Representative Emilio Q. Daddario of Connecticut, chairman of the science subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, has a bill to establish a Department of Resources, Environment, and Population. A key idea here is that, unless resources and population are kept in balance, conservation efforts are sure to fail. In the Senate, Frank Moss of Utah, Clifford Case of New Jersey, and Mike Gravel of Alaska also are proposing the establishment of a new agency, theirs to be called the Department of Conservation and the Environment. The Department of the Interior would be abolished, with most of the bureaus now within it being absorbed by the new department. But units such as the Office of Oil and Gas and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries would be transferred to the Department of Commerce. While this would relieve some of the conflicts now present within the Department of the Interior, it would obviously create new problems of coordination.

Political interest in the environmental-quality issue is such that it seems likely that, within the next year or so, legislation of some sort will be enacted in an effort to improve decision-making in this field. According to Senator Jackson, there is now "general agreement" between him and the Nixon Administration on the need for his proposed council of environmental advisers. Actually, the Administration's attitude seems to be more one of acquiescence in the Jackson proposal than of wholehearted endorsement. There is, in fact, reason to think that the Muskie bill setting up an office to support the President's interagency council comes closer to the Administration's desires.

But whatever the nature of the new mechanisms which it may ultimately prescribe, Congress is putting the heat on the Administration to deliver on its promises to translate the "new conservation" from doctrine into practice.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

Campus Unrest: Congress Ponders Federal Sanctions on Universities

An effort to translate public resentment against campus disorders into federal sanctions has in recent weeks tied the House Education and Labor Committee in knots. At the center of the dispute is a proposal which would make possible the cutoff of federal aid, including research funds, to an institution of higher education which failed to certify to the Commissioner of Education that it has published rules and regulations for insuring orderly discussion of campus issues and set standards of conduct for students, faculty, staff, and campus visitors. Present education legislation already calls for the revoking of federal assistance under certain circumstances to individuals involved in campus violence.

On Tuesday, as *Science* went to press, the Education and Labor Committee by narrow margins first voted down the provision which would have allowed a cutoff of federal funds to institutions of higher education and then sent back the bill to subcommittee for further consideration. Recommittal of a bill often signals its demise.

Proponents of the new measure insisted that only enactment of a moderate measure such as theirs would forestall the passage of repressive legislation by colleagues bent on punishing students, faculty, and administrators for their errant behavior in campus confrontations. Opponents argued that enactment would set a dire precedent of federal intervention in the internal affairs of the universities and cloud the future of relations between the federal government and higher education.

The deadlock in the committee has probably been encouraged by the current absence of dynamism on Capitol Hill. The Democratic leadership has been sounding a very uncertain trumpet, and the new Administration has shown a definite wariness about committing itself on controversial issues. Education Commissioner James E. Allen has made no bones about his opposition to the principle embodied in the new bill and told the committee "we do not believe that legislation that would punish the entire university, that would hold up possibly the operation of the university because of loss of (federal) funds, is a proper approach." However, the higher the official in the Administration hierarchy, the less specific have been the statements on campus unrest. Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) Secretary Robert Finch and President Nixon have both subscribed to the view that it's up to the colleges and universities to keep their houses in order. But Finch was out of Washington on vacation as the impasse on the legislation developed; President Nixon has not really gone beyond his statement of very general principles of 22 March, in which he called the federal sanctions against individuals "moderate" and "justified," but said it is the task of the instiution to maintain discipline. A definitive expression of attitude on the measure by the Administration would no doubt have sped resolution of the issue. On balance, Administration reticence probably contributed to the blocking action.

The issue has split the Education and Labor Committee on cross-party lines. A majority of Democrats have opposed the measure, while a majority of Republicans supported it. However, committee chairman Carl D. Perkins, a Kentucky Democrat, and three Democratic subcommittee chairmen were lined up behind Mrs. Edith Green (D–Ore.), chairman of the subcommittee which handles higher education legislation and chief exponent of the bill. Opposing the measure have been two Democratic subcommittee chairmen, Frank Thompson of New Jersey and John Brademas of Indiana, a chief tactician for the opposition, a solid phalanx of junior Democrats, and Republican Ogden Reid of New York. Republican William A. Steiger of Wisconsin announced a switch to the opposition after he participated in a tour of campuses with 21 other younger Republican House members.

On Tuesday the balance changed slightly in favor of the opposition, notably with the shift of Perkins. Marvin Esch (R–Mich.), whose vote had been somewhat in doubt, also voted with the opposition. Esch too had made

the campus tour. The motion to refer the bill back to the committee won 18–17.

