

# CENTERS?

interfere with their mutually complementary duties of training and research. Their first task is to measure their present position. Has the balance been displaced? Which way is it moving? What percentage of the research scientists on the campus are completely tied up in research projects, so that they are not giving courses? What fraction of the undergraduate training is carried on by junior assistants? Are graduate students, on the average, taking longer to get their advanced degrees than heretofore? Are they being assigned routine jobs in projects, which have little training value? What is the ratio of full-time to half-time assistantships? What fraction of projects requires special clearance before a student can be employed in them? What percentage of the project facilities are available, as a matter of course, for use in connection with thesis research? It is not difficult to measure the trend, if we so desire; it is much more difficult to decide what to do about it.

For ten years now these new pressures have been considered as temporary inconveniences, to be dealt with by makeshift expedients. It should be clear by now that they are not temporary; they will be with us for a long time. Our universities must learn to live with them, neither rejecting the subsidies nor being overwhelmed by them. The resulting new equilibrium probably will not be the same as the old. It may be that a certain fraction of the faculty will have to be immersed in project work; it is possible that a certain percentage of projects will have to be classified, or otherwise will become unsuitable for the assignment of student assistants.

Nevertheless the new balance must not slight any of the three tasks of the university. Whether we are in for a period of international crisis, as at the end of the eighteenth century, or one of general peace, as at the end of the nineteenth, our universities must continue to expand the frontiers of research, to train new generations of scientists, and to keep laymen aware of the broader import of science.

Philip M. Morse

## Institute doings

The so-called "Annual Meeting" of the AIP was held February 16, complying with New York corporation law. The Member Societies of the American Institute of Physics, Inc., gather in the shape of accredited proxies. The election of the Governing Board is their primary function and they are guided by a slate of nominations from Member Societies. The By-Laws state how many nominations each Society may make. It goes by size. There are now on the Board 5 from the Physical Society, 4 from the Association of Physics Teachers, 3 from the Optical Society, 3 from the Acoustical Society, and 1 from the Society of Rheology. The new roster of the Board appears on the title page of this journal. Those elected in February were from APS, G. B. Pegram to succeed himself and C. C. Lauritsen to succeed J. R. Oppenheimer; from OSA, W. F. Meggers to succeed Wallace R. Brode; from ASA, Hugh Knowles to succeed C. Paul Boner; from AAPT, Mark Zemansky to succeed Paul Kirkpatrick and R. M. Sutton to succeed H. K. Schilling. Also by popular ballot one Member-at-Large is elected each year. This year Karl K. Darrow was elected and the term of J. W. Beams ended.

The new Governing Board met all day March 15. After conducting general business, it re-elected G. R. Harrison as Chairman and W. Waterfall as Executive Secretary. G. B. Pegram continues in office as Treasurer and Henry A. Barton as Director. The Board being too large to meet often, it named, as usual, an Executive Committee: G. R. Harrison, G. P. Harnwell, G. B. Pegram, John C. Steinberg and Mark W. Zemansky.

Actions taken by the Board on the agenda items will be reported after details are worked out. Much time was spent on a new basis for that part of financial support of the AIP which comes from Member Societies, and this must be studied further. There was general assent to the idea that *Physics Today* should go to all AIP members and this will be worked out if possible. There was discussion whether reserve funds of the AIP should be invested exclusively in Government bonds and savings bank accounts, or whether a trust should be set up, with investment advisory service, to include industrial securities also. The former practice was adhered to for at least one year.

The possibility of joining with other organizations in a Natural Sciences Manpower Commission was considered, and the question of the Societies' desire to hold a joint meeting in 1956, possibly in New York, was raised. No final conclusions or actions resulted on these matters and they will be considered further.

Henry A. Barton