

cent of engineering students—are concentrated in Paris in splendid isolation from the universities. (The influence of these elite schools and the problems they create in French research and technical education will be discussed in another article.)

Limiting growth in Paris is not a simple matter. Historically the best teachers have been attracted to Paris, and there has always been an inflow of provincial students. To cut this traffic radically would be viewed as discrimination. The policy of decentralization in higher education, however, has been given strong impetus by the government's program of regional development. The economic case for strengthening provincial higher education is especially cogent in the sciences, and the French equivalent of a "new centers of excellence" program seems to promise genuine competition for

Paris. Grenoble has already established its reputation as a center of physics research, and the science and engineering departments at Bordeaux seem set for a central role in the development of an electronics-aerospace complex around Toulouse.

Decentralization is also intended to help the cause of democratization in French education. There are pronounced regional inequalities in education, reflected in the percentages, by age group, of students who complete secondary school and enter the university. The major cities, and particularly Paris, lead other areas, especially rural France, by a wide margin. A recent study showed that only 2.5 percent of university students are children of farmers. In the 1950's the government started serious efforts to stem this waste of talent, with a series of education reforms under a policy of "investing in

men," but much remains to be done. Not until next year, for example, will a sizable scholarship program for peasants' children be launched.

The French have not solved their crisis of numbers in higher education, but they are putting into effect a program of reforms of a kind still only being debated in Germany and Italy. The trouble is that the recent outbreaks bring into doubt the willingness of French students to accept these reforms.

Government policy assumes that a reformed university will fulfill the needs of modern society. The student militants, however, have given violent emphasis during the past 2 weeks to their argument that the role of the university is not to be a service academy for the technological society but an agent for the transformation of that society.—JOHN WALSH

## Federal Aid: House Votes To Deny Funds to Campus Rebels

In a fit of resentment against recent campus disturbances, the House of Representatives last week voted to deny National Science Foundation support and various forms of Office of Education aid to individuals who participate in riots or who willfully commit serious infractions of university regulations. The restrictions face an uncertain future, for they must still be considered by the Senate, but the legislation has potentially far-reaching impact. It would cover about 1.25 million students receiving educational assistance and about 30,000 students and teachers receiving NSF support. Moreover, some congressmen hope to place similar restrictions on virtually all federal aid to college students and teachers.

The House action brought swift cries of outrage. Donald F. Hornig, the president's science adviser, likened it to "cutting off one's nose to spite one's face." And Harold Howe II, commissioner of education, labeled the restrictions "unfair, unnecessary, totally unmanageable, totally destructive, a dangerous precedent, and a triumph of resentment over wisdom."

The House action caught almost ev-

eryone concerned by surprise. It seems to have originated as a spontaneous outburst of indignation by a few congressmen, but it clearly struck a responsive nerve and won overwhelming support from House members. The move to crack down on campus rebels was launched by Representative Louis C. Wyman (R-New Hampshire) who lamented in a floor speech on 7 May that "infraction of university rules . . . has assumed disturbing proportions in recent months." Wyman, who was particularly critical of disturbances at Columbia University, said he would offer an amendment to the appropriations bill for NSF that would deny NSF funds to "any individual certified by the president of any educational institution to the director of the National Science Foundation as having . . . refused to obey a willful order of university authorities."

However, when Wyman actually introduced his amendment on the following day, there was no mention of having university authorities certify that an individual had refused to obey orders. The amendment simply said that no part of the NSF appropriation could

assist "any individual who at any time after the effective date of this act willfully refuses to obey a lawful regulation of the university or college which he is attending or at which he is employed." That leaves NSF in charge of determining who has disobeyed university rules—a task which one NSF official claims is "difficult, if not ridiculous."

Wyman said his amendment was "intended as a help to the institutions in controlling their own internal affairs." He stressed that "no part of this amendment limits or otherwise restricts the grant of funds to the institution itself—it applies solely to individuals." When asked if the amendment covered minor infractions of university rules, such as cutting classes, Wyman replied: "The intention, of course, is that the infraction shall relate to a disruption of the university or college administration. . . . There is no intention to penalize anyone by cutting off a scholarship for a minor infraction." Wyman said he hadn't specifically worded the amendment to exclude minor infractions because he had been advised it would then be subject to a point of order. After only a brief discussion, Wyman's amendment was adopted by voice vote, with the understanding that its wording might be "perfected."

On the next day, 9 May, it was the Office of Education's turn. While considering a bill to extend four student assistance programs [namely, the low-interest student loan program under

the National Defense Education Act (NDEA); the college work-study program; the program of educational opportunity grants under the Higher Education Act; and the guaranteed loan program under the Higher Education Act], the House adopted three more restrictive amendments.

The first, introduced by Representative Neal Smith (D-Iowa), provided that "No loan, guarantee of a loan, or grant . . . shall be awarded to any applicant who has been convicted by any court of general jurisdiction of any crime which involves . . . force, trespass, or the seizure of property under control of an institution of higher education. . . ."

