

Finding non-Defense money

Scientists who get money from the Department of Defense have seen the handwriting on the wall for a few years. This year the message was especially bad. The script was written by Sen. Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), majority leader of the Senate, who topped off a billion-dollar cut in Defense's requested \$8 billion research and development budget for fiscal year 1970 with a prohibition amendment. Now famous as article 203, the amendment forbids the department to spend any of the appropriated money on research projects not related to its mission (SN: 12/13, p. 550).

Article 203 is the culmination of several years of Congressional grumbling about Defense's alleged tendency to build a research empire for itself in areas where Congressmen thought it had no business to be. "It was the only agency that could always get more for research than it asked for," says an official of the Democratic Policy Committee. For several years Mansfield and others have been trying to change this favored status.

The problem with article 203 is that it neither defines the Defense Department's mission nor names any categories of research that are in or out. It is open to wide interpretation and raises the need for an arbiter.

Defense had hopes that the National Academy of Sciences would be the arbiter and had invited the Academy to join in a review of Defense research efforts to see what ones violate article 203. But the Academy tossed the potato right back. "The Academy is ready to give advice," says a spokesman, "but we feel it would be sensible for the Defense Department to take a first stab at the situation."

The department is proceeding to re-view its research programs. It is still too early to tell what categories may go or to name specific projects that may be discontinued, but it is clear that with the budget cut and amendment 203 something will have to go. The department has been negotiating with other Government agencies to see if they can take up the slack.

Some of these talks have been going on since the Defense Department began to have Congressional trouble. Defense has been talking to the State Department for a year and a half about the possibility of State's taking over some of Defense's projects in the social sciences. Nothing solid has come of the talks, says Dr. Donald M. MacArthur, deputy director of Defense Research and Engineering. There is speculation that people at State are reluctant to get

involved in basic social-science research of the sort the Pentagon is doing.

In physical sciences the alternative for many will be the National Science Foundation. The Science Foundation's policy is that anyone dropped by the Defense Department will have to go through the same procedures of application and evaluation as anyone else on the NSF lists. People who have been supported by Defense are already getting in line. "There are dozens or a hundred or more," says Dr. Paul F. Donovan, director of NSF's intermediate energy physics program, and implementation of article 203 has not yet been carried out. When that happens, there may be a further substantial increase, he says.

This sort of thing could lead to a severe money problem at the Science Foundation and other agencies unless additional money is made available to them. It was not Mansfield's intention to provoke such a crisis, says a spokesman for the Democratic Policy Committee, but rather to relieve Defense of research projects in favor of other agencies. The committee suggests the possibility of transferring money from Defense to other agencies.

According to Budget Bureau opinion, however, such transfer of funds appropriated for fiscal 1970 seems impossible. One Federal agency can give money to another, but only if the receiving agency does some work on behalf of the giving agency as part of the giving agency's activities. Since the Mansfield amendment forbids using the Defense appropriation for research unrelated to Defense's mission, it seems to forbid such subcontracting by definition.

The alternative of putting supplemental appropriation bills through Congress remains, but is unlikely to be used since the 1971 budget is almost ready for presentation. There is the chance that adjustments are likely to be made in the 1971 budget, which takes effect next July, instead of further tinkering with this year's budget.

Unless something is done, interpretation of article 203 could bring dire consequences to the nation's research establishment. At the University of Illinois, for example, over half the outside support for research in the Engineering College comes from the Defense Department, says Dr. Daniel Alpert, dean of the college. About one-third of the work in the university's Materials Research Laboratory is basic enough to be subject to different interpretations under the Mansfield amendment. The university will contend that

the research is relevant to Defense's mission, but, says Dean Alpert, "We've got to hold our breath and hope for the best."

If Defense Department support is cut immediately, says Dr. Charles Schwartz, associate professor of physics at the University of California at Berkeley, a bitter situation of competition for available funds will develop.

Dr. Schwartz feels that the Mansfield amendment is a good thing even though he has an Air Force contract he may lose as a result of it. He feels scientific leaders should start to work with Congress to provide alternate means of support for the day when the impact of article 203 reaches the laboratories. □

HEW POLICY

Blacklists and loyalty oaths



MIT

Nobel laureate Luria: Victim of blacklist.

The security procedures followed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in appointing its advisers and consultants "are supported by a logic all their own," says H. Reed Ellis of Columbia University. "This is to say that no reasonable man would design the present system as it has evolved," the Harvard law graduate declared in a special report to HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch last week.

The system which has been under heavy fire from the scientific community applies particularly to scientists advising the National Institutes of Health on the distribution of research funds and design of programs. Candidates for these positions have been subjected, without their official knowledge, to preappointment security checks. The result was the blacklisting of individuals who failed to receive clearance, often because of left-wing political ties or association with others holding radical views.

Until December, HEW denied the ex-

istence of such lists which, it now concedes, do exist. Even Nobel laureate Salvador Luria of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (SN: 10/25, p. 371) was barred from NIH service. Says Ellis, who denies knowledge of the specific reasons for Luria's rejection, "The whole operation takes on a Kafkaesque aura in the public mind when Nobel laureates are excluded from Government service for whatever reason."

