moved to social violence, she explains. The enemy must be shorn of his humanness. Overriding ideals, such as divine commands, justice or economic welfare, must be found.

Americans of one persuasion or another are currently engaged in the process of justifying group violence on both domestic and foreign fronts— in Vietnam, on campuses and in ghettos. The violence itself is not a disease, but a social pattern common to all human groups.

Why Americans' mental processes should now be leading them to violence is another matter altogether. The riot commission found deep-rooted inequality in American life and spelled out the suppression of blacks in a white society as a root of one kind of violence. The crime commission pinpointed a plethora of ills in the system of criminal justice that act to enhance crime as the root of another. Both panels called for massive amounts of money and major changes in American institutions to cure these ills, but nothing substantial has been done.

What more will the experts say? There are social-political forces shaping American character, but social scientists know very little about them. A few scientists, spurred on by the poverty war and the Negro revolt (SN: 4/20, p. 373) have looked specifically at American character. One or two academic centers—the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence at Brandeis University and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, Calif.—deal with U.S. society. But otherwise social scientists have not turned much attention on the quality of American life and on the possible forces that may act to tear down human bonds, amplifying a climate of brutality in the social milieu.

To Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner of Cornell University, an architect of Project Head Start, the agonizing over a sick society stems not only from specific acts of violence, but also from a sense of deeper divisions among people, divisions that stifle expressions of compassion.

"It is not that we are not kind, but there are not enough actions bespeaking that feeling," says Dr. Bronfenbrenner. "Violence is a natural reaction to a world in which people are not being treated as people," he says, concluding that the United States now lacks "explicit training in what it means to treat others with dignity and compassion. . . . In that vacuum, sex of the commercialized variety and violence grow."

Americans, more than other peoples, are segregated by age into peer groups. An individual forms social bonds almost exclusively with others of the same age. This tendency toward age segregation "can be expected to increase alienation, indifference, antagonism and even violence on the part of the younger generation in all segments of American society—including the middle class as well as the disadvantaged," says Dr. Bronfenbrenner. "In fact, there is evidence that crime is both rising and moving into the younger age groups."

In all societies technological advance and urbanization tear down human contact, he adds. But Americans have been particularly susceptible to the process. Lacking a long social tradition, they are easy game for the mobile life accompanied by broken human links and indifference to the problems of others.

Dr. Bronfenbrenner's research indicates that the 1964 Genovese affair—in which a woman was stabbed to death under the eyes of 30 witnesses who chose not to become involved—was not a passing dream on a dark New York street. It has reality in American life.

A three-year study recently completed on 12-year-old children in England, Switzerland, the U.S.S.R. and the United States points up that reality. The children were asked what they would do if they saw one child hurting another. The standard reaction among American children was to do nothing, says Dr. Bronfenbrenner. This was not the case with children of the other three nations.

This and other research, says Dr. Bronfenbrenner, points to a "national need for greater involvement of adults in the lives of children and of children in the problems and tasks of the larger society," and he believes it can be done. "I think we're in desperate trouble," he says, "but I feel reasonably confident that the solution lies in rediscovering and reinforcing the positive."

So far, Americans have experienced nothing so horrible as the Stalinist period in Russia. "But that does not mean we cannot hope to compete in the future. At the moment, we're going toward violence; they're going away from it," he says.

FDA SUCCESSION

Goddard-forged image expected to survive

Since Dr. James L. Goddard resigned as head of the Food and Drug Administration in May, most of the interest in his successor has centered less on exactly who it would be than on whether or not he would be a Goddard man.

A lot of pent-up breath was let out June 6 when Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Wilbur Cohen announced that Dr. Herbert L. Ley Jr. would take over the hottest of government hotspots.

The sighs were accompanied by some looks of resignation and some of relief.

Ley was chairman of the department of microbiology, Harvard School of Public Health, when he was picked by Goddard to direct FDA's Bureau of Medicine in 1966, and was recommended by him for the commissioner's spot. He is likely to continue running the agency in something similar to Goddard's style.

Before the appointment of Dr. Goddard as FDA Commissioner in January 1966 the agency and the industry it was supposed to regulate had had a reasonably happy marriage. George P. Larrick, Dr. Goddard's predecessor, held to the position that his agency would only prosecute a drug company if it had to, that the industry was basically honest anyway, and that FDA's power was limited in most cases.

Goddard, who rarely spoke without frankness, almost immediately declared that the agency had been lax, if not grossly negligent. He cracked down with a bang on laxness within the industry and shook up the organization of FDA to put it on a more hard-line, scientific basis. He gave himself five years to transfigure the agency; he lasted half that long.

Dr. Ley inherits the Goddard mantle.

Most recent of his statements, from what he called the hottest seat in Government, was to the effect that the corner drug store is an obsolete institution whose days are numbered as far as the dispensing of prescription drugs is concerned. This raised a howl, and there are some who believe that this

last few calories applied to the hotspot led to his resignation.