The second, introduced by Wyman, denied educational assistance to "any individual who, at any time after the effective date of this act, willfully refuses to obey a lawful regulation or order of the university or college which he is attending or at which he is employed when such willful refusal is certified by the appropriate university or college authority to have been of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of university or college administration. . . ."

The third, introduced by Representative William J. Scherle (R-Iowa), denied assistance to "any individual convicted in any federal, state or local court . . . of inciting, promoting or carrying on a riot, or convicted of any group activity resulting in material damage to property, or injury to persons. . . ."

Wyman's amendment was placed in the portion of the bill relating to NDEA, but the congressman intended it to apply to all of the educational aid programs covered in the bill, and a House legal expert believes it is worded in such a way that it does, indeed, apply to all four programs. The matter may be clarified before the bill becomes law. The other two amendments clearly apply to all four programs.

The three amendments passed easily by voice votes, but the strength of feeling against campus rebels became fully apparent when a separate vote was demanded on Wyman's amendment. The tally was 306 yeas, 54 nays, and 73 not voting.

Congressmen who supported the amendments generally argued that it is a "privilege" to receive federal financial assistance and that the taxpayers should not be expected to support students who disrupt university life. As Repre-

sentative Otis G. Pike (D-New York) expressed it: "I have told my own children . . . that they can do anything they want to at college. They can tie up the dean. . . . They can steal papers out of the office. They can do anything, because I am physically unable to prevent them. My son can beat me up, and my daughter is too old for spanking. But, if they do these things, they are not going to do them at my expense. They are going to do them at their own expense. . . ."

Opponents criticized the amendments on a variety of grounds, including the following:

► Some of the amendments punish individuals without due process of law, a factor which may make them unconstitutional.

► All of the amendments discriminate against the poor, since they would not affect wealthy students who are not receiving federal assistance.

► The amendments constitute a threat to academic freedom since the federal government would, in essence, be intruding in internal university matters.

► The amendments attempt to use scientific and educational aid programs as a punitive device, a use for which they were never intended. If Congress wants to punish college demonstrators, it should use a more direct approach.

► Federal assistance is not a "privilege" or a reward for good behavior, as Congress seems to think, but is an investment aimed at producing trained manpower and research in the national interest. The amendments may thus undercut the national interest.

► The amendments might actually aggravate tense campus situations because there would be bitter controversy over whether to invoke the sanctions.

► The amendments introduce numerous practical difficulties. Will they, for example, discourage banks and other lending institutions from participating in the guaranteed college loan program?

The future of the restrictive legislation is not completely clear. Congressman Wyman plans to offer similar amendments to every suitable bill that comes along. Meanwhile, the House Committee on Education and Labor, whose chairman Carl D. Perkins (D-Kentucky) expressed concern over the lack of thought given to the ramifications of the amendments, plans to hold hearings on the best way to deal with college disruptions. And whatever the House does must still be approved by

the Senate, with any differences resolved in a joint House-Senate conference committee.

Some observers think the restrictions are so unworkable and so unlikely to be invoked that it may not make much difference whether the legislation passes. Others believe the legislation might be challenged in court. But one wag is convinced he has hit on a sure-fire way to stop the drive for restrictive legislation. He suggests that students form a Wyman for Congress Club and hold a disruptive demonstration at the University of New Hampshire, in Wyman's home state.—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

## APPOINTMENTS



E. T. Hayes



W. R. Hibbard, Jr.

**Earl T. Hayes**, deputy director of the Bureau of Mines, to director of the bureau. Hayes is succeeding **Walter R. Hibbard, Jr.**, who is leaving to become vice president of research and development of Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation. . . . **John K. Hulm**, director of the solid-state sciences department, Westinghouse Research Laboratories, will represent private industry on the NSF Advisory Committee for Science Education. . . . **James M. Roxburgh**, administrator of the scholarship and fellowship programs at the National Research Council in Ottawa, to secretary of the Medical Research Council. . . . **George C. Sponsler III**, director of the Center for Exploratory Studies for the Federal Systems Division of IBM, to executive secretary of the division of engineering of the National Research Council. . . . **Donald F. Squires**, deputy director of the Smithsonian's Museum of Natural History, to director of the Marine Sciences Research Center of the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

*Erratum:* In the report, "Tritiated digoxin binding to (Na<sup>+</sup> + K<sup>+</sup>)-activated adenosine triphosphatase: possible allosteric site" by Arnold Schwartz *et al.* (p. 323, 19 Apr.), the opening parentheses of line 6, column 3, has been omitted. The line should read "(Na<sup>+</sup> + K<sup>+</sup>)-activated adenosine triphosphatase. . . ." The last line of paragraph 1 should read "K<sup>+</sup>-dependent phosphatase reaction (6)" and not ". . . phosphate reaction. . . ."