

University of Caen in 1966, although aimed at scientific and medical teaching and research, have become a classic prescription for the reform of the "statutes, structures and functions" of the French universities.

The dominant theme of the Caen conference was that France must face up to the fact that providing mass education at the university level requires a new kind of institution. The conference recommended that the size of uni-

versities be limited to 20,000 students and that each university be granted much greater autonomy, with the faculty sharing authority. The "feudal" system of professorial "chairs" should be abolished; departments in the American style should be created, as well as parallel, separately financed research institutes.

The recommendations give the inescapable impression of having been inspired by American models. It is sig-

nificant that the minister of education at the time of the conference, Christian Fouchet, rejected any implication of Americanization but did endorse in principle the Caen statement, with its stinging criticism of the status quo.

It is important to note that French higher education is a dual system. Before Napoleon created his Imperial University, the Ecole Polytechnique had been established to train military engineers for France's Revolutionary army.

NSF: Senator Warns against Budget Lobbying

The National Science Foundation last week was subjected to as ill-tempered a budget hearing as has ever occurred in the agency's 18 years of congressional appearances. The monetary outcome of the hearing, which was held before the Senate Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, is yet to be revealed. But if the subcommittee's mood is any measure, NSF is not destined to receive even the slimmed-down budget that it brought to Capitol Hill. Furthermore, Colorado's Senator Gordon Allott, who is ranking Republican on the subcommittee, took the extraordinary step of warning NSF to refrain from repeating the lobbying campaign that helped retrieve part of the Foundation's budget last year (*Science*, 20 October 1967). Though there was no evidence that NSF directly inspired that campaign, Allott charged that NSF turned its clients loose on the U.S. Congress—in direct violation, as he took pains to stress, of the Crimes and Criminal Procedures provisions of the U.S. Code. "I would say every Senator in the United States Senate was absolutely besieged and lobbied by his college people in his own state . . .," Allott declared. "I believe that the members of the NSF may have utilized to a considerable extent or to a lesser extent moneys of the Federal government in contacting various institutions throughout the country. . . . If we have a recurrence of a situation like that again, I assure you that there is going to be a long and prolonged and detailed investigation into the situation."

No discussion was held on why NSF should be barred from even discreetly playing a game that is blatantly engaged in by virtually every other federal agency. Allott was the only member of the subcommittee to discuss the issue, and NSF officials prudently let the matter pass without comment.

The rest of the hearing, which was on NSF's request for obligational authority totaling \$527 million, was mainly either neutral in tone or downright hostile. Thus, when the subcommittee came to NSF's social science programs, Chairman Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash.) asked for details about some of the research that is supported under a \$1.5-million item for various projects in political science. Referring to a project at the University of Michigan on the formation of political interests, Howard H. Hines, division director for social science, replied, "They are interested in studying to find out how it is, for example,

that children get interested in politics and develop their early ideas about politics."

Replied Magnuson, "Are you kidding me?"

Hines replied that he was not, and added that the Michigan project was only one of a number that came out of the \$1.5 million. To which Magnuson answered, "I don't quite understand that. I think maybe we can help you out and save \$1.5 million."

"Or maybe more," said Allott.

The dialogue was joined by Senator Allen J. Ellender (D-La.) who said, "If you go down the list, you will save more than that."

Magnuson, author of the bill that created NSF in 1950, observed of NSF's social science activities, "In the first place, this was hardly the intention of the Science Foundation. You don't have explicit authority to go even into social sciences, although I am not objecting to it. . . ."

When NSF director Leland J. Haworth argued that it is important to study "the whole theory and practice of how political systems work," Magnuson dismissed this with, "That is history."

Allott took up NSF's social science role by observing, "I am inclined to think that if this came to the floor of Congress today, that these things would be eliminated."

Haworth responded by noting that the House passed a bill [H.R. 5404, introduced by Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.)] that, among other things, would give NSF explicit authority to support the social sciences. Haworth noted the bill has been reported out of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and will shortly come to the floor. To which Magnuson responded, "You are in for some trouble."

Last year, when the subcommittee cut up the NSF budget, a rescue party was led by Senator Fred Harris (D-Okla.), with the assistance of Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.). This year, both are heavily engaged in the presidential campaign—Harris in behalf of Vice President Humphrey and Kennedy in behalf of his brother. Furthermore, though budget-cutting fervor was in ample supply last year, it is nothing short of frenetic this year. On the basis of Allott's warnings, those in the direct employ of NSF would be well advised to stay aloof from a new rescue attempt. But there is nothing to prevent private citizens from exercising their constitutional right to petition.

—D. S. GREENBERG