

to his medical suggestions. These include a major pilot program of child and parent centers, to be run by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and a \$135-million "follow-through" to expand Project Head Start into the lower grades.

As well as pointing to changed directions in the organization of medical practice, the President's message makes several specific requests for increases in health funds. The largest increase will be a \$100-million jump (to \$221 million) in the request for medical care for needy children under the Medicaid program. The crippled-children and mental-retardation programs are also to be expanded; the latter will include the first federal support for the staffing of community mental-retardation centers.

The President's new medical programs for children and his requests for increased funding are important, although they are not as striking as the major medical legislation of 1965. Arthur J. Lesser, Deputy Chief of HEW's Children's Bureau, explained in an interview that "the climate is not ripe for bold, big new programs" because of high costs elsewhere, including that of the Vietnam war, and because "Congress does not seem in the mood" for such expenditures. On the other hand, Congress in the past has shown itself favorable to the improvement of health conditions, especially among children. HEW officials expect little difficulty with this year's requests.

Even if modest in amount, the children's program proposed by the President may eventually have striking

implications for the medical profession. "These programs may not be especially significant this year," Lee said, "but potentially they can be very significant."

Lee, an energetic 42-year-old Californian, has yet to complete his second year as a top administrator in the health and science area of HEW. Already he has helped encourage important changes in medical programs, and he seems committed to the need for much more substantial innovation. With the backing of a President who has often expressed his desire to improve medical services, Lee and other HEW officials may eventually achieve some success in their efforts to help bring about a self-transformation in the organization of the powerful and well-established American medical profession.—BRYCE NELSON

Social Sciences: Harris Bill Evokes Limited Support

Last week Senator Fred R. Harris (D-Okla.), chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research, called in a number of federal officials to testify on his bill to establish a National Foundation for the Social Sciences (NFSS). But, as was the case last year, when he solicited the views of academicians (*Science*, 28 October 1966), the response was generally tepid.

What the Senator has going for him is the general feeling that something should be done to expand the volume and utilization of the social sciences, and, further, to reduce their dependence on military support. Since the Camelot fiasco (*Science*, 10 September 1965) this last consideration has loomed large in discussion of federal support of research in the social sciences, although, according to NSF tabulations, the Defense Department provides less than \$16 million of the \$325.7 million that the federal government is spending this year on "social science" and "social psychology." However, the military does predominate in "foreign area" research, and probably far more so than is readily apparent when CIA's hidden contribution is included.

Whether present appropriations are a lot or a little in terms of good ideas and people to carry them out is a subject that draws no more attention in the social than in the physical sciences; in both areas the prevailing opinion is that more is needed. Nevertheless, outside the Senate, where Harris's bill, S. 836, has acquired 18 cosponsors (including Majority Leader Mike Mansfield and the two Kennedys), the Senator is yet to elicit very much support. In fact, many of the intended beneficiaries of his bill are privately puzzled about its origins and uneasy about the mechanisms that it would create for assisting their professions.

In brief, the foundation proposed by Harris would parallel the National Science Foundation to the extent that it would have a distinguished advisory board drawn from outside government, a presidentially appointed director, and broad authority to support research in the social sciences. But then it goes its own way. For example, unlike NSF, the proposed foundation would not be expected to play any part in education or training, areas in which NSF, by wide agreement, has filled an enormously valuable pioneering role. Har-

ris's rationale for this departure from the NSF model is that funds for such purposes are available through the National Defense Education Act and other recently instituted or expanded federal programs for education. The fact that NSF's money has really been secondary to the stimulation and leadership it has provided for educational activities—ranging from reforms in high school curricula to postdoctoral fellowships—seems to have had no impact on the Harris formulation.

The proposed foundation would also serve, upon request, as a sort of filter to remove any taint from military-sponsored or politically sensitive research abroad in the social sciences. This arrangement, obviously inspired by Camelot-type episodes, would be implemented through a process by which other federal agencies could transfer to the foundation the funds they wish to spend on foreign projects. The foundation would then dispense the money, but only if the foreign government concerned did not disapprove of the project; such proxy operations, however, could not exceed 25 percent of the foundation's annual expenditures.

At last week's hearings, praise for the potential of the social sciences gushed forth, but, when it came to the question of whether Harris's bill was a wise means for attaining that potential, the witnesses were generally skittish. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, for example, said that "The present development of research in the social sciences falls so far short of both its potential and of the imperative neces-

sity for its infinitely larger development that I think our problem is actually one of whether there are forms for expression of the present form of the problem or even a recognition of it." But, when Wirtz came up against the question of whether he was for or against the Harris bill, "I just do not know enough about the structure in this field to answer in conclusive terms the questions of whether this is the best approach, the one reflected in this bill or not."