Besides Goddard's mantle, Dr. Ley has inherited some tough fights. Chief among these is the agency's attempt to hang a label, which the industry describes as a kiss-of-death label, on packages of vitamins and food supplements that, in effect, says they are not normally of any value in a society that eats well. He also inherits an effort to bring medical devices under the same regulations that now apply to drugs.

There is even a row brewing with government agencies. The Army, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Brookhaven National Laboratory have been experimenting with sterilizing food by radiation. The FDA is taking a cautious view on the safety of such food treatment despite some industrial eagerness to develop it.

The hearings on the vitamin labeling regulations have gotten no further than the point of settling how the hearings will run. They are likely to stretch well into 1969. The hearings are on revisions of revisions of regulations originally suggested in June 1962, pre-Goddard. Such a storm was raised then that the proposal went into limbo for four years.

It was revived in June 1966 by Goddard, whose view of vitamins and other nutrition supplements is that nearly everybody gets more than enough vitamins in food; what they pay good money for in the drug store is most likely going to be quickly excreted.

The label being fought so bitterly would state that "vitamins and minerals are supplied in abundant amounts by the food we eat. Except for persons with special medical needs, there is no scientific basis for recommending routine use of dietary supplements."

Not only industry but many nutrition scientists have replied that there are many people who fail to get the proper vitamins and minerals and that not enough is known about the need for vitamins to say what is abundant and what is not.

The label regulation has already been promulgated, but it will not go into effect until after the current protracted set of hearings are over, if then.

The medical-devices power sought by Goddard before his departure, and by Larrick before him, faces debate in Congress. An Administration-backed bill introduced by Rep. Harley Staggers (D-W.Va.) would bring medical devices under the provision of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, under which the FDA regulates new drugs.

With devices under this act, Food and Drug would be able to require that manufacturers demonstrate both the safety and efficacy of medical devices before marketing them.

Medical devices include such things as artificial hearts and other organs, if and when developed, artificial limbs, contact lenses, surgical instruments, equipment used for therapy, and other hardware directly involved in treating patients.

Another bill, introduced by Rep. Ed Reinecke (R-Calif.), is considered much tamer. It would set up a 20-man National Medical Devices Standards Commission composed of representatives of science, Government and industry. This commission would be able to recommend only, the Food and Drug Administration would have no enforcement power.

Both bills currently are in the House Commerce Committee, with action on neither having been scheduled. Hearings, at least, are probable next year.

UNIVERSITY SCIENCE FUNDS

Spreading the gravy

Even though this is a bad year for Federal appropriations and especially for research appropriations, Representative George P. Miller (D-Calif.) has chosen the last weeks of the 90th Congress to move for action on a bill that would grant $150 million a year for the next five years for the improvement of college and university science and technology departments. Subcommittee hearings will start June 25.

Representative Miller, who is chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, introduced the bill as a courtesy to the Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, which have wanted to get such legislation before Congress for several years; they will be its principal beneficiaries.

The Miller bill divides its annual appropriation into three $50-million sections, each of which would be granted according to a different formula. One-third of the money would be granted to institutions in proportion to the total amount of specific project grants they receive from all Federal agencies. One-third would be divided geographically: a share of the $50 million to be assigned to each state according to the share of the nation's high-school graduates that state has in the given year. Each sum would be distributed among institutions in the particular state according to the credit hours in undergraduate science offered by each school. The final $50 million would be divided among institutions according to the advanced degrees in science—including teacher certification degrees—that they award in a three-year period.

The Miller bill is not intended to supersede or repeal present institutional grant programs of various government agencies, including the so-called centers-of-excellence programs, though it is being promoted in their name. That term was coined in a request by President Johnson early in 1967 that government agencies see what they could do to help institutions that had good bases for research work in particular subjects develop into excellent ones.

The term is currently applied to programs such as the Defense Department's Themis and the National Science Foundation's University Science Development Program. The National Institutes of Health have a program of General Research Support Grants, but they do not like the generic term. All of these, however, stress agency priorities —defense, health research or science development—without regard to geography.

A major criticism of all present programs, including the centers of excellence, is that they go to those already supported by other grants. The Miller bill seeks to get around this both by its mandatory geographical provision and by the distribution of two-thirds of the appropriation by formulas related to the institutions' teaching effort rather than their research. The $50 million that is apportioned among the states will be distributed to institutions according to their undergraduate teaching effort. This is intended to benefit junior colleges, teachers' colleges, nuns' colleges and other types of institution that seldom get into current programs. For the third $50 million masters and teacher-training degrees have the same weight as Ph.D.'s in the formula. This distribution should also aid many institutions whose research programs are modest.

The Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, under the chairmanship of Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.), plans to spend nine days of hearings on the bill over a three-week period. Even with this amount of time, an aide says, of those who want to testify only about a quarter can be accommodated.

The purpose of holding hearings now is to gain information according to which the bill can be reworked into a form likely to pass and be presented to the opening of the 91st Congress in January. Supporters expect that the bill's provisions, which will benefit almost every Congressional district, should attract widespread support, whatever the intrinsic merits of the provision might be.