eliminate the NDEA and NSF disclaimers, following charges that it was an insult to require a disavowal of disloyalty. HEW, however, retained the disclaimer for all non-NDEA fellowships, although it had imposed it at its own discretion and could have removed it at any time. This week HEW announced that, henceforth, the disclaimer will no longer be required. As to why it waited this long, the answer was, "We just didn't get around to it."

—D. S. GREENBERG

News in Brief: Hearings on NSF, Other Federal Programs, Announced; NAS to Study Accelerator Site

The National Science Foundation is soon to receive its first comprehensive congressional review. While no federal agency enjoys being scrutinized by a congressional committee, it is clear that the review is to be conducted in a friendly atmosphere, and is not motivated by suspicions that anything major is amiss at the Foundation.

NSF, of course, meets annually with House and Senate appropriations subcommittees to discuss budgets and closely related subjects. But throughout the Foundation's 15 years, no congressional committee has conducted a detailed study of NSF's programs and policies or of the role the Foundation plays in the grand scheme of federal support for research and education. Such a study, it was announced last week, is now in the works, under the auspices of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, chaired by Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D–Conn.). Daddario's subcommittee, which comes under the House Science and Astronautics Committee, has authority over the legislation governing the Foundation's organization, policies, and objectives. During the past few weeks, subcommittee staff members have been collecting information about the Foundation, and it is expected that about 10 days of public hearings will be held toward the end of June.

The decision to hold the hearings seems to arise from a number of factors. First of all, it is customary for legislative committees to take a look now and then at the federal activities under their jurisdiction. When annual approval of legislative authority is required, as is the case at present with foreign aid, for example, a review automatically takes place. NSF, however, operates under a continuing statutory authority, which requires only annual approval of its budget. As a consequence, there has been no necessity for the Foundation's law-writing committee to review its activities. Another reason for the study is that Daddario's subcommittee is seeking to enlarge its prestige and scope of activities, and it is a natural step for it to take a look at the one federal agency that is responsible for across-the-board support of basic research.

The fact that friendliness prevails between Daddario and the Foundation does not necessarily mean, however, that NSF will emerge unscathed. Lots of people have been critical of the way the Foundation dispenses its limited resources, and they can be expected to make their views known. In addition, there has been some dissatisfaction with the Foundation's performance in the difficult task of collecting and analyzing statistics on research and education. These statistics have become increasingly important for regions that feel they are not getting their share of federal support of research.

The latest congressional-committee arrival on the research scene also disclosed last week that it is conducting a study. This group is the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, chaired by Representative Henry S. Reuss (D–Wis.). The subcommittee was created at the beginning of this Congress upon the recommendation of the now-defunct Elliott Committee.

Reuss's group is going to look into the question of "whether federal research programs carried out by institutions of higher learning may be adversely affecting the nation's goals for higher learning." Some 200 faculty members, administrators, and other persons associated with higher education have been asked to write answers to a series of questions. These cover a broad range of subjects, including whether undergraduates are being short-changed by emphasis on research, and whether federal research programs are benefiting large universities at the expense of smaller institutions. Reuss's subcommittee is also planning hearings toward the end of June.

In another development concerning federal support of research it was announced that the Atomic Energy Commission has engaged the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate sites for the 200-bev accelerator now under design at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory (*Science*, 19 March). A lot of high-energy politicking is already under way among regions that would like to be chosen for the gigantic installation, which is expected to be 1 mile (1.6 km) in diameter and cost $280 million. The Academy has not yet announced the names of the committee that will handle the AEC assignment, but it is understood that the group will be chaired by Emanuel R. Piore, vice president and chief scientist of IBM. Piore, a longtime government adviser, has logged many committee hours on sticky scientific-political problems, including chairmanship of the study which helped extricate Project Mohole from its congressional difficulties.

Accelerator Site Criteria

In specifying the criteria that the Academy should employ, the AEC announcement stated that "a desirable site would (1) contain at least 3000 acres owned by, or reasonably available to, the U.S. Government; (2) have the potential of delivering a firm power load of several hundred megawatts and a minimum of 2000 gallons a minute of high quality water; (3) be reasonably close to a commercial and industrial center which includes research and development activities; and (4) be reasonably close to communities having adequate housing, cultural and educational facilities for some 2000 scientific and technical personnel and their families. Also, the site should be close to adequate surface transportation systems and a major airport with frequent service to major U.S. cities."

Whatever the final verdict may be, it is probably inevitable that this great facility will be the subject of a noisy political row, especially if it lands in an area already rich in federally supported R&D activities—which, as might be expected, tend more than the have-nots to meet the criteria.

Among government people associated with the siting problem, there seems to be general agreement that the employment of the Academy offers the best available hope for getting a politically uncontaminated recommendation. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will, of course, have its say, but since that 18-member body has representatives from 15 different states, it might be hard to enlist a majority in a decision motivated purely by pork-barrel considerations. The AEC said it

plans to select a site this year, so that final design funds may be included in the fiscal 1967 budget.

