

comparatively low drop-out rate among the carefully screened nonresidents.

A survey made a few years ago showed only one-fourth of the faculty members of professional rank to be native North Carolinians; the remainder had come from 40 states and 15 foreign countries. Faculty members with their Ph.D.'s from Ivy League universities easily outnumbered those who had earned theirs at UNC; 58 were from Harvard alone.

UNC's academic strength was attested to recently when the university emerged with a high rating from an American Council on Education's evaluation of the graduate programs at 107 institutions. The evaluation, based on 5400 questionnaires sent to department chairmen and other scholars, gave UNC an "A" rating in ten departments, a "B" in four, and a "C" in two, for a higher average standing than that of any other southern university (though Duke and the University of Texas were close behind). UNC was strongest in the social sciences and humanities, but the mathematics, psychology, and chemistry departments were among those receiving an "A."

The current controversy, which places in hazard all the university's attainments, might never have developed except for the naiveté of the sponsors of the speaker-ban law. Some appear dumbfounded at the furor they have aroused. The measure was introduced by Representative Phil Godwin, a legislator from a rural eastern county. "When the bill was prepared, I just couldn't see anything wrong with it or that anybody in the State of North Carolina would ever object to it," Godwin said recently. Godwin's explanation that he meant only to protect students from the influence of communist visitors is puzzling. The communist speakers who have appeared in Chapel Hill have not been numerous, even when one goes back to the Depression years of the 1930's to begin counting them. A few known or suspected communists, including a left-wing poet invited by a group of English graduate students, spoke at UNC during the 3 years preceding enactment of the speaker ban. These appearances generated no great excitement on campus. A student leader recalls that only 14 people were present to hear an extreme leftist labor leader, and that this modest audience included three newspaper reporters and two monitors from the American Legion, both of them red-blooded, 100-percent Americans. Even

the students were unsympathetic; the speaker found himself ringed by hostile questioners.

The belief persists that civil rights demonstrations going on in Raleigh, where the General Assembly was in session, either provoked the speaker ban or provided its emotional impetus, although Godwin has denied this. Five days before the speaker-ban bill was introduced, Albert Amon, an assistant professor of psychology at Chapel Hill, together with a faculty member from the consolidated university's Raleigh campus, was spotted taking part in a demonstration at the Sir Walter Hotel, where most of the legislators were quartered. Some outraged legislators called William Friday, President of the university, and said both men should be fired. Friday replied that faculty members are not dismissed except by an elaborate procedure safeguarding their rights. No action ever was taken against either man, although each was counseled by his chancellor against behavior hurtful to the university. Amon, who had a history of ill health, died the next year. The other demonstrator has left the Raleigh faculty, but for reasons said to be unrelated to his civil rights activities. An appropriate footnote to the incident is that one of the first legislators to complain of the faculty men's part in the Sir Walter demonstration later resigned his seat to become state commander of the American Legion, which is perhaps the speaker ban's most passionate defender.

The General Assembly was sharply criticized by the state press for its hasty enactment of the speaker ban, which applied not only to Chapel Hill but to other campuses (at Raleigh, Greensboro, and, now, a new one at Charlotte) of the consolidated university and to other state-owned colleges as well. Officials and faculty throughout the university system denounced the measure. The Board of Trustees scored it as a preemption of its prerogatives and an impairment of academic freedom. No sustained campaign was mounted against the speaker-ban law until this year, however. University officials hoped that with some quiet prompting the General Assembly would see its error and repeal the law at its 1965 session.

Nothing of the kind happened. Governor Dan Moore, a UNC alumnus who does not favor the law, has been criticized for not moving forcefully at the beginning of the session to get the speaker ban repealed, either outright or

by an amendment permitting the law's proponents to save face. Moore held back, however, and by the time he began to count votes the controversy had flared alarmingly and the prospects for repeal were discouraging. A telegram to the trustees from the accrediting agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, was interpreted by some legislators as a bald threat, to which they would never bow. Enough legislators had had second thoughts about the speaker ban that a majority probably regretted its passage; but to vote for repeal of this "anti-communist" measure, which many legislators believed to be popular with their constituents, was quite another matter.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

(A second article in this space next week will discuss the current status of North Carolina's speaker-ban controversy.)

