tacks on it by members of Congress have been by representatives of states, such as North Carolina and Virginia, where tobacco is grown and processed. Congressional interest in intervening may increase, for editorial criticism of the ruling—often by newspapers whose owners also have broadcasting stations —has been heavy.

The tobacco and broadcasting industries showed their legislative potency in 1965 and they may do so again. It would not be surprising if they try to use as a vehicle for their purposes a bill recently introduced by Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and sponsor of the cigarette labeling act of 1965. The Magnuson bill would require cigarette packages and advertising to show tar and nicotine content—a relatively soft measure. It no doubt would be acceptable to the tobacco industry if amended to include provisions rescinding the fairness-doctrine ruling and continuing to keep the FTC from requiring health warnings in cigarette advertising.

Magnuson, however, seems likely to oppose any such strategy. "It is necessary to have some kind of antidote to the messages of the commercials which imply that cigarettes can be smoked without harm," he has said. Indeed, the tobacco industry ultimately could find itself battling proposals to ban broadcast advertising of cigarettes entirely. Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York has said he may offer legislation to have such a ban tried for 1 year.

Although cigarette smoking as a national habit may very well outlive any who prophesy its demise, its enemies are growing stronger and, in the FCC ruling, they have a new weapon. Things could reach a point where, when someone strikes a match, the tobacco industry won't know whether it's a smoker lighting up or a nonsmoker getting ready to throw a bomb.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

Molecular Biology: Drug Firm To Establish New Research Center

Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc., the Swiss-owned behemoth of the pharmaceutical industry, has announced its intention to take a major plunge into basic research, an area that heretofore has drawn much praise but little financial support from the multibillion-dollar industry as a whole.

Hoffmann-La Roche's means for doing this will be through the creation of the Roche Institute of Molecular Biology, to be located adjacent to the firm's headquarters in Nutley, New Jersey. And at the head of the institute will be a widely esteemed researcher who is now at the National Institutes of Health, Sidney Udenfriend, age 49, chief of the Laboratory of Clinical Biochemistry of the National Heart Institute. Udenfriend, who has been at NIH since 1950, will not be joining the company until next July, but, in the meantime, plans are proceeding to assemble a staff of 150, including 75 to 100 Ph.D.'s.

Whether any significant number of them will be coming from NIH itself is a sensitive matter. But at least several NIH people are already signed up. Among them is Herbert Weissbach, a research colleague of Udenfriend's at the Heart Institute, who will be joining the Roche Institute in about 2 years. According to a spokesman for the company, Weissbach will be "the number two man." Starting next month in the capacity of general administrator will be Richard Snyder, who, at present, is an administrator at the Heart Institute.

At this point, with plans being drawn up for a five-storied research building with 85,000 square feet of floor space, honeymoon talk predominates in the company's announcement of its plans for basic research. Skeptics may recollect that there is ample precedent for industry to talk lovingly of basic research but to lose its ardor when confronted by current bills and distant payoffs. Nevertheless, Hoffmann-La Roche seems to have imbibed a good draught of the mystique of pure research and is saying all the right things. Describing the institute as "wholly devoted to fundamental research designed to shed light on basic life processes," a company announcement goes on to add, "This research will be done on the very frontiers of science, unrelated to traditional efforts to develop marketable drugs. . . . In selecting research projects, the members of the Institute will be guided solely by the scientific importance of a problem, regardless of potential practical applications." And the announcement quotes John J. Burns, Roche vice president for research, who is an NIH alumnus and an old colleague of Udenfriend's. Says Burns: "This new approach to fundamental research is necessary because of the extremely complex nature of the problems we face. The Roche Institute of Molecular Biology is a basically new concept which provides an academic atmosphere, stressing the search for new knowledge for its own sake; at the same time it provides ready access to the scientific manpower and support facilities of a major pharmaceutical research organization."

Sidney Udenfriend

Plans call for company-financed visiting and postdoctoral appointments, as well as close ties with nearby medical schools.

Both Udenfriend and spokesmen for the company stress that, though the institute will be situated close to Hoffmann-La Roche's Nutley research center, it will be accorded complete autonomy. It will be separately incorporated and have its own charter and budget; and its director, Udenfriend, will report directly to the company's vice

president for research, Burns, who was a key figure in establishing the institute. Udenfriend says he has been assured that the institute will not be required to involve itself in the company's market-oriented operations; on the other hand, he says, he has been assured that, in this era of "big biology," the company's present facilities will be available to support work at the new fundamental research center.