Finally, the Academy last week released a summary of the final report on a study conducted last summer on "Biology and the Exploration of Mars." The study, conducted by a working group of the Academy's Space Science Board, concluded that, "given all the evidence presently available, we believe it entirely reasonable that Mars is inhabited with living organisms and that life independently originated there." It recommended a "large orbiting mission" to study Mars by 1971, and the first instrument landing mission no later than 1973, and by 1971 if possible. The summary of the report put particular emphasis on the development of sterilization techniques to avoid contamination of the Martian surface, and stated, "We believe that many of our non-biologist colleagues have still not fully grasped either the magnitude or the fundamental importance of this issue." The study group was chaired by Colin Pittendrigh, of Princeton, and co-chaired by Joshua Lederberg, of Stanford.—D.S.G.

State Department: Rank, Authority of Science Office Is Emphasized

The State Department last week took steps to increase the attractiveness of its top science position, a job that has been vacant since last fall.

Henceforth, it was announced, the director of the science office will have "rank and authority" equivalent to that of an Assistant Secretary of State. He won't actually have that title, however, since the number of assistant secretaries is limited by Congress to 12, and the Department apparently doesn't want to go through the process of seeking an increase. At present, some seven or eight State officials hold the rank without the title, which is third highest in the Department hierarchy. Previously, it was supposed to be understood that the science director was equivalent to an assistant secretary, but this never was explicitly stated, an omission that is said to have caused some problems in the carefully ranked Department. The Department also announced that the name of the office is changed from International Scientific Affairs to International Scientific and Technological Affairs. The last director, Ragnar Rollefson, a physicist, returned to the University of Wisconsin in September after serving for 2 years. The position pays $26,000 a year.

The office operates a science attaché program at many diplomatic posts and serves as the Department's adviser on scientific and technical matters affecting foreign policy. The acting director of the office is Herman Pollack, a career officer with long experience in administration, but no scientific training.

—D.S.G.

Summer: The "Climate" Is Changed for University Scientists and the Federal Government Did It

In the spring the scientist's fancy, like anybody else's, turns to thoughts of what he'll be doing when summer comes. And it's a safe generalization that most scientists will spend their summers rather differently from the way they would have a generation ago.

In the old days (prewar), when the long vacation began the geologists headed for the hills, the oceanographers went to sea, the marine biologists went collecting at the seashore, and the anthropologists set out looking for primitives. And they still do. But for most academic scientists, the end of the school year in the depressed 1930's meant teaching summer school for money or doing research in a semi-deserted lab and probably washing one's own glassware.

The big change in summer occupations for scientists, like most recent big changes in science, is traceable to the arrival on the scene of the federal government and federal funds.

The competent scientist now has a veritable smorgasbord of summer activities to choose from—travel, domestic or foreign, to do research or to teach or to attend a rich variety of meetings, conferences, seminars, or symposiums.

The traveling professor is a familiar figure year-round as he flies off to fill consulting commitments to industry or government or makes the academic rounds. But it is in the summer that scientists, like businessmen, are likeliest to combine pleasure with business by taking wives and children along and sometimes making extended side trips.

How wide the horizons can be is indicated by a recent notice to Americans that a group was being made up to fly from Amsterdam to a physiological sciences congress in Tokyo, with a 3-day stopover in Moscow and a 3-day side trip to Tashkent, Bokhara, and Samarkand.

Most opportunities are not quite so exotic, but scientific societies now generally take into account the extracurricular interests of their members in planning for meetings. The American Society for Microbiology, for example, in exploring the most desirable and least expensive way for its members to attend the 9th International Congress for Microbiology, to be held in Moscow in July 1966, is asking for applicants for a variety of charter flight arrangements. There are several options: a direct flight to Moscow with an immediate return after the conference; a return flight from Paris 2 weeks after the conference closes; and a 2-week conducted tour with a choice of northern, central, or southern European itineraries.

While he pays for the excursions himself, there is no question that, depending on his standing and his endurance, the American scientist has opportunities for travel not open to people in most other occupations. In general, it is the most distinguished who are the best traveled.

Travel within the United States has also increased considerably, and a number of summer-only institutions have developed. Two influential models for these, both established before the war, are the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole and the Gordon Research Conferences.

The conferences, named for Professor Neil Gordon, were started in 1931 at Johns Hopkins, where Gordon taught, and were later moved to Gibson Island in Chesapeake Bay. After World War II, for a number of reasons—notably the heat and humidity and the increasing intrusion of vacationers—the conferences were moved to the cooler and more austere latitudes of the New England academies.

The combination of plain living and fancy thinking has proved a durable attraction, and the pattern of 5 days of morning and evening sessions with the afternoons left free has been maintained. Attendance is limited to about 100, and the rule that nothing said at the conference shall be for attribution permits researchers working within a specialty to engage in a kind of give-and-take possible almost nowhere else.

The Gordon blend of informality and intensive exploration of a subject has proved so popular that a winter version