Congress: Higher Education Act Including Scholarship for Needy Passed in Final Days of Session

Last week the House and Senate gave final passage to a higher education bill which tops off 2 years of unprecedented legislative activity in behalf of education.

The new law, authorizing a \$2.3-billion potpourri of programs, combines major features of bills passed independently by the House and Senate and exceeds original administration proposals in both variety of programs and cost.

In common with the Elementary and Secondary School Act passed last spring (*Science*, 22 January 1965), the new law has a full educational-opportunity rationale. Such a bill was what President Johnson had in mind when he spoke in his education message of an intention "to extend the opportunity for higher education more broadly among lower and middle income families."

Opening the debate on the House-Senate conference report on the legislation last Wednesday, House Education and Labor Committee chairman Adam Clayton Powell (D-N.Y.) put this sanguinely when he said, "Both Chambers and both sides of the aisle sought compromise with one goal in mind—the enactment this year of legislation that will revitalize the tired blood of our anemic colleges and universities and pump needy students into the all too upper class main stream of academic life."

The higher education bill agreed upon in conference passed the House by a top-heavy vote of 312 to 62 and sailed through the Senate on a voice vote, but it had a curiously checkered legislative history replete with difficulties and delays. The House bill, for example, was reported out by the House Education and Labor Committee on 14 July but not enacted upon until 26 August. The Senate version was reported out of committee on 1 September and passed the next day. On both sides of Capitol Hill the votes were overwhelmingly in favor of the measure.

The failure to take the measure to conference to reconcile differences before the lust for adjournment had Congress in its grip was in part due to the extraordinary busyness of the committees throughout this session. But fears of disagreement over some provisions—particularly scholarships for needy students and the so-called Teacher Corps—also contributed to dilatory handling of the bill.

When the issue was finally drawn the Teacher Corps did cause trouble, particularly in the House of Representatives. President Johnson had espoused the idea of a corps of volunteers—both experienced teachers and newly graduated “teacher interns”—to serve in poverty-area schools. And a measure drafted by Senators Nelson of Wisconsin and Kennedy of Massachusetts had the strong backing of Senate conferees. But House Republicans were dead set against the proposal, and Democratic support appeared to be lukewarm in the House at large. At one point Powell appeared to be ready to give up the Teacher Corps but was persuaded to make a fight for it.

Discussion of the Teacher Corps dominated the short House debate on the conference report, and when a vote was taken on a Republican motion to recommit the bill to committee for amputation of the Teacher Corps, the move was defeated by a rather surprising margin of 74 in a vote of 226 to 152.

At the heart of the controversy was the issue of federal control. The Teacher Corps provision is the section of the higher education bill which most directly affects local school districts and is therefore the most sensitive. Opponents of the corps argued that since its teachers would be selected, given some training, and paid under federal auspices, their presence in schools would introduce a measure of federal

control. Proponents responded that no federal control would be involved since local school officials who requested the services of Teacher Corps members would have the power to “hire and fire” and direct them, and federal funds for salaries would be disbursed by the school authorities.

The vote on the higher education authorization act would appear to have settled the matter, but on the very next day both houses of Congress accepted a supplemental appropriations bill which cut out all of \$13.2 million in “start-up” money for the Teacher Corps. There has been many a slip between authorization and appropriations actions in Congress, particularly in the frenzied final days of a session. The question of whether this leaving of the Teacher Corps in limbo is evidence of deep-running doubts about it or simply another eleventh-hour caprice will have to wait until the next session for an answer. When Congress returns in January, it is assumed, a recuperated President Johnson will take a personal interest in the corps, and a move to finance it will have a good chance of succeeding.

