manent staff or by short termers who use RFF as a base for particular projects.

Gilbert F. White, director of the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado, who is current chairman of the RFF board and has long been active in RFF affairs, feels that in the long perspective of 25 years RFF has made its mark by early applying cost-benefit analyses to the field, taking the lead in environmental quality assessment, and applying systems analysis techniques to residues and wastes.

White says that the RFF board position in the current discussion is clear. The board is not committed to merger. Its "objective is to see that the kind of service performed by RFF as a research organization continues," and the board will, therefore, "explore any possibility that assures stability and continuity." This means further consideration of merger and of other options.

The option favored by most RFF staff members is continued operation of RFF as an autonomous organization, even without the sustaining flow of general support funds from Ford. To continue to operate in the manner to which RFF is accustomed, however, it is generally agreed that a sizable infusion of "unrestricted funds" would be necessary. Such funds have never been abundant and are particularly hard to come by these days. But only such funds are likely to make it possible to maintain the independent mode of operation and stable staff which has made RFF effective.

Efforts under Hitch to diversify sources of funds made "considerable progress" according to White, but are "not yet sufficient" to support the RFF sans Ford funds. Somewhat less than half of RFF's current annual budget of $4.5 million comes from other foundations, government agencies, and industry. Since 1975 RFF has had a specific policy governing acceptance of grants and contracts. Projects must fit in with RFF's research program, RFF staff must design and carry out research as it thinks proper, and research results are to be made public. There seems to be general agreement that, so far, work on new grants and contracts has met the criteria, but staff members are apprehensive about relying on such funds because industry and, particularly, government agencies insist on setting the terms of research they sponsor.

RFF staff members note an irony in the fact that Ford Foundation staff members at the time of the last award of the general support grant when Hitch joined the organization, urged RFF to expand as well as diversify. Staff members have been increased from roughly 60 to about 110 in the last 3 years, many of the newcomers having been recruited to perform research on new grants and contracts.

Hitch says that whether or not an RFF-Brookings merger occurs it will be necessary to reduce RFF staff. White notes that in considering prospects for

Briefing

House's Mr. Health Seeks New Career

Florida Democrat Paul G. Rogers, for the last decade the chief architect of health legislation emerging from the House, has announced he will not seek another term in Congress.

Rogers' decision was unexpected. Chairman of the House health subcommittee, a post he has held since March 1971, Rogers is probably at the peak of his power and influence in the Congress. In his district, the West Palm Beach area of Florida, he won his last election with 91 percent of the vote, and did not face serious opposition this time.

Rogers is said to feel he has done all he could in Congress and that, at age 57, the time to start any new career is now. He may go into law or business, or even the Administration should he get any suitable offers.

The Democratic members of the House commerce committee will elect the new chairman of the health subcommittee. The most senior member of the subcommittee after Rogers is David E. Satterfield of Virginia. Rogers, however, is said to have asked third ranking member Richardson Preyer of North Carolina if he would be chairman. Preyer has a family connection with the drug industry which would probably require the Food and Drug Administration to be removed from the subcommittee's purview should Preyer become chairman.

The stature of the subcommittee is likely to be diminished for a while, whoever becomes its new chairman. By hard work and political dexterity, Rogers usually got the subcommittee sufficiently united on any issue that its positions pre-

vailed over challenges both from the parent House commerce committee, chaired by Harley Staggers of West Virginia, and from the Senate health subcommittee under Edward Kennedy. Where Kennedy and Rogers differed, for example on setting up the National Cancer Institute as an independent agency, Rogers' position often emerged victorious from the House-Senate conference session.

Rogers' style of running his committee was well described by a staff aide who was quoted in the 1972 profile of Rogers by the Ralph Nader Congress project: "He employs great patience and allows each member to have his say. He then identifies the mid-point which he suspects everyone can agree on. Even though the subcommittee represents a broad cross-section of the political spectrum, Rogers's bills are always reported unanimously. This sort of operation assures the legislation will skim through without attacks or proposed amendments by other members."

Rogers entered Congress in 1955, filling the seat that had been held by his father. He has described himself as a "Conservative Democrat" and in the 1960's supported such causes as reducing foreign aid, cutting off funds to dissident students, and the immediate arrest of Stokely Carmichael. "Yet the deeper he has delved into health and environment issues," columnist Judith Randal observed in 1971, "the more committed he has become to the need for a greater governmental role."

Major legislation that bears the stamp of the Rogers committee includes laws on migrant workers' health, health manpower, cancer research, community mental health centers, and creation of the National Eye Institute and National Institute of Aging (both creations were opposed as unnecessary by the Administration). In the environmental sphere his committee helped shape the clean air act and the safe drinking water act. In the opinion of committee staff aide Robert

0036-8075/78/0707-0030$00.50/0

the future, the board is looking at "the level of program RFF might reasonably carry out." The implication is that the level could be substantially lower.

