

# Surprise

There is such a thing as a fully-automatic curriculum-programmed classroom planetarium.



To find out about the Apollo, and our entire in-depth line of planetariums, write:



THE UNIVERSE  
AT YOUR FINGERTIPS

**PLANETARIUMS UNLIMITED, INC.**  
a subsidiary of Viewlex, Inc.  
49 Broadway, Holbrook, N.Y. 11741

■ WE CAN HELP YOU WITH A SPANISH PROVERB



A Spanish proverb states, "For each man a good woman, a spirited horse, a fine knife." While the first two are outside our competence, we are certain we can help with the third. ■ Our G.P.K. (Gentleman's Pocket Knife) is only 1/8" thin, but contains in its leatherette-sheathed body: knife, manicurer, screwdriver/bottle opener and scissors. All forged of the finest steel. ■ Once you own the G.P.K. we know you won't part with it and will carry it in tackle box, tweed suit or tux! Order yours now but, don't forget, the woman and the horse are up to you!

Send me my G.P.K. I encl. \$5.95 (\$4.95 plus \$1 post. & ins.) Return within 1 year if not delighted. (Calif. resid. add 5% tax.)

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

**haverhill's**

584 Washington St.,  
San Francisco, 94111

SN-1026

mixed audience without turning beet red, she says.

"If we're going to meet the urgency," says Dr. Mead, "we'll have to find a method of amplifying what we've got." The use of films may be the best way to do this, she says.

Training teachers in sex education is a task to which the prestigious Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), now four years old, is more and more bending its efforts.

The organization is attacking the problem by sending out consultants to speak in schools and before teacher workshops. This year there were 58 such workshops, contrasted to 12 in 1967.

The group's aim is to provide people who can serve as models in communicating about sex. It may be more instructive for teachers to hear experts

talk about sex than to receive what is called sensitivity training—a kind of group therapy—says Dr. James Lieberman, chief of the NIMH center for study in child and family health and a member of the SIECUS board.

Sensitivity training lacks direction when teachers often need a model to follow, says Dr. Lieberman. He disagrees with pessimism about teachers' capabilities in sex education, but concedes that problems arise from both the sexually inhibited adult and the over eager, whose desire to teach about sex often arises from their own exhibitionism.

Nevertheless, he adds, "the more sources from which young people get sex information the better—so long as some of the sources are good. A school teacher is likely to be better than a garage mechanic."

## COMMITTEE NOMINEE

### Handler named for Academy post

Dr. Philip Handler, James B. Duke Professor of Biochemistry at Duke University, has been nominated to be the next president of the National Academy of Sciences. He is the choice of the Academy's nominating committee, set up to find a successor to Dr. Frederick Seitz, who has resigned to become president of Rockefeller University.

Dr. Handler is currently chairman of the National Science Board, an advisory panel of the National Science Foundation, and has served on the President's Science Advisory Committee.

Although selection by the nominating committee is a prestigious recommendation it may or may not amount to election. The election is still to be held, and other nominations may come from any member of the Academy. In fact in the Academy's 1950 election the nominating committee's choice, Dr. James B. Conant, was rejected in favor of Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, who was nominated from the floor.

The new president will take office at a time when there is as much questioning of the Academy's role as there was in 1950. The Academy was set up originally to provide scientific advice to the Government. This it has done when asked; it has sponsored meetings, run a publishing program, and performed other administrative chores. Though its influence on policy has been large, it has not, as some think it should, tried to be a lobby for the interests of the scientific community, especially on budgets and funding.

On these subjects Dr. Handler has expressed views, which though they are similar to those of many scientists,

may not jibe so happily with prevailing opinion in Congress.

He is cautious about geographical equality in distribution of research funds (SN: 6/22, p. 591). Although he favors building up new centers of scientific excellence, he feels that scattering scientists evenly over the country will not do this. Scientists work best when they can communicate easily with each other, and a certain critical mass of them must be present in a given place before individuals can work efficiently, he says.

Although he favors institutional grants for construction of large equipment and improvement of instruction—another Congressional favorite—he is strong for retention of individual grants and for administering such money from Washington, rather than from the office of the dean or department head. "I have little confidence in the ability of the university . . . to arrive at decisions concerning whether a given professor should be supported at the rate of \$100,000 or \$10,000 a year, much less deny him support."

Dr. Handler also favors a new level of grant recipient—a whole academic department—which could use the money for common equipment, personnel and continuing programs.

And he thinks the American public, like the European, will become a patron of science for its own sake. "Increasingly science will be fostered and research supported by our Government, not only because its derived technology prolongs and makes our lives more comfortable, but because science enhances our perception of the world about us. But only if science is understood by nonscientists. . . ."