Wirtz was followed by Robert A. Levine, assistant director for Research Plans, Programs, and Evaluations in the Office of Economic Opportunity. Levine said there was need for some new national organization to stimulate research in the social sciences and to fill the gaps among the programs of mission-oriented agencies. But he said, "The question of whether the national body to which I have referred need be a separate National Social Science Foundation seems to me another somewhat separate issue and one to which I have no clearcut answer."

Levine offered the view that "A social science body functioning within the National Science Foundation seems to me more likely to be sympathetic with the more general overview of manpower problems." To which he added, "It would be tragic indeed if the prolongation of poverty in our society resulted from a poverty of imagination in developing a rational social science research policy."

At this point, Harris's temper appeared to wear thin. He asked Levine if he had "any reason to believe" that NSF might lessen its support for the social sciences if the NFSS came into existence. Levine started to answer, "I would imagine, Mr. Chairman, that if you . . .," but Harris broke in with, "[Do] not imagine. I am first asking you. You can imagine later but I am first asking you whether you have any reason to believe that that would be so." Levine said he had "Only theoretical reasons, conceptual reasons. I have no advanced feeling on the matter."

Next came Archibald S. Alexander, assistant director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He said that a separate agency might improve the prestige of the social sciences, and he went on to state that Harris's bill ". . . is a possible means of accomplishing the purposes which you list in your act." But then he observed that "There are probably or possibly other methods of trying to see that there is more basic

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **TRAVEL GRANTS:** The National Science Foundation is accepting applications for grants to travel to the 19th International Congress of Linguists in Bucharest, Rumania, 28 August to 2 September 1967. Applications may be obtained from Richard W. Lieban, Program Director for Anthropology, NSF, 1800 G Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20550. Closing date for applications is 1 March and awards will be announced by 1 May.

● **CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE PETITION:** An end to the use of anticrop chemicals in Vietnam and a declaration against initiating the use of chemical and biological weapons was urged on President Johnson this week in a petition that was signed by 5000 scientists. Among the signatories were 17 Nobel laureates and 129 members of the National Academy of Sciences. The petition, which was initiated last September (*Science*, 23 September 1966), was delivered to Donald F. Hornig, special assistant to the president for science and technology. In the petition the scientists called the use of anticrop and nonlethal antipersonnel chemical weapons in Vietnam a "dangerous precedent." They also asked for a White House study of overall government policy regarding CB weapons and the possibility of arms control measures, with a view to maintaining and reinforcing the world-wide restraints against CB warfare. Presenting the petition were Matthew Meselson, Paul Doty, and John Edsall, all of Harvard University, and Irwin C. Gunsalus, of the University of Illinois, all among the originators of the petition.

● **ARGENTINE UNIVERSITIES:** *A Report to the American Academic Community on the Present Argentine University Situation* has been published by the Latin American Studies Association (LASA), a newly formed academic organization which investigated the Argentine university crisis. LASA, with the aid of the Ford Foundation and the National Academy of Sciences, sent a three-man fact-finding mission to Argentina shortly after the government withdrawal of university autonomy there. The reports of the group (Joseph Burnett, University of California; John P. Harrison, Univer-

sity of Texas; and George Waggoner, University of Kansas) are included in the booklet. LASA concludes that there has been a grave breach of academic freedom, that the national universities have been seriously weakened, particularly in the most advanced and professionally oriented sectors, and that the American academic community has a professional responsibility to take action, especially in offering assistance to Argentine professors and students who request it.

The pamphlet may be obtained from LASA, Provisional Secretariat, Hispanic Foundation, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540.

● **THE NEW FRESHMEN:** A sampling of about 20 percent of all 1966 college and university freshmen, taken by the American Council on Education (ACE), produced the following findings.

Background: 91 percent white; 60 percent Protestant; about 17 percent of fathers and 15 percent of mothers have college degrees; a little under half come from families with incomes of more than \$10,000 per year before taxes.

Financing of education: 15 percent list scholarships as major support for their first year and 58 percent parental aid; only 9 percent have any major financial worries.

Academic interests: more than half plan to take graduate or professional degrees; most popular major fields are business, 14 percent; education, 11 percent; engineering, 10 percent; physical and biological sciences, 7 percent; and mathematics, 4.5 percent; most popular probable occupations are educator, 22 percent, and businessmen, 11.6 percent; trailing were research scientist, 3.5 percent; and college professor, 2 percent.

The statistics are from the first report (*National Norms for Entering College Freshmen—Fall, 1966*, available for \$2 from the Office of Research, American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036) of an ACE project begun last year to assess the impact of the college environment on the student. Follow-up studies will be collected to evaluate changes which occur and what role the educational institution may have had in causing the changes.

social science research, but we certainly think this is an entirely possible way of doing it."

The crowning performance of the day came when NSF director Leland J. Haworth occupied the witness chair. Although NSF had to be dragged, kicking and screaming, to support research in the social sciences, the fact is that it is now in the field to the extent of \$21 million this year (perhaps as much as \$50 million if all forms of support are included), and, at present, it is getting in deeper. Furthermore, under Representative Daddario's revised charter for NSF, which passed the House last year but did not get to the hearing stage in the Senate, NSF might undertake a still-larger role in the social sciences. Thus Haworth, in a sense, personified the leading alternative to Harris's bill and the Senator was loaded for him.