Opponents of the measure have been conducting a holding action in committee by raising frequent points of order and employing a variety of stalling tactics—much to the annoyance of the bill's proponents. On the other hand, the dissenters objected strenuously not only to the substance of the legislation but to the procedures employed by Mrs. Green. Their major objections were to a lack of hearings on specific legislation and to an abrupt transfer of the debate on the measure from the subcommittee to the full committee by Mrs. Green when the parliamentary guerilla fighting broke out in the subcommittee. Fairly extensive hearings on student unrest, in fact, were held before the Green subcommittee, which heard a range of witnesses including students, faculty, and administrators. There was a strong representation of people with recent combat experience, such as presidents Pusey of Harvard and Hayakawa of San Francisco State. No hearings on specific proposals had been held, however, as June began, but Mrs. Green had made clear that she expected the subcommittee to produce a new proposal and that she hoped that this would head off a punitive assault either by way of amendments on the floor or of proposals steered through other committtees.

On 5 June the subcommittee discussed a proposal by committee member John N. Erlenborn (R–Ill.) which had not been introduced in the House, but was to become a chief feature of a "Green-Erlenborn bill."

The vehicle for legislation was a measure amending the Higher Education Act. The bill combined Erlenborn's proposal to require institutions to certify disciplinary rules with a revised but basically unchanged provision for the withdrawing of federal aid from individuals found to have been involved in serious campus disruptions, which Congress passed last year (*Science*, 27 Sept. 1968). (The mandatory 2-year suspension was changed to a flexible "up to 5 years".)

Erlenborn's proposal had been considerably modified since it was first discussed. Earlier versions, for example, required that institutions actually submit rules and regulations to the commissioner and apparently required that the commissioner determine whether the institution was enforcing the rules.

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **HEW POST GOES TO EGEBERG**: After a 5-month impasse in which the appointment of John H. Knowles as HEW Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs was blocked in the Administration (*Science*, 11 April 1969), HEW Secretary Robert Finch named Roger Egeberg, Dean of the School of Medicine at the University of Southern California, to the HEW post. The appointment of Knowles, director of Massachusetts General Hospital, was opposed by the American Medical Association and Republican congressional leaders. The Egeberg appointment must still be approved by the Senate.

● **HOUSE CUTS NSF BUDGET**: The House last week cut $80 million from the National Science Foundation's budget request, leaving the agency with only $420 million in new appropriations instead of the $500 million requested. Neither the full Senate nor the Senate Appropriations Committee have yet taken action, but the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare recommended that NSF should receive $150,000 more than it had requested. The House and Senate actions will ultimately have to be reconciled.

● **RATHJENS WITHDRAWS FROM CORNELL POSITION**: M.I.T. visiting professor of political science George W. Rathjens, who had been named to replace Franklin A. Long as vice president for research and advanced studies at Cornell University, has withdrawn his acceptance due to the recent resignation of James A. Perkins as president of the university. Rathjens, known to have Long's support for the job, told *Science* that "a new man should have his own choice" as to who would be his vice president. He said that with Cornell's administration in a state of transition, it would be a "particularly inauspicious" time to make appointments at this level.

● **SKETCH OF THE SOVIET ACADEMY**: A brief history and description of the operations of the Soviet Academy of Sciences is now available, in English, to U.S. scientists interested in learning about this Soviet institution. The 170-page book, prepared by the Soviet Academy, contains an account of its history and organization, a list of Soviet Academy members, and a description of some of the Academy's activities. *The Academy of Sciences of the USSR, a Brief Account of Its History and Work*, may be obtained for $3 from the Joint Publication Research Service, JPRS 47808, Commerce Department, Washington.

● **BROOKINGS LOOKS AT DEFENSE**: A new policy studies program on defense and national security, which involves high-level experts, has been launched by Brookings Institution in Washington. A purpose of the new program will be to review the U.S. defense budget and to encourage public discussion of defense decision-making. A study group, consisting of congressmen, government officials, representatives of industries, and academic institutions, will analyze major strategic policy alternatives relating to arms control and disarmament, military technology, and resource management. The 2-year study group is chaired by Harold Brown, president, California Institute of Technology, and includes the President's Science Advisor Lee A. DuBridge; George Rathjens, professor of political science, M.I.T.; John Wheeler, professor of physics, Princeton; and Herbert York, chancellor, University of California at San Diego. The $90,000 program is funded jointly by Brookings Institution and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

● **FAMILY PLANNING PERSPECTIVES**: A new quarterly magazine, *Family Planning Perspectives*, is being distributed without charge to about 25,000 professional persons who are interested in family planning and population control. The magazine, sponsored by a division of Planned Parenthood–World Population, discusses legal problems and public policy questions in regard to birth control programs, ways of setting up community-operated family-planning programs, and other issues. *Perspectives* is funded by foundation support and by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is available upon request from the Technical Assistance Division of Planned Parenthood–World Population, 545 Madison Avenue, New York 10022.

The form under discussion until Tuesday required simply that the institution certify to the commissioner that a set of rules and regulations of the kind described in the law have been published or are being published.

