

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **200-BEV ACCELERATOR:** AEC officials say that, despite the prodigious budget cutting now going on inside the administration, plans are proceeding to go ahead with the construction of the 200-bev accelerator, and a site will be announced before the end of the year. Total construction costs are now estimated at close to \$400 million, but in the first year, it is estimated, \$5 million to \$10 million would suffice to get the project off the drawing boards and underway. As for a site, the six nominated by the National Academy of Sciences—in California, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York—are still in the running. So far, by all available accounts, the White House has left the selection entirely to the AEC, which in looking at the various sites has been paying particularly close attention to power costs and the civil rights situation.

● **NEW COLUMBIA INSTITUTE:** Columbia University recently announced the creation of a permanent Institute for the Study of Science in Human Affairs, which will call upon an interdisciplinary group of scholars to recognize and interpret the effects of science on society. The program will concentrate on studies in this field and on developing graduate and undergraduate teaching programs that cross departmental lines.

A \$1 million founding grant for the institute came from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. A quarter of this grant will support the Advanced Science Writing Program in Columbia's School of Journalism, whose facilities will be used to keep the public informed of the institute's studies. Christopher Wright, director of the new Institute, predicted expenditures of several million dollars over the next 10 years.

The institute replaces Columbia's Council for Atomic Age Studies which Wright directed.

● **ACADEMY HISTORY:** Rexmond C. Cochrane, author of the recently published history of the National Bureau of Standards, *Measures for Progress*, has joined the staff at the National Academy of Sciences to write a history of the Academy. Cochrane, author of a number of publications on

Francis Bacon and 17th- and 18th-century science, received his Ph.D. at Columbia and has taught at Indiana University and the University of Virginia. He also served for some years as a military and contract historian for the Army Chemical Corps. Cochrane, who has been reviewing the Academy's historical documents since early August, finished a working outline of the history in early October. The proposed history, which will be a 5-year project, would span the years from the Academy's inception in 1863 to its centennial observance in 1963, with special emphasis on the events of the last 50 years.

● **NIH ADVISORY COMMITTEE:** Implementing a recommendation of the Wooldridge committee (*Science*, 26 March 1965), the National Institutes of Health has appointed a new advisory committee on program and policy matters. It is the first committee set up specifically to advise the NIH director on the overall direction and balance of NIH programing. Existing committees deal with the programs of particular institutes and are technically advisory to the Surgeon-General of the Public Health Service, not to the chief of NIH. Members of the committee are Philip P. Cohen, University of Wisconsin; Douglas D. Bond, Western Reserve; G. Franklin Edwards, Howard University; Caryl P. Haskins, Carnegie Institution of Washington; Maurice John Hickey, University of Washington; Irving M. London, Yeshiva University; William D. McElroy, Johns Hopkins; V. G. Nielsen, Aerospace Corporation; Wendell M. Stanley, University of California; Barnes Woodhall, Duke University Medical Center; and Jerome B. Wiesner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

● **ACADEMIC POST FOR DOUGLAS:** Senator Paul Douglas (D-Ill.), who was defeated for re-election by Charles Percy, has accepted a teaching position at the New School for Social Research in New York, starting on 3 January. Douglas, who taught economics at the University of Chicago before his election to the Senate 18 years ago, will teach economics as a member of the New School's graduate faculty of political and social science.

Leddy, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, have been active in government discussions of the problem. Hornig is expected to supervise the workings of the group directly rather than delegate duties to a subordinate.

The committee is scheduled to make its preliminary report by 30 January. Some OST officials seem to hope that the group's mission will be discharged with the filing of the preliminary report; in any case, they do not expect it to operate for more than 6 or 9 months.

Since the committee has not met, OST advisers are unwilling to predict the future shape of the committee's deliberations and recommendations. But, whatever the hopes of the Italian and other European governments for extensive American cooperation, it is obvious that the U.S. Government is reluctant to become committed to any kind of "technological Marshall plan."

American officials tend to dismiss the technological gap with Europe as a "non-problem," or at least as a problem that the U.S. Government can do little to help solve. While admitting that the United States is ahead of Europe in computers, electronics, aviation, and space, Americans point out other areas where the United States is behind—metallurgy, steel, and shipbuilding. They also note the German superiority in plastics, the Dutch preeminence in cryogenics, and the positive balance of trade for the European Economic Community in synthetic fibers. Like Kosygin, they wonder whether the greater amounts the United States spends on R&D actually result in greater industrial improvement. Alexander B. Trowbridge, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business, recently posed this question: "If the Atlantic Community nations are really at a technological disadvantage vis-à-vis the United States today, how have most of them managed to outstrip the United States in production growth and in expansion of their foreign trade during the last decade?"

In addition to doubting whether greater U.S. R&D expenditure produces greater industrial development, American officials also remind Europeans that great technological gaps exist within the United States. They note that the east and west coasts tend to be much more developed than much of the interior, and that there is a Ph.D. "brain drain" from the Midwest.

A final and more significant American attack on European complaints of