As to what else is in prospect for education legislation, the situation differs from any in recent years. Passage of bumper crops of education legislation in the last three sessions has virtually wound up what most advocates of federal aid consider the unfinished business of the last decade.

In respect to education, however, Congress should not look forward to a restful spring and summer. Several important education laws are due to expire, and action to extend them will be required. And it is known that administration scouts are seeking ideas for new legislation.

Furthermore, a new and possibly strained period in relations over education between the administration and the Congress—particularly the House—appears to have dawned. As Great Society programs have advanced in Congress, education legislation has increasingly been pushed into areas formerly regarded as the terrain of social and welfare legislation. The Poverty Act, for example, contained several programs which fell to the Office of Education to administer. At the same time, recent civil-rights legislation imposed new responsibilities on the Office of Education for the enforcement of antidiscrimination regulations in the disbursing of federal funds.

It happens that Powell, who repre-

sents the Harlem district in Congress, is patron of a big antipoverty project in New York City whose administrators have been somewhat at odds with city and federal officials. Early in the last session Powell appointed a special investigating committee to look into the Poverty program. Powell himself has been critical of some aspects of the program and particularly of operations in Chicago. His special ire, on civil-rights grounds, has been directed at Chicago school superintendent Benjamin Willis. And Powell was plainly piqued by Office of Education action in examining charges of discriminatory practices in Chicago schools and then releasing federal funds which had been briefly tied up. Powell's irritation has been expressed recently in some “Keppel must go” statements directed at Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel. Powell also said that the time is ripe for establishment of a joint Senate-House Committee on Education, a move which would presumably enable Congress to exert more leverage on the Executive in education matters.

To head the House investigation of the Office of Education, Powell named Representative Edith Green (D-Ore.), chairman of the subcommittee which deals with higher-education legislation. Mrs. Green has lately indicated that she feels so much education legislation has been passed that the time for reflection and appraisal has arrived. She objected to some portions of the Elementary and Secondary Education bill on the score of the church-state issue, and her enthusiasm for the higher-education bill, as reflected in the debate, was restrained, although she did vote with the administration on the bill, both on the Teacher Corps provision and on final passage. All in all she is not currently one of the administration's biggest boosters on the committee.

The thrust of the proposed investigation of OED was summed up in Powell's introductory remarks on the floor.

“I want to take this opportunity to point out that we in the Education and Labor Committee are fully cognizant of the rapid changes taking place both in education in America and the Office of Education's administration of vast amounts of Federal funds. How well are these funds being administered? Is the Office of Education fulfilling its role as administrative watchdog of discriminatory practices in educational institutions receiving federal funds? Is the Office of Education completely

Main Features: Higher Education Act of 1965

Title I: Community Service and Continuing Education Programs

Grants totaling \$25 million in the current fiscal year and \$50 million in each of the two following fiscal years are authorized for programs in institutions of higher education to assist in the "solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation and land use." These are matching grants. The federal share is 75 percent in the first 2 years and 50 percent in the third year of the program.

Title II: College Library Assistance and Library Training and Research

This section is designed to enable colleges and universities to acquire new materials, improve the quality of services, and train librarians. Part A authorizes \$50 million in each of 3 years in grants for purchase of library materials. Part B authorizes \$15 million in fiscal 1966 and the same in 1967 and 1968 for grants to institutions to assist in training of persons in "librarianship" and for research projects relating to the improvement of libraries or the improvement of training in librarianship. Part C authorizes \$5 million this year and amounts rising to \$7.7 in fiscal 1968 to the Library of Congress for the acquisition of materials published abroad and the provision of catalog information on these materials.

Title III: Strengthening Developing Institutions

This is a 1-year program which authorizes \$55 million to "assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and the potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life."

