

hike for economics). But he perceives them primarily as support functions: "our main responsibility is to select the ones important to the physical sciences." Bloch thinks work needs to be done in sorting out the priorities in social and behavioral sciences and in coming up with some "common denominators" (the National Academy of Sciences is currently trying to do just this); meanwhile, "the foundation can't be held responsible for doing everything."

Bloch also appears to be cautious about any expansion of NSF's international role, although he says "with the rest of the world making progress in science and engineering it behooves us to look at the international program with new interest." Former NSF director Guyford Stever, who is heading a study on the subject, believes the foundation should take a more prominent part in international science policy, but Bloch is reluctant to have NSF mixed up in any initiatives other than those related to basic research. Appointing a "foreign secretary" (one of Stever's suggestions) for NSF "is a bit too highfaluting for me," says Bloch.

Bloch wants to promote global cooperation insofar as it benefits American science, but he does not see NSF taking a direct role in addressing global problems, such as how to build up the scientific infrastructure of developing nations. "I am more directed toward making sure that our own infrastructure and research is the best in the world."

Bloch makes no bones about the fact that he sees the issues in a very competitive light. "I think we have to try to be the best in all those areas that are of importance to us. I am pretty sure there's an area of no importance to us but I don't know what it is. . . . A lot of people are upset about that kind of approach to life. They say science is international, so who cares who does it. I say science is no more international than commerce is. . . . I think it's a highly competitive field, I don't apologize for it."

Bloch's views appear to be very much in line with those of General Electric executive Ronald W. Schmitt, chairman of the National Science Board (NSB). "No board is effective without extremely close working relationship with the CEO, and we have that," says Schmitt. Ties with the NSB, which intends to take a more active role in the direction of NSF, will presumably be further enhanced by the appointment of board member John H. Moore, an economist at the Hoover Institution, to the deputy directorship.—**CONSTANCE HOLDEN**

---

## Newman's Motor: Does It Work or Doesn't It?

---

The creation of a perpetual motion machine would be, as one scientist puts it, "one of the world's greatest inventions." But a man who claims to have invented such a machine is refusing to submit the device for rigorous scientific testing.

For the past 5 years in a widely publicized battle, Joseph Newman of Lucedale, Mississippi, has pitted himself against the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in hopes of securing a patent on his machine. When the patent office indicated it was unconvinced that the device works, Newman sued the agency to make it reconsider (*Science*, 16 November 1984, p. 817; 10 February 1984, p. 571).

Last week, the court battle took a slightly new turn. U.S. District Judge Thomas Jackson ordered Newman to submit the machine to the National Bureau of Standards for testing. Newman said he will not comply.

Newman asserts that the bureau had a chance to test the device back in 1982, but it refused. The bureau has a different recollection of the circumstances. According to bureau spokesman Mat Heyman, Newman showed up at the bureau's doorstep virtually unannounced and asked for a test of the machine, which he had hauled up from Mississippi on the back of a truck. Bureau staff agreed only to observe, not test, the machine since the bureau has a policy to test only those devices submitted by other federal agencies. At the time, the bureau also did not have the proper equipment. Nevertheless, the bureau did make arrangements with Auburn University, the closest facility to Newman's hometown with the proper equipment, to test the machine. Newman never showed up, according to Heyman.

Newman also claims that the court's order requiring a demonstration of his machine sets an unfair precedent. "No other inventor has had to demonstrate his invention," he says. Not so, says patent office spokesman Oscar Mastin. He says it is not uncommon for the patent office to require testing before a decision is made to issue a patent, especially in

unusual cases. "This is an unusual case," Mastin says.

Newman complains that he is not about to spend more money to ship his machine back to Washington for testing. Meanwhile, he has hired a public relations firm to publicize his cause.

Newman has until 30 May to present his machine to the bureau, which now has the necessary equipment. The next court hearing is set for 11 June. If Newman does not submit the device, the judge said, "I will draw inferences."—**MARJORIE SUN**

---

## NIE's Director Ousted, Its Survival in Doubt

---

The National Institute of Education (NIE), storm-tossed since its inception, may be headed for the guillotine under the leadership of William J. Bennett, the provocative new Secretary of Education. Bennett has asked for the resignations of NIE director Manuel J. Justiz and his boss, Donald Senese, assistant secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

The action appears to be a step toward remodeling the department along the lines recommended by the conservative Heritage Foundation in its 1984 government blueprint, *Mandate for Leadership II*. Observers anticipate that Bennett will eventually consolidate the NIE and the National Center for Education Statistics into a single office of research and statistics. This expectation has been reinforced by Bennett's hiring of Eileen M. Gardner, author of the Heritage recommendations, as a policy adviser.

Reportedly chosen to replace Senese is Chester ("Checker") Finn, an education researcher at Vanderbilt University who helped write the Heritage manifesto. Finn, a friend of Bennett's, participated in the original design of NIE when he was working for Daniel Patrick Moynihan in the Nixon White House, but has since denounced the agency for being captive to special interests and failing to confine its focus to basic research.

Education research advocates are particularly concerned over the fate of the educational laboratories and centers competition, which will culminate