that some science officers will continue to be recruited to meet specific circumstances, but the implication is that officers who start with standard Foreign Service credentials are likely to fare better in the personnel system.

The plan aims at creating a "new" science officer program that will attract capable people and offer them rewarding, mainline State Department careers. On the agenda are such actions as making the selection and training of science reporting officers a less hit-or-miss proposition and a serious effort at consciousness raising with personnel officers.

Attaining the larger objectives of the program requires the infusion of science and technology literacy through the department and the action plan calls for initiatives on several other fronts. The reformers see the Foreign Service Institute, the department's main training mechanism, as providing an important opportunity to exert leverage. In the works are a strengthening of the treatment of science and technology in State's standard introductory and midcareer courses. In the latter course, which lasts several months, the institute is working with M.I.T. to develop a science and technology segment based on a case-history approach designed to give FSO's insight into dealing with science and technology issues in an operational setting. In the past, science and technology has been mainly left to lectures by visiting dignitaries. The institute will also underwrite longer term training relevant to science and technology assignments—typically a year at a university—for two people each year.

The action plan agenda also includes a number of initiatives to improve the effectiveness of relations between the State Department and other government technical agencies. And OES also promises to tidy up its own backyard by upgrading its support for science officers overseas, which has frequently been criticized. OES will also advance the cause if it improves its record of giving senior management posts to science officers when they are on home assignments.

Little in the action plan is novel. The difficulties of integrating science and technology into foreign relations and of creating a bigger niche for the science attachés have vexed successive Administrations. Many of the initiatives in the action plan have been recommended in previous studies of the problem, and the lack of effective action has bred skepticism. One observer, for example, wryly paraphrased the reformers as saying, "We're doing it for the first time, again." What could make a difference this time is that the plan is a comprehensive one and, as Malone points out, is designed to work from the inside by eventually changing the way that science and technology is viewed by those within the system.

The strongest factor in favor of the initiative, however, is Shultz's declaration of interest. As Malone says, that created "momentum." The Foreign Service view of the world and value system are hard to change, but if the Secretary speaks, and particularly if he and his successors keep saying the same thing, the diplomats do listen.

—JOHN WALSH

Pork Barrel Scorecard

Northwestern University is the latest U.S. seat of higher learning to benefit from having political friends in high places. Thanks in no small measure to the efforts of Representative Sidney Yates (D–Ill.), the university is about to have a national lab built close to its campus that will act as an interface between its scientists and private industry.

A catchall appropriations bill, passed by the 98th Congress with virtually its dying breath, contains $16 million for the lab, which will be funded by the Department of Energy. The lab, which will include research on tribology, ceramics, metal fatigue, and polymer chemistry, will be the anchor for a science park that Northwestern and the city of Evanston hope will attract high-technology industry into the area (*Science*, 28 September, p. 1454).

The university approached Yates, who represents Evanston and chairs a key appropriations subcommittee, with a proposal for the facility and $26 million was included in an appropriations bill passed by the House in August. The legislation did not make it all the way through Congress, however, and it seemed for a while that the lab would not get funded this year. But the facility enjoyed sufficient political support for $16 million to be included in the continuing appropriations bill—a measure designed to fund government agencies for which Congress did not approve a regular appropriations bill—which was passed by Congress on 11 October.

Northwestern thus joins several other universities that have found direct appeals to Congress to be a quick way to raise money for scientific facilities. Those approved by Congress this year include:

- A $7-million grant to Florida State University to establish a supercomputer center. The center is expected to cost a total of $63 million, of which the federal government will pay 70 percent;
- $19 million for an engineering center at Boston University;
- A $2.9-million planning grant to the University of Oregon for a new science facility. Congress also directed the Department of Energy to request construction funds for the facility next year;
- $8.9 million to complete construction of a vitreous state laboratory at Catholic University. This project was first approved by Congress last year in a pork barrel amendment proposed on the floor of the House of Representatives; and
- A second installment of $3 million for new chemistry labs at Columbia University, which was also first approved last year.

This year's crop of grants follows an equally abundant season last year when, in addition to providing $5 million each to Catholic and Columbia, Congress approved the following:

- A $20.4-million grant to Oregon Health Sciences University for an information center;
- $15 million to the University of New Hampshire for a space and marine sciences building;
- $7.5 million to Boston College for a new library; and
- $820,000 to Georgetown University for a feasibility study for a fuel cell demonstration project.

That amounts to almost $100 million over 2 years for projects that have not gone through the usual peer review procedures—or, as the universities that have the funds prefer to state it, $100 million for university facilities at a time when federal programs for academic construction have dried up.

—COLIN NORMAN