Hoffmann-La Roche, a closely held firm that ranks among the very largest in the industry, reveals virtually nothing about its corporate finances, but it has been estimated that the company now spends $40 million a year on research, and will spend at least $3 million a year to operate the new institute. Company officials refuse to comment on these numbers, beyond saying that they are not far off the mark.

A key question, of course, is, What's in it for Hoffmann-La Roche? And the answer, quite simply, is that the company, which is not oblivious of profits, expects that, over the long haul, it will be making money out of its investment in basic research. Just how it will link its basic research enterprise to its money-making endeavors is not certain. The successful experience of Bell Labs figures large in talk about the new institute, though many of the key figures in the Roche enterprise admit they know little about Bell Labs beyond its sterling reputation. But, amidst the turbulence and uncertainty that now surround a good deal of government-financed basic research, it is interesting to note that a hardheaded, profit-making company is acting on the assumption that there is a payoff to be had in undirected, pure research.

Udenfriend, who receives an annual salary of $25,980 at NIH, says he will get "considerably more, though not double" the amount at Roche. But, in the present manpower market, there is no doubt that, if money was the motivating force for his decision to depart from NIH, he could have done far better. Rather, the attraction, quite simply, appears to be the promise of a blank check for basic researchers to do basic research, without any red tape or pressure to satisfy political or economic criteria. Udenfriend makes it clear that he has no complaints about NIH, and points out that he had turned down several lucrative opportunities in universities and elsewhere before discussions between him and his old colleague, Burns, led to the conception of the institute. Here was a rare opportunity, Udenfriend explains, to build a research institution from the ground up, and, professionally, it was too attractive to pass up.

The irony of it all is that the Roche Institute of Molecular Biology is basing its designs and aspirations on the best of NIH's experience in basic research. Meanwhile, the lag in government salaries, the tightness of funds for basic research, and political pressures for cures rather than research are closing in on NIH.

Since the Roche Institute will not go into operation for another year, its effects on manpower and resources in the biomedical sciences are still remote. But the core of its scientific concerns, molecular biology, is not so heavily populated that the effects can be expected to pass without notice. It not unlikely that other drug firms will emulate Hoffmann-La Roche's move in one way or another. Universities seeking to maintain or expand their own position in this field will find the already tight manpower situation still tighter, and NIH, once the most placid cloister of biomedical research, can reasonably expect a new surge of recruiters to its campus.—D. S. GREENBERG

Advisory Unit Drops War Protestor

Donald F. Hornig, the President's science adviser, last week found himself in the center of a small but embarrassing controversy that illuminates Vietnam's gangrenous effects on domestic affairs.

Hornig acknowledged that he had decided not to appoint William R. Taylor, a University of Wisconsin history professor, to a White House advisory panel on education because Taylor was publicly identified with opposition to the administration's Vietnam policies. The panel, headed by a longtime White House adviser, Jerrold Zacharias, an M.I.T. physicist, had earlier engaged Taylor as an occasional consultant because of his work in developing new methods for instruction in history. Last summer, when it was indicated to him that he would be appointed a panel member, Taylor notified John Mays, executive secretary of the panel, that he had been active in anti-Vietnam "teach-ins," had helped organize a faculty protest against the administration's Vietnam policy, and had published articles and reviews critical of the administration. Mays assured him, he said, that these activities would be no obstacle to his appointment, though a routine FBI check would be necessary.

Last November, Taylor reported, Hornig advised him that, though there was no question as to his loyalty, it had been decided not to go through with the appointment. The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* says that, on the basis of his conversation with Hornig, Taylor made the following diary entry: "Problem he [Hornig] insisted, was credibility of panel's recommendations. Said panel would be making recommendations to Congress; therefore had to be careful that panel contained no 'red flags.' Seemed to be preoccupied with 'benighted Southerners.' " (The case became publicly known after Taylor learned that other members of the panel had not been informed of the decision to exclude him.)

Hornig told *Science*, "I get cut up in Congress on lots of things and I don't think there is any sacrifice of principle when I say I want these panels to be effective." He said that Taylor's was the first case involving a nonsecurity area in which publicly expressed attitudes on Vietnam affected an appointment. Hornig said that the case was an unusual one and that it was not a precedent for similar action. He added that he made the Taylor decision himself, without instructions from or consultations with higher authority.

Meanwhile, at a time when the administration's relations with the academic community are far from healthy, a number of university-based advisers are boiling about the Taylor case, but, since they share Hornig's concerns for domestic affairs, it is not likely that they will rebel; nor, considering Hornig's embarrassment, is it likely that so many fingerprints would be left behind if a repeat performance were to occur? —D.S.G.