Funds will go into grants to support cooperative agreements among developing institutions and other colleges and universities and also into a program of "National Teaching Fellowships" for "highly qualified graduate students and junior members of the faculty of colleges and universities to encourage such individuals to teach at developing institutions." The term of the fellowships would not exceed two academic years and the stipend would not be more than \$6500 a year plus allowances for dependents.

Title IV: Student Assistance

Funds totaling \$70 million a year for 3 years, beginning with the school years 1966-1967, would be authorized for "educational opportunity grants" to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means would not otherwise be able to attend college. An annual limit of \$1000 would be set on each grant, but the average is expected to be about \$500.

In addition, a program of federal insurance for

student loans is established to benefit those who find that funds from state and other nonprofit plans are not "reasonably accessible." Limits on insurable loans would be \$1000 a year for undergraduates and \$1500 for graduate students. An interest subsidy is provided for students from families with annual adjusted incomes of less than \$15,000, with the government paying all interest costs while the student is in college and partial interest costs of 3 percent thereafter.

Changes affecting two other federal programs of student assistance are also included in this section. The work study program established by the Poverty Act will be transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education, and funds authorized for the program are increased. The National Defense Education Act is amended in a way which will tighten administration of the NDEA loan program and also extend the forgiveness feature of the program to permit persons who teach in areas with a high concentration of low-income families to cancel their obligation at the rate of 15 percent a year.

Title V: Teacher Programs

A National Teacher Corps is established with an authorization of \$36.1 million for the current fiscal year and \$64.7 million for 1967. Experienced teachers and "teacher-interns" with bachelor's degrees would be recruited for periods of up to 2 years. Local education agencies having a high concentration of children from low-income families could draw on the Teacher Corps for experienced teachers or teaching teams. Costs, including salaries of the teachers and costs of their training, would be paid by the federal government to the school district.

Another section of this title authorizes 4500 fellowships in the current fiscal year and 10,000 in each of the succeeding 2 years to persons pursuing a graduate degree other than that of doctor of philosophy or the equivalent for periods of up to 24 months.

Title VI: Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction

Totals of \$35 million for the current fiscal year, \$50 million for fiscal 1967, and \$60 million for 1968 are authorized for the acquisition, by institutions of higher education, of laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual equipment, for use in undergraduate instruction.

An additional \$2.5 million in this fiscal year and \$10 million for the two succeeding years are to be made available to institutions of higher education for acquisition of television equipment.

Title VII: Amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

Current authorizations were doubled, funds for undergraduate facilities in the current fiscal year being increased from \$230 million to \$460 million and for graduate education facilities from \$60 million to \$120 million.

equipped within its administrative apparatus to shift from a comparatively unimportant agency to a major dispenser of federal funds in American education? How professionally able and skilled are those administering the Office of Education? Does a cohesive ideological philosophy guide the Office of Education?"

Until now Keppel's relations with Congress have been excellent, and there is every evidence that he retains the full confidence of the new Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John Gardner, and of the President. But creation of a joint committee acquisitive of power—something which seems by no means certain of happening—or investigation by a committee out of sympathy with the Office of Education, could produce an atmosphere markedly different from that in which all that education legislation was enacted.

—JOHN WALSH

Announcements

Vanderbilt University has established a Ph.D. program in **environmental sciences** as a joint effort of the departments of electrical engineering and of preventive medicine and public health. The program will be administered by the electrical engineering department. Doctoral research will be conducted into areas relating to both space and public health sciences, and will include such fields as control of special environments, models of bacteria transport, disease migration in various environments, life support systems, and environmental factors in occupational health. Information on the program is available from the director of studies, William K. Roots, Department of Electrical Engineering, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

Meeting Notes

An international congress of **comparative pathology** will take place in Beirut, Lebanon, next 11–18 September. Papers are invited for symposiums on pathologic problems concerning overcrowding, flu in comparative pathology, problems concerning Mediterranean countries, and recent progress in heart surgery. Papers, no more than 15 pages, must be submitted by 31 December; they will be published before the congress. (L. Grollet, Boite Postale No. 100, Paris 17, France.

