

The Science Watching Ten

Following are the names of the ten members of Science Watch, who between them put up \$2500 to fund the survey on House voting records:

Roland Schmitt, chairman; former chairman of the National Science Board, former senior vice president for research at General Electric and former president of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; now chairman of the governing board of the American Institute of Physics;

James Duderstadt, former president of the University of Michigan and past chairman of the National Science Board;

D. Allan Bromley, dean of engineering at Yale University and science and technology adviser to President Bush as well as director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy in the Bush Administration;

Erich Bloch, distinguished fellow at the Council on Competitiveness, former director of the National Science Foundation and former vice president of the IBM Corp;

Maxine Singer, president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington;

Nobel laureates: **Kenneth Wilson** of Ohio State University; **F. Sherwood Rowland** of the University of California, Irvine; **Herbert Simon** of Carnegie Mellon University; **Gertrude Elion** of Glaxo Wellcome Laboratories and **Leon Lederman** of the Illinois Institute of Technology and former director of Fermilab.

senting Texas—Ken Bentsen, Eddie Bernice Johnson and Sheila Jackson Lee, each with 97%. Only slightly below them were Texans Ronald Coleman, Martin Frost and E. “Kiki” de la Garza. Tom Bevill of Alabama, senior Democrat on the Appropriations subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and George E. Brown Jr of California, senior Democrat on the Committee on Science, both received a score of 93%. Among Republicans, Robert Walker, of Pennsylvania, who chairs the science committee, got a grade of only 40%, lower than Amo Houghton of New York with 67%, Sherwood Boehlert of New York with 60%, Connie Morella of Maryland with 57% and Vernon Ehlers of Michigan with 52%. Ranked last in the survey was Jim Ramstad, a Minnesota Republican who received 4%.

A day after the ScoreBoard results were issued, Walker declared that the ratings were misleading and contaminated by “overt subjectivity” in an attempt to “politicize” science. In a po-

lemical letter to Apple, Walker wrote that Science Watch’s choice of floor votes was wrong, because it equated preserving the scientific status quo with support for science and excluded many unrecorded voice votes in which members demonstrated their support for science. Those voice votes, Walker argued, indicated that “there was broad, bipartisan support for these measures aimed at ensuring that the basic science base of this nation remains strong and healthy.” As for using votes on science funding as a meaningful measure of support for science, Walker declared, “the science community needs to recognize that a vote against increased spending or for termination of a program doesn’t mean a member is anti-science; it means that [the member] had to make a decision in the context of a larger picture.”

Walker’s evaluation of ScoreBoard: “The bottom line of this survey is that if you’re a big spender you get an ‘A.’”

Attacks on the survey came from some circles that sought to insulate

science from politics.

Cornelius Pings, president of the Association of American Universities, which represents 64 major research universities in the US and Canada, warned that assigning grades to lawmakers “is a serious mistake and may anger members of Congress who have been among the best friends of scientific research.” Washington representatives of leading universities criticized the ScoreBoard concept as “wrongheaded” and “politically naive.” And David Goldston, legislative director for Congressman Boehlert, who is a longtime member of the science committee and recognized as an advocate of science, characterizes the survey as “a silly way to start an argument with Congress. Ratings are done by lobbyists to defeat people—to say in effect, ‘Let’s get rid of the guys who don’t support us.’ By circulating the ratings the people behind Science Watch, no matter how many of them have Nobel Prizes, are taking a big risk of a backlash in Congress.”

In defense of the survey, Schmitt says, “We decided this was the right thing to do for two reasons: to increase the sensitivity of members of Congress to the well-being of science and to stimulate the interest of the scientific community to what’s happening on Capitol Hill.” Science Watch was created, he says, “because a lot of us are convinced that the health of science cannot be maintained by a few of us walking the marble corridors of Congress to plead for support of a certain program or a costly facility.”

That tactic is still necessary, Schmitt observes, “but it’s not enough. Members of Congress still say ‘We don’t hear from your people in my district.’ Our aim with this survey is to stir up the grassroots. Well, it’s making quite a stir already.”

IRWIN GOODWIN

Washington Ins & Outs

Departures and Changes at NSF and OSTP and New Science Board Members Are Nominated

A wave of resignations and retirements has hit Washington’s science bureaucracy this fall, suggesting perhaps that the old order is making way for the new.

Several top-level changes have occurred at the National Science Foundation. In mid-September **Anne Petersen** left NSF, where she was deputy director, to fill the new post of senior vice president for programs at the W. K. Kellogg Foundation in Battle

Creek, Michigan. With \$6 billion in assets, the Kellogg Foundation ranks second only to the Ford Foundation. Founded on cornflakes profits in 1930, the Kellogg Foundation awards “seed money” and other grants for programs that apply existing knowledge, rather than research, to advance education, health and community development. Petersen, a statistician, was vice president for research and dean of the graduate school at the University of

Minnesota before joining NSF. As NSF’s deputy director, she was given the additional job of chief operating officer by Neal Lane, the agency’s director. The post of deputy director requires Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation, which means it will be months before her successor is cleared by the White House and by security agencies.

Meanwhile, Lane has designated **Joseph Bordogna**, assistant director

for engineering and an expert in electro-optics and, especially, holographic television devices, to be acting deputy director and has assigned him to handle the agency's administrative functions that Petersen performed.

