary inducements to get schools to train more primary care physicians and to get those physicians to work in underserved areas. For example, Rogers favored a major expansion of the National Health Service Corps, a scholarship program in which recipients are expected to serve a year for every year of aid. Rogers reasoned that, with the cost of medical education rising as sharply as it is, the service corps would have wide appeal, certainly sufficient to meet the goal of geographic distribution without having to virtually draft doctors into service.

On the other side of Capitol Hill, Senator Kennedy, chairman of the health subcommittee, could not have disagreed more. Kennedy figured that, since every medical graduate is taking some federal money through the capitation funds that are paid to the schools, every graduate should serve. Kennedy wanted to tie capitation money to mandatory service for all.

But Kennedy's mandatory service provision could not get past the Senate. Senator J. Glenn Beall (R–Md.), true to aide Goldman's prediction, felt it "went too far," and successfully got the Senate to accept a compromise proposal in which schools would set aside a certain percentage of places for students who would agree to take health service corps scholarships. Rogers did not like the idea one bit, saying it would create a track system within medical schools.

Specialty Maldistribution

The Senate also wanted to attack the specialty maldistribution issue by what became known as the "percentage set aside" method, with schools having to agree to set aside a certain number of residency positions in primary care—family medicine or pediatrics, for instance—as a condition of capitation. In addition, Kennedy wanted to establish a federal residency control board to tell schools what those numbers should be. Again, Rogers took exception to the Kennedy approach. He wanted a provision requiring schools to give each student "remote site training" in a rural area or other nonhospital setting as part of undergraduate education. Here, as with

New Quarterly from the Smithsonian

The Smithsonian Institution has come out with the first issue of a new quarterly periodical that its creators believe fills a void in the realm of publications aimed at the scholarly and public affairs–minded layperson.

Described as "a national review of ideas and information," the *Wilson Quarterly*, put out by the Smithsonian's Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, is a sort of a thinking man's *Reader's Digest*. It contains articles, summaries of articles that have appeared in other periodicals, and book reviews on topics ranging across government, foreign affairs, economics, science, the arts, and the press.

The editor of the new quarterly is Peter Braestrup, former newspaper and magazine reporter and also a former Wilson fellow. Braestrup explains that the center, since it began in 1970 (*Science*, 5 Jan. 1973), has had in mind the development of some sort of publication to fill its mandate, which includes the communication as well as the support of scholarly work. The publication was originally planned as a display case for work conducted at the center, but it was decided that there are already enough periodicals around that print selections of scholarly work from a variety of disciplines.

So, in April of 1975, the board agreed on the present format—a digest designed for "laymen." Braestrup said that after surveying the field, they found the closest publication to what they had in mind was the more "flossy and glossy" *Intellectual Digest*, which is now defunct.

Funds to launch the new endeavor, amounting to about $225,000, have been collected from a multitude of private foundations, corporations, and individuals, notably the Richard King Mellon Foundation.

The crucial factor in getting things going, says Braestrup, has been the cooperation of the *Smithsonian* magazine, which is handling all the circulation, promotion, and noneditorial functions. A subscription costs $12 a year, and out of a direct mail campaign to 1.3 million people, 70,000 subscribers have been obtained. The ultimate circulation is expected to be about 90,000.

The quarterly will contain contributions from Woodrow Wilson fellows as well as outsiders. An unusual feature is a series of tightly written summaries of articles from a selection of more than 400 periodicals—grouped in nine categories. There are 47 of them in the first issue, each running about half a page, which reflect a staggering amount of thumbing and thinking by the editorial staff, the fellows, and freelance writers.

There follow two articles apiece on Brazil and on the American Revolution, lists of "background books" for readers who want to pursue these topics, and many tiny book reviews of titles thought to be worthy but that tend to go unreviewed in the popular press.

For dessert, the first issue serves up a reprint of the famous article by Russell Lynes, "Highbrow, lowbrow, middlebrow," that was first printed in *Harper's* in 1949. The humorous essay was based on Lynes' perception that the old class structure was falling apart and there was a new one based on taste and "high thinking." Lynes' observations are as apt now as when they were written—and their republication in the quarterly may be taken, perhaps, as an indication that the high thinkers participating in the new enterprise are not going to be allowed to fall into the familiar scholars' trap of taking themselves too seriously.—C.H.