J. K. Frenkel, Department of Pathology and Oncology, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City 66103)

The ninth international **cancer** congress will be held in Tokyo 23–29 October 1966. Papers, exhibits, and films are invited on experimental or clinical aspects of cancer or on cancer control.

Moon Songs

The American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers has published a list of titles of hit tunes published between 1914 and 1964 and of the great song hits of the years 1892 to 1913. *Moon* appears in 43 of these titles (see page 557):

- 1906 - Moonbeams
- 1908 - Shine on Harvest Moon
- 1909 - By the Light of the Silvery Moon
- 1912 - Moonlight Bay
- 1917 - Give Me the Moonlight, Give Me the Girl
- 1920 - Pale Moon
- 1921 - Swanee River Moon
- 1922 - 'Neath the South Sea Moon
- 1925 - Moonlight and Roses
- 1926 - Moonlight on the Ganges
- 1927 - Silver Moon
- 1928 - Carolina Moon
- 1928 - Get Out and Get Under the Moon
- 1930 - Lazy Lou'siana Moon
- 1930 - Moonlight on the Colorado
- 1931 - When the Moon Comes over the Mountain
- 1931 - Wabash Moon
- 1932 - Underneath the Harlem Moon
- 1933 - It's Only a Paper Moon
- 1933 - In the Valley of the Moon
- 1933 - My Moonlight Madonna
- 1933 - Orchids in the Moonlight
- 1934 - Blue Moon
- 1934 - The Moon Was Yellow
- 1934 - Moonglow
- 1935 - Moon over Miami
- 1936 - In the Chapel in the Moonlight
- 1936 - Moonlight and Shadows
- 1937 - The Moon Got in My Eyes
- 1939 - Moon Love
- 1939 - Moonlight Serenade
- 1939 - Oh! You Crazy Moon
- 1940 - How High the Moon
- 1941 - Moonlight Cocktail
- 1942 - Moonlight Becomes You
- 1942 - Velvet Moon
- 1946 - Full Moon and Empty Arms
- 1951 - Marshmallow Moon
- 1954 - Fly Me to the Moon
- 1956 - Moonlight Gambler
- 1957 - Mountains beyond the Moon
- 1958 - Go Chase a Moonbeam
- 1961 - Moon River

U.S. contributors must submit abstracts to the U.S. National Committee on the International Union Against Cancer. Deadline: 15 January. The U.S. National Committee is offering a limited number of travel grants to the congress for U.S. citizens or residents. Letters of application must be countersigned by the applicant's department director or administrative officer. They should include the titles of pertinent publications in cancer or related fields within the last 5 years. Persons planning to present a paper at the congress should include a 250-word abstract; others should include abstracts of their major current research, and invited participants should indicate what other expenses will be involved. Six copies of the letters and abstracts are required. Charter flights to the Congress, arranged by Garber's Travel Service, 1406 Beacon Street, Brookline 46, Massachusetts, are available to members of the medical sciences section of the AAAS and bonafide registrants of the Congress. Deadline: 15 January. (Chairman, U.S. National Committee on the International Union Against Cancer, Room 256, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20418)

The American Physical Society is soliciting papers on **neutron cross-section technology**, particularly on topics relating to measurements and applications, for a conference in Washington 22–24 March. Abstracts of up to 200 words are required; deadline: 20 December. (W. W. Havens, Jr., Department of Physics, Columbia University, New York 10027)

Scientists in the News

Harold C. Bold, chairman of the University of Texas botany department, has been elected president of the Botanical Society of America. He is to take office 1 January.

Roger D. Williams, professor of surgery at Ohio State University, has been appointed chairman of the department of surgery at the University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, effective 1 November.

Richard M. Adams has been appointed assistant director of Argonne National Laboratory. He had been scientific assistant to the director.