

future. "The main thing is that people are mystified and therefore conclude that something very sinister is going on. It is not known to what extent research is related to war." The demand is for "real information," he said; "the question for scientists and universities is—are they being used?"

CBW is likely to get another Parliamentary airing when the question of privilege is decided. At the center of the case is Labor MP Tam Dalyell, who makes no bones about having discussed the unpublished report of his committee with the *Observer* reporter. His action, Dalyell says, was the result of his interest in seeing the activities of government research establishments linked more effectively to civilian

uses. The committee visited Porton as part of its current study of defense research establishments, not because of a specific interest in CBW. Dalyell says he thinks there are "vast resources of highly skilled manpower in these establishments" not being properly utilized.

Dalyell is a talented and insistent user of the parliamentary question to focus attention on issues in the scientific and technical arena which he regards as important. The government sometimes seems to regard Dalyell's questions as embarrassing. He was a constant critic of the ill-starred variable-geometry aircraft project, and chief advocate of preserving the ecologically interesting atoll Aldabra in the Indian Ocean, which was spared from being

used as a military staging post. On the CBW issue Dalyell describes himself not as an opponent of defensive research on CBW, but as a believer in open science.

Within Parliament, support for shifting control of Porton out of the ministry of defense now seems to be strongest among parliamentary Labor Party leftwing members who are particularly distressed by British government support of U.S. policy in Vietnam and who see the CBW issue in the context of British-U.S. cooperative arrangements. Support could certainly grow as more is learned about Porton.

A fair amount, in fact, is already known. The center is located about 80 miles southwest of London on Salisbury

Senate Aims Blow at Colleges That Bar Recruiters

The Senate tried to whip rebellious colleges and students back in line last week, by adding an amendment to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) authorization bill which would deny NASA grants to institutions that bar Armed Forces recruiters from their campuses. Presented by Senator Carl T. Curtis (R-Neb.), the amendment was similar in spirit to last month's action of the House of Representatives in voting to deny National Science Foundation and Office of Education funds to rebellious students (*Science*, 17 May).

Speaking for his amendment on 10 June, Curtis said that he believed "institutions have an obligation, patriotic in nature, and in the interests of our country to cooperate with programs of the U.S. Government. . . . I do not believe that very many universities will continue this practice [of barring recruiters] if Congress takes this action." Cosponsors of the amendment included Senators Margaret Chase Smith (R-Me.), John Stennis (D-Miss.), and Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), all military-minded conservative members of the Senate.

Although on the surface the amendment is aimed at simply forcing the colleges that ban recruiters to stop doing so, its actual results and effects might be different and far-reaching. Most NASA officials refused to comment, but one did say that the amendment would "create definite problems." He told *Science* that NASA's opinion on the amendment had not been sought. Out of the 22 institutions that now bar recruiters,* seven receive money from NASA. "Presumably some of those grants will be renewable," he said, "and then we will have to worry about this amendment." An even larger part of NASA's

academic program—which involves grants and contracts totaling some \$100 million in about 200 institutions—could be affected if the war in Vietnam continues and more universities bar military recruiters from campus.

Defense Department (DOD) officials are also somewhat unhappy about the amendment. In a letter to a NASA official, Albert B. Fitt, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, said that DOD "would strongly oppose sanctions" on the schools that bar recruiters. He called them "isolated situations, which are, in the large majority of cases, considered temporary suspensions rather than permanent prohibitions." He said that "in the long run" such sanctions could "serve to handicap" the entire DOD student recruitment program.

Objections to the amendment from other sources are based on the expected side effects. In actuality, opponents say, the amendment punishes people who really have nothing to do with the various institutions' decisions to bar recruiters. In essence, they argue, NASA and university scientists are the ones who will suffer—not the militant students and the administrators who succumb to their demand that recruiters be barred. The militant students may actually take some satisfaction from the amendment, seeing NASA, another vestige of the federal presence at the university, removed from their campus.

Although the amendment may not be considered terribly important by the Senate (only about 20 Senators were on the floor when the amendment was agreed to, by a voice vote), it would have significant effects on universities. Whether the amendment will make it through the House-Senate conference on the NASA authorization is uncertain as of this writing—as is the status of the House restrictions on the NSF and Office of Education appropriations—but the amendment does represent another example of many congressmen's increasingly critical view of protests on college campuses.

—ANDREW JAMISON

*According to the Department of Defense, as of 8 May the following schools have policies of barring recruiters for one or more of the military services from campus: Columbia, Fordham, New York University, Brandeis, Syracuse, University of Massachusetts at Boston, Howard, New York University at Queens, Rutgers, Upsala, Barnard, College of New Rochelle, Finch, Long Island University, Pratt Institute, Queens, Sarah Lawrence, Central State, Hood, Oberlin, Wilberforce, and the University of Puerto Rico. The first seven now have grants from NASA.