Other high-level departures: **William C. Harris**, who had been at NSF for nearly two decades, the last four years as head of the mathematical and physical sciences directorate, was recruited by George Rupp, president of Columbia University, to be executive director and president of the Biosphere 2 Center, outside Tucson, Arizona. Columbia's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory adopted the trouble-riddled closed-ecology laboratory on 1 January and expects to develop credible research programs there on global climate change, biodiversity and sustainable agriculture. In the four years before Lamont-Doherty's takeover, the \$150 million glass-domed facility was often ridiculed as a Disneyland gimmick and criticized for its research blunders, such as the problems encountered by its small group of inhabitants in 1993 when CO₂ was allowed to rise to precarious levels. At the time, Carl Sagan of Cornell University lambasted Biosphere 2 as an "uncontrolled experiment" on Earth sciences. Columbia and Lamont-Doherty intend to transform Biosphere 2 into a research laboratory, science museum and conference center. Harris's boss at Columbia is **Peter M. Eisenberger**, former director of Princeton University's Materials Institute and before that director of Exxon Research and Engineering. Eisenberger recently became vice provost of the newly organized Earth Institute on Columbia's New York City campus and director of Lamont-Doherty.

Ashton B. Carter, Assistant Defense Secretary for International Security Policy, returned in September to Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government to lecture on international security issues. Carter, who earned bachelor's degrees in medieval history and physics from Yale University before receiving a PhD in theoretical physics from Oxford University in 1979, began his government career right after Oxford, when he worked at Congress's Office of Technology Assessment and then in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

At the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, John H. Gibbons, its director and President Clinton's science adviser, has lost his right-hand man, **Lionel Skipworth Johns**, who was associate director of technology. "Skip" Johns has been close to Gibbons since 1978, when Johns joined

Congress's Office of Technology Assessment, met Gibbons in Washington and soon began campaigning among members of Congress on OTA's board to name Gibbons to head the little agency. Gibbons was appointed the following year. Before joining OTA, Johns, a Navy aviator turned engineer, spent a decade in industry, with Hazeltine Corp, Magnavox and Ocean Science and Engineering. He even did a stint in corporate investment at Alex Brown and Sons, which wasn't too surprising, because he got a BS degree in finance from the University of Virginia. Johns insists he is retiring from the Washington science and technology scene—at least for the winter, which he will spend with his wife sailing his 40-foot ketch across the Caribbean and scuba diving around coral reefs.

Gerald T. Garvey completed two years as OSTP's associate director for physical sciences and engineering and returned to Los Alamos National Laboratory as a staff scientist on 30 August. His position at OSTP was taken on 16 September by **Beverly Hartline**, who is on one year's leave from the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, which until its dedication last May was known as the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, located in Newport News, Virginia. Hartline's position at the Jefferson Facility was associate director and project manager. Prior to joining CEBAF in 1985 she held jobs as scientific assistant for planning and development at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, research scientist at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center and research news writer at *Science* magazine.

In August President Clinton announced his intention to nominate eight new members to the National Science Board, which sets policy for the National Science Foundation. They would replace the eight members whose six-year terms ended last May. Before the new members can join the board, however, they must be confirmed by the Senate. In this case, the Senate, returning after Labor Day from its summer recess board, found itself swamped by a flood of legislation, including appropriations bills that had to be passed by the start of fiscal 1997 on 1 October, and put aside almost all of the President's nominations in its rush to adjourn in early October. As a consequence, the President will need to send this list of nominees back to the Senate when the 105th session begins in January. Clinton's nominees:

John A. Armstrong, former IBM vice president of science and technology and former member of the computer giant's corporate management

board. Armstrong, whose research fields were quantum electronics and laser physics, is best known recently for his writings and lectures on basic research in an era of limits on government and corporate budgets. He set forth his arguments in 1993 in the Karl Taylor Compton Lectures at MIT.

Mary Katherine Gaillard, professor of physics at the University of California, Berkeley, and a senior faculty scientist at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, where she works in theoretical particle physics and astrophysics. In 1988 the Department of Energy selected her for the E. O. Lawrence Memorial Award. The American Physical Society recognized her with the J. J. Sakurai Prize in 1993.

M. R. C. ("Marci") Greenwood, chancellor of the University of California, Santa Cruz, and former dean of graduate studies and vice provost at the University of California, Davis. She served for a year and a half as associate director for science in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. Her academic studies were in physiology and nutrition.

Stanley Vincent Jaskolski, chief technical officer and vice president of the Eaton Corp in Cleveland. He was a faculty member in the electrical engineering and computer sciences department at Marquette University for 15 years. In May 1997, Jaskolski will become president of the Industrial Research Institute.

Eamon M. Kelly, president of Tulane University and a former president of the Association of American Universities, which represents 64 leading research universities in the US and Canada. An economist, Kelly was previously at the Ford Foundation, where he was in charge of social development, the organization's largest domestic and civil rights division. He also was chairman of the Ford Foundation's satellite working group, which helped develop the nation's first satellite system for public broadcasting.

Vera C. Rubin, a research astronomer in the department of terrestrial magnetism of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. For her studies of the behavior of stars and galaxies, she was awarded the President's National Medal of Science in 1993.

Bob H. Suzuki, president of California State Polytechnic University in Pomona. He has conducted research in both aeronautical engineering and educational sociology.

Richard A. Tapia, the Noah Harding Professor of Computational and Applied Mathematics at Rice University. Tapia's fields are numerical analysis and optimization.

IRWIN GOODWIN ■