

the academy after less than 2 years of operation? The academy itself budgets a small evaluation effort, but so far this amounts essentially to some time and motion study. The two most interested parties, OSU and Battelle, are keeping close track of developments but so far appear not to be doing any serious second guessing. Outside observers cite debits and credits but generally agree that it is too early to balance the books.

There is no question that the academy faces some formidable challenges. Inflation is pushing up costs at a rate which makes it necessary for the academy to find an additional \$150,000 a year merely to operate at its present level. And if the economy continues to decline, the parent institutions' contributions to the academy could be harder to keep up.

The legal status of the academy raises other sorts of questions. Sometime before the 10-year OSU-Battelle warranty on the academy runs out, a decision will be made on whether the academy is to have a chartered life of its own, and if so on what terms. This decision could be complicated by the current challenge to Battelle's operations as defined in the will of the founder, Gordon Battelle (*Science*, 13 December). Of even more immediate concern is a ruling by the state attorney general that Battelle support of the academy does not in its present form qualify as a charitable contribution under the will. It seems likely that Battelle can find an acceptable way to support the academy, but the organization may well face a legally bumpy future.

Under the present dispensation, the academy operates under a mixture of OSU and Battelle rules and regulations which makes for some administrative confusion in such matters as leave and vacations, general record-keeping, purchasing practices, and so forth. Other questions of management are more fundamental. The academy is pledged to be free of ideology and to avoid taking adversary roles. While this is irreproachable in principle, critics question whether the academy can be effective in some projects if it does not adopt a particular policy and push for it.

Then there is the question of the differing operating styles of the fellows. Some have one foot in the academy and the other in government agencies or in other organizations and personally perform a bridging function. Others base themselves in the academy and depend on friendly persuasion and pro-

viding the best possible information to those with whom they are working. The academy is supposed to provide information and education as well as participate in action projects, but some observers see a tendency to go the "seminar and conference route."

The academy takes pride in the claim that it attracts "risk-takers" who operate outside the usual incentive systems. In fact, few of the people who come to work at the academy appear to be taking big risks with their careers. They seem to be highly competent professionals with home bases to return to or better jobs to springboard on to. But the academy does seem to take some genuine risks by choosing difficult projects that can fail conspicuously. To their credit, both parent institutions seem prepared to accept a fairly healthy failure rate as a sign that the academy is tackling worthwhile projects.

To the outsider, the academy does seem to have real strengths. Some of

them are perhaps minor, such as a low level of jargon in the discussion of projects and what appears to be a successful effort to involve people with problems in every stage of the problem-solving process.

The results of applied social science research in the 1960's were not brilliant. Too often, university experts saw a research contract as a way to study an "interesting" problem and get a few graduate students their Ph.D.'s. And private research organizations often did potboiling contract research.

The academy fellows have the advantage of a financial base which permits them to pick the problems they regard as important and deal with them in a way they think will be effective. To make good as an institution, the academy will have to make good on its promise of putting good ideas into useful action. It will have to satisfy some stern judges among those who hold the IOU's.—JOHN WALSH

Briefing

Edward Rall Expected to Replace Stone at NIH

It is apparently just a matter of time before Robert S. Stone resigns under pressure as director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). It is known that he is looking for another job.

Already, Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) officials are laying the bureaucratic groundwork necessary to put his successor in place with as much dispatch as possible. If anything goes according to plan, Stone is expected to be replaced by Joseph Edward Rall, who presently is director of intramural research in the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases (NIAMDD). Reportedly, Rall's name has cleared channels at HEW and has been sent to the White House for final approval. Rall's supporters hope that the fact that he is a liberal Democrat will not be held against him.

Stone's ouster has been in the works for at least a couple of months (*Science*, 15 November), the main problem being that he simply does not get along with his immediate superiors, Assistant Secretary for Health Charles C. Edwards and Deputy Assistant

Secretary Theodore Cooper. During Stone's year and a half in office, relations between HEW and NIH, which had not been very good to begin with, deteriorated further.

The prospect of Rall heading NIH is both surprising and pleasing to many of his colleagues. He has been considered for both the directorship and scientific directorship in the past and has turned the jobs down. Furthermore, Rall is regarded as a man of considerable strength of character who would not complacently take orders from anyone, including the HEW brass. On the other hand, a strong leader may be just what HEW wants at NIH. As one HEW official has said, "The trouble with Stone is that he is a director who is not directing, and NIH needs direction."

Rall is admired by many fellow scientists for his interest in the social and ethical aspects of medicine. Scientifically, he has stature as an endocrinologist whose special interest has been in thyroid hormones.

In order to become NIH director, Rall will not only have to win White House approval—the NIH directorship is a presidential appointment—but also, under a new law, Senate confirmation.—B.J.C.