Haworth stated that NSF was providing a good deal of support for the social sciences, hoped to provide a great deal more, and also offered an existing means for meshing the social and physical sciences in programs of applied research on social problems such as environmental pollution and poverty. He also observed that the provision for transferring funds to NFSS might "... result in the foundation that you propose being thought of as ... a cover agency." Finally, he expressed fear that other agencies might cut back on research in the social sciences if the proposed foundation came into the field.

Politeness prevailed on both sides, but Harris vigorously hacked away at Haworth's arguments. With a total budget of \$480 million and only \$21 million going directly into the social sciences, how could NSF contend that it was taking the social sciences seriously? Haworth pointed out that NSF hopes to increase its social-sciences expenditures substantially next year—by about 25 percent if Congress accepts its budget. NSF, he conceded, had been slow to accept the social sciences, but claimed that all that is past. Harris countered that NSF was still too timid regarding the social sciences, still too fearful of treading in controversial areas. "If we are going to do some innovative thinking ... isn't that going to rather shake up some of the people who have nine-tenths [presumably a reference to the proportion of NSF support for the physical and natural sciences] at stake in the National Science

Foundation. . . ." Haworth replied that NSF was not afraid of controversy, but Harris appeared unconvinced.

On the subject of NFSS's proxy role for foreign research, Harris demanded to know how such research could be made politically acceptable to foreign countries. Haworth replied that "There should be much more foreign area research conducted or supported by civilian agencies." He said he did not know the foreign-research needs of the military agencies, "But I do not believe it can be done for them by another agency."

Turning to Haworth's fear that creation of a new agency might result in reduction of support of research in the social sciences by existing agencies, Harris asked whether NSF had reduced any of its activities since the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Haworth replied that it had not; further, that there was a good deal of cooperation between NSF and the new foundation, but that he felt that "The humanities overlap science but they are not the same integral part of science that the social sciences are." And so it went.

The question of the origin of Harris's bill can be simply answered. It was written last spring by the subcommittee's staff director, Steven Ebbin, a Ph.D. in political science who came to Harris's staff from a position with Majority Leader Mansfield. Ebbin, who is bright and energetic, frankly says, "The bill came out of my own head." After writing it, he consulted various social scientists to get their ideas, but says that no substantial changes resulted from these consultations. Further, he says that on the basis of all the hearings held to date neither he nor the Senator sees need for any major changes in the legislation.

At this point, Harris will hear a few more government witnesses in public sessions; then he plans to hold a series of seminar-style hearings, probably in April, to obtain the views of various social scientists.

—D. S. GREENBERG

Appointments

George Adomian, professor of mathematics at Pennsylvania State University, to David Crenshaw Barrow Professor of Mathematics at the University of Georgia . . . **Paul W. Kabler**, acting director of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary

Engineering Center, to deputy director of the U.S. Public Health Service's newly established National Center for Urban and Industrial Health, Cincinnati, Ohio . . . **Ernest Courant**, senior physicist at Brookhaven National Laboratory, to a half-time joint appointment as professor in the Institute of Theoretical Physics and professor of engineering at the State University of New York, Stony Brook, effective 1 September . . . **Joseph A. Gallagher**, assistant PHS surgeon general and former acting director of the Bureau of Health Manpower, to deputy director of the Bureau . . . **B. Harvey Minchew**, assistant to the director of FDA's Bureau of Medicine, to acting deputy director of the Bureau . . . **David Rosenthal**, research psychologist at NIMH, to head of the NIMH Laboratory of Psychology . . . **Charles H. Townes**, institute professor of physics at M.I.T., to president of the American Physical Society; **Luis W. Alvarez**, professor of physics and group leader, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley, to vice president-elect of the Society. . . . **Alton Meister**, professor and chairman of the Department of Biochemistry, Tufts University School of Medicine, to Israel Rogasin Professor and chairman of the department of biochemistry at Cornell University Medical College, effective 1 July.

Recent Deaths

William H. Cole, 74; professor emeritus of physiology and biochemistry at Rutgers University and retired director of the Rutgers University Research Council; 6 February.

Donald E. Guss, 36; experimental physicist at the Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Md.; 4 February.

J. Raymond Hodgkinson, 38; on leave from the physics department of Virginia State College to research into measurement of airborne dust in Sweden; 24 August.

David A. Libby, 43; chief of the macronutrient research branch of the FDA; 31 January.

Alfred Leroy Johnson, 85; professor emeritus of clinical dentistry at Harvard School of Dental Medicine; 26 January.

Harry V. Knoop, 69; consulting physicist for the Charles F. Kettering Foundation and professor emeritus of physics at Antioch College; 13 November.