

meeting in 1969, when activists organized a war protest march on the White House.

Attempts at making major changes in the APS constitution did not succeed, but at the same time there has been an evolution toward acceptance of a broader role for the society. The clearest symbol of this evolution is the decision this year by the APS council to support a Congressional Science Fellowship Program with society funds.

The council authorized spending of \$35,000 to support up to two physicists as fellows to work for a year in the offices of representatives, senators, or congressional committees. The APS has issued an immediate call for applicants. The APS will select fellows for the program but plans to cooperate with the AAAS and other professional organizations in administering the fellowships. The AAAS is in the process of selecting its own congressional science fellows and will operate a Congressional Fellowship Office in Washington to coordinate the activities of science fellows in the Capital.

The APS science fellowships were proposed by the Forum on Physics, which has an official if still ambiguous status in APS. The forum represents an institutionalization of the liberal, activist wing of the society, and a number of its leaders were involved in organizing the 1969 march on the White House. Forum chairman this year is Martin Perl of the Stanford Linear Accelerator; vice chairman is Barry Casper of Carleton College. Among members of the executive board are Jay Orear of Cornell, who has been associated over several years with efforts to open the APS to action on public-interest issues, and Brian Schwartz of M.I.T., who has acted as program chairman both before and since the forum gained an official place in the program.

This year and last, forum sessions dealing with public-interest questions have been official parts of the program. (The best attended this year were one addressed by Ralph Nader and Philip M. Boffey (see NAS story) and another on science and secrecy at which Edward Teller spoke.) The forum is one of the society's subgroups which requires extra payment for membership. In the case of the forum this is \$2. Forum members are said to number about 1500. There is a monthly forum newsletter, and there have been other forum activities such as surveys

## Hogness to Quit NAS Post in 1974

John R. Hogness, president of the National Academy of Sciences Institute of Medicine, will be leaving his post in about a year to assume presidency of the University of Washington.

Hogness, who became the institute's first director in August 1971, had intended to stay at least through his 5-year term, but he said he "just can't turn down" the Washington offer. He previously spent 21 years at the university, ending up as executive vice president.

The Hogness departure was totally unexpected by all, but he said that the institute is a "vital and vibrant" concern and so stable that it will be able to get along fine without him. He also opined that the job as institute president is the "best job in health in the United States," so the NAS shouldn't have too much trouble finding a successor.

The institute was formed as a top-level body to study all aspects of the nation's health system.—C.H.

and reports undertaken by forum members, but the science fellowship program is the most significant, concrete result achieved by the forum to date.

Commenting on the state of the relationship between APS and the forum at a news briefing on the fellowships, Perl said, "It [acceptance of the fellowships] was amazingly fast. The Congressional Fellowship Program puts us over the hump as far as credibility goes."

APS executive director W. W. Havens said, "by establishing a Congressional Fellowship Program, the American Physical Society gives its blessing to this type of activity and encourages physicists to become engaged in public service science. The APS is thus supporting the long-range goal of legitimatizing for physicists activities other than traditional research in universities and industry."

The APS council actually more than doubled the funds originally requested for the program by the forum. Instead of the \$16,500 asked in the original proposal, the council voted to spend \$35,000 for up to two 1-year fellowships. Officials say APS was able to come up with the sum, at a time when many professional societies are financially hard-pressed, because of economy measures the society took in the late 1960's when it was faced with serious deficits. Savings from a shift to typewriter composition and offset printing for its publications from more expensive methods are primarily credited with making the funds available.

Havens notes that the financial situa-

tion will affect the council's decisions about continuing the fellowship program, so that the program has to be regarded as an experiment. Casper at the briefing said, "We eventually hope for an expanded program funded by foundation support."

At the APS meeting this year, the squeeze on the federal funding of science and its effect on the job market for physicists continued to be a matter of worry and discussion.

There is a theory that the recession in science, a common concern of all physicists, both activist and traditionalist, has helped bring the two groups together on the question of broadening APS horizons. Physicists generally now perceive Congress as arbiter of the financial fate of physics and tend to feel that giving physicists practical experience of Congress and vice versa would profit both sides. Those who attend the meetings regularly said there appeared to be fewer younger physicists in the graduate-student and post-doctoral age groups on hand than in the past. This was attributed to the tightness of travel funds provided in federal grants. In addition, there is an impression that a significant number of young physicists who have been unable to find jobs for which they have trained have either dropped out of the job market; others are staying close to the lab doing the research that may get them one of the scarce longer term jobs still going.—J.W.

*Erratum:* In "Navy R & D: Will Congress have the nerve to spear Trident?" (20 April, p. 284), the *Manchester Union Leader* is incorrectly referred to as the *Times-Union*.