RFF staff members, some of whom have found the recent news understandably traumatic, tend to see the increase in staff and overhead costs during the Hitch regime as exacerbating RFF's problems. They feel that Hitch, who came to RFF from UC and before that was comptroller in the McNamara Pentagon, had grown accustomed to larger institutions and perquisites and a grander institutional style than RFF provided. Hitch reorganized the previously rather unstructured RFF into three main divisions whose chiefs report to him and provide his main contact with RFF people, say staff members. RFF's administrative staff and the general volume of paperwork have also increased, according to staff members, although they acknowledge that the larger program and increased number of grants and contracts result in greater complexity in RFF operations and record keeping.

Most RFF staff are generally proud of RFF and comment favorably on work conditions there. In some ways they have inhabited the best of research worlds, spared the hassle of university teaching and committee work and the hustle required to raise research funds in many nonprofit think tanks. RFF remuneration, for senior staff, while not munificent, is said to be generally comparable to government salaries, which these days puts them ahead of salaries in most universities.

Under the merger agreement now on the table, RFF would become a division of Brookings, retaining its name and its own funding for 5 years. After that, the decision on RFF's fate would be legally up to Brookings, but the assumption would be that the RFF research capacity would be preserved and cherished. Brookings would get an infusion of expertise and, presumably, a substantial sum of money eventually, since RFF has managed to put aside some $8 million in endowment-like funds and would bring along the additional $7 million Ford proposes as a wedding present.

As it now stands the governing boards of the three organizations have been apprised of the merger talks, but they have taken no formal action. The option of RFF's remaining independent, which is most attractive to the RFF staff, would seem to require the raising of an amount at least equal to the present $8 million RFF kitty to have any real prospect of viability. Initial soundings have indicated it will be difficult to raise outside funds on that scale, but news of the merger proposal could serve to rally support for RFF.

The question of whether the Ford trustees would be willing to provide a $7 million dowry if RFF instead should seek to make it on its own, seems at this point moot. RFF senior staff members came away from a 21 June meeting—at which

Briefing

Mayer, Rogers' greatest contribution lies not in any one piece of legislation but in his generic impact on the health field.

Flexible Thought Gets Tentative Blessing

It was only to be expected that the American Tentative Society would long hesitate to commit itself to definite action. First put in business in 1974 by a $300,000 bequest from its founder, AP science reporter Rennie Taylor, the society has for 4 years remained innocent of dogmatic thought, precipitate word, or definite deed. Last month it performed its first activity, the presentation of awards to six scientists.

"They are people who have demonstrated intellectual flexibility," says society president Al Blakeslee in explaining what they have in common. The awards, consisting of $2500 in cash and a trapezoidal trophy, went to the following:

- J. Tuzo Wilson of the Ontario Science Center, for championing the concept of continental drift against then current dogma,
- Frank D. Drake of Cornell, for his early and continuing interest in detecting signals from extraterrestrial life,
- S. Jocelyn Bell Burnell, of the Mullard Space Laboratory in England, who "persevered despite discouraging advice" in the work that led to the discovery of pulsars,
- Norman E. Shumway of Stanford, for pioneering and persevering with human heart transplants,
- Rose Payne of Stanford, whose immunology contributed significantly to the Stanford heart transplant successes,
- Edwin Land of Polaroid Corporation, "for answering his daughter's question 'Where is the picture?' after he had taken her photograph with a conventional camera."

This round of awards is presumably irreversible but may be unique: it is not certain that the awards will be made again, says Blakeslee, nor does the society seem to have any definite future activities in mind.

Speculative Thought Gets Definite Blessing

A new scientific journal has appeared dedicated solely to frank speculation in the hard sciences. Edited by William M. Honig, an American electrical engineer now at the Western Australian Institute of Technology in Perth, the journal is titled *Speculations in Science and Technology*.

The first issue does not explicitly say so, but the journal's intended purpose seems to be as a forum for ideas too radical to be accepted by established journals.

"We do not expect that a large number of the ideas presented here will ultimately find general acceptance," Honig explains in an editorial. But exposure of the ideas will be useful in testing "our accepted ways of thinking in science."

Martin Ruderfer, an electronic engineer of Hempstead, New York, and a member of the editorial board, says that both he and Honig have had trouble in getting their ideas about physics published in established journals. "The established journals are not well equipped to handle revolutionary ideas, yet revolutionary ideas are the font of all scientific progress," Ruderfer says.

Revolutionary papers are sometimes rejected—*Nature*'s alleged rejection of Krebs's paper on the citric acid cycle is one egregious example—but presumably most of them make it into print eventually. Ruderfer contends one would never know about the ones that don't.

The first issue of *Speculations in Science and Technology* contains articles on evolution, relativity and cosmology, subatomic particles, and the ether. Three out of 14 authors are at universities; the others are from research establishments or list private addresses.

The journal costs $58 for five issues a year and the subscription address is Western Australian Institute of Technology, Perth, South Bentley, 6102, Western Australia.

Nicholas Wade