Finch has now issued orders to revise the controversial system and eliminate blacklisting.

The present practice of preappointment investigations will be discontinued, and individuals will be appointed on the basis of "professional competence, that is, integrity, judgment and ability." The only ground for denying an appointment will be that a candidate "possesses traits that would so adversely affect the performance of his job as to disqualify him." Such traits might include alcoholism or drug addiction. An important addition to the provisions, says Ellis, is that if such a charge is made against a person, he now will have a right to confront and refute the evidence.

Another condition of appointment, initially announced by Finch but actually subject to further consideration, is that accepted candidates sign a loyalty oath. Prior to September, every Federal employe was required to sign an appointment affidavit that contained a section beginning, "I am not a Communist or a Fascist," and affirming that he did not advocate the overthrow of the Government or belong to any organization that does, ranging from the Abraham Lincoln Brigade to the Yugoslav Seaman's Club, Inc.

But last summer a District of Columbia court ruled that section unconstitutional, and the Civil Service Commission, which administers the affidavit, declined to challenge the ruling in the Supreme Court. While it remains on current forms, anyone who objects to it may strike the section before signing. It will be deleted from future affidavit papers.

To satisfy proponents of loyalty review, Ellis proposed and Finch announced a new loyalty affidavit, worded to be constitutionally acceptable. But that, too, is likely to be stricken before it ever goes into effect.

According to Phillips Rockefeller, assistant to Secretary Finch, the Ellis affidavit would apply only to HEW appointments. But because the Civil Service Commission has not indicated any intention of rewriting a loyalty affidavit for Government-wide use, HEW is unlikely to move unilaterally to introduce a version of its own.

CONGRESSIONAL DEMAND

More bioscience needed

Last November, the House Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications heard 13 witnesses testify on the state of bioscience in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (SN: 12/13, p. 560). Much that the Congressmen heard related to the early termination of the flight of Biosatellite 3 and the death of Bonnie, the space monkey, who survived only 9 of a planned 28 days of weightlessness.

After reviewing the testimony, the subcommittee, headed by Rep. Joseph E. Karth (D-Minn.), has issued its report, calling on NASA to pay more attention to bioscience.

"The question is," says Karth, "where do we go from here? Nothing more is scheduled in the way of flight tests of the biological effects of weightlessness in space, except the remaining Apollo and post-Apollo manned space flights. Is it our intention to use man as our test animal in the planned long-duration voyages to the moon and the planets? . . . Or should we try first to

learn more . . . by further exploration with monkeys or other animals?"

Specifically, the subcommittee recommends that:

- The abandoned biosatellite program be reinstated.

- Bioscience research be extended to the planets when it becomes technologically feasible.

- The role of science—particularly biomedicine—be upgraded as a mission objective to help justify the substantial cost of space exploration.

- The recommendations of the President's Science Advisory Committee for a "new level of biomedical research capability" be implemented by NASA.

- The Office of Manned Space Flight, on the upcoming 28-day Apollo Applications Program missions (SN: 1/3, p. 21), conduct a new and higher level of biomedical experimentation on the astronauts.

- NASA cooperate closely with academic research institutions in planning its scientific investigations.

HUNGER WAR

Second try on a conference

"The hunger of even one American can no longer be excused by anyone, for any reason," President Nixon was told last month by the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health. But the conference, organized at the President's request by Harvard nutrition professor, Dr. Jean Mayer, came to a stormy end.

The three-day conference rapidly galvanized around a strong, almost universal sentiment that the President take drastic measures to tackle the hunger problem before the end of the conference. Even conservative panel chairmen, some of them heads of food corporations, asked the President to act immediately, and minority groups demanded a national emergency policy. Mayer, himself, to stress the urgency of the problem, pressed other groups to demand that a guaranteed annual income of \$5,500 be established, and the figure was picked up by 10 of the 17 separate panels recommending an annual guarantee.

The Administration's own Family Assistance Plan, designed for the President by White House adviser Daniel Patrick Moynihan (SN: 3/8, p. 232) proposes a guaranteed income of \$1,600 for a family of four, which would cost the Government \$70 billion a year, he says.

The two views were never reconciled, and the meeting ended in an atmos-

phere of confusion.

A second start may have begun last week when Mayer released a 645-page final report of the conference, including over 800 recommendations by 26 separate subject panels and 8 task forces.

In addition to emphasizing a \$5,500 income floor, the report proposes that a national free lunch and breakfast program be made available immediately to all children through secondary school, regardless of income. Because the responsibility here is divided among Federal agencies, the report recommends that all responsibilities for such programs be shifted from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

NEWSBRIEFS

New legislation; Born

Despite misgivings about one of its provisions, President Nixon last week signed the Coal Mine Health and Safety Bill of 1969. The act includes Federal compensation for pneumoconiosis, a disease, caused by inhalation of coal dust (SN: 12/29, p. 592).

The bill, in addition to compensation, deals with accidents and occurrence of the disease by limiting coal dust to three milligrams per cubic meter, six months after it becomes law. Hereto-