Whether anything like the Erlenborn proposal will make its way through House and Senate to final passage this year is still difficult to predict. Certainly the issue is the kind that makes legislators nervous, particularly House members who must run every two years and, furthermore, run in districts in which a single issue, exploited by an opponent, can assume great weight. Many Congressmen not only "run scared" but vote scared. Opinion polls this spring made campus unrest the "Number 1 issue" with voters, and this is a period when a vote for law and order is a safe vote.

This is not to say that genuine indignation at the events of the year on the campuses is not widespread among congressmen who generally reflect middle-aged, middle-class American views. Mrs. Green, for example, whose standing as a political liberal and friend of higher education was established in the campaigns for passage of programs of federal aid to higher education during the Eisenhower and Kennedy-Johnson years has expressed this impatience. In discussing her bill on the floor of the House on 11 June she said, "I must say I am a bit weary of hearing people say, 'I am terribly concerned about this or some other legislation . . . how this action will be looked at by the alienated.' I think that maybe it is time the Congress looked at how the vast majority of students and faculty members on our college campuses are looking at the disturbances and riots that prevent the majority from doing what they are there to do."

As always in Congress, the bill was being considered in the context of a bigger legislative equation. Perkins, for example, who has seen his committee divided against itself on the campus-unrest issue, is responsible for steering the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) authorization bill, which still contains the bulk of the poverty program, through an unenthusiastic House. He was no doubt apprehensive that further delay or an all-out fight on the campus-unrest bill could adversely affect the OEO bill. The Administration, concerned about extension of the surtax and other priority measures, is not anxious to offend either side in the campus-unrest question by wading into the fight.

The climate of discussion on the issue has moderated since the end of the school year as incidents receded into the past and constituent mail dwindled.

In Congress a campus tour by 22 younger Republican members has had a cooling influence. A report based on a synthesis of their impressions carried the leading conclusion that "In our opinion the fundamental responsibility for order and conduct on the campus lies with the university community."

Those who made the tour would not necessarily reject imposition of federal requirements on institutions—Erlenborn himself was one of the travelers. But the group's report achieved a measure of insight and balance not always found in congressional documents. The report discusses not only the actions of militants but the criticisms which the militants say led to campus disturbances.

The quality of the report seems due to the fact that the congressmen trav-

Rubella Vaccine Is Licensed

The government has licensed a rubella vaccine to help fight against German measles, a viral infection which is known to cause birth defects in children when women contract it during pregnancy. In addition, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch has announced that a nationwide distribution of the live virus vaccine is already under way. The new rubella vaccine was manufactured by a Pennsylvania company from a virus strain developed in 1965 by scientists of the National Institutes of Health. About 18 million doses are expected to be available for use in private and government immunization programs during the next year in an effort to counter an expected nationwide epidemic. Public health experts, who say that German measles usually reaches epidemic proportions in the United States every 7 to 10 years, believe such an epidemic may occur in late 1970 or early 1971.

Although the disease is relatively mild in children and in most adults, rubella can cause serious damage to unborn children if women contract it during pregnancy. When the last nationwide epidemic occurred in 1964–65, an estimated 30,000 fetal deaths occurred and more than 20,000 babies were born with serious birth defects, such as loss of vision and hearing, heart disease, and mental retardation.

The development of the rubella vaccine has resulted from the combined efforts of government, university, and industry scientists over an 8-year period. In 1961 two teams of scientists working independently proved that the development of a vaccine against the disease was possible. Thomas H. Weller and Franklin A. Neva of Harvard and Edward L. Buescher and Malcolm S. Artenstein of the Walter Reed Army Medical Center reported simultaneously the isolation of the rubella virus for the first time and its growth in cell cultures. Four years later, two National Institutes of Health scientists, Harry M. Meyer, Jr., and Paul D. Parkman, first successfully developed a live attenuated virus strain. Since that time researchers have been experimenting with processes for manufacturing and testing the vaccine, which led the federal government, in 1969, to grant the first license for rubella vaccine to the Merck Sharp and Dohme Company in Pennsylvania.

For months prior to granting the first license, the federal government has been considering who would be the recipients of the new vaccine once it had been successfully manufactured and tested. Last month, the Public Health Service advisory committee recommended that the vaccine be distributed only on a selective basis. Priorities are to be given to young children in order to diminish the risk that pregnant women will be exposed to the infection. The vaccine will not be recommended for routine use in women of childbearing age, and care will be taken not to administer it to pregnant women. About 2 million doses of the vaccine are expected to be distributed by the end of August.—MARTI MUELLER

eled as individuals and without fanfare. Congressional "fact-finding" missions often turn into road shows which seem to be quests for publicity as much as serious searches for information. In addition to acquiring a closer acquaintance with a complex problem and filing a useful report, the traveling congressmen seem to have made a valuable innovation in the way Congress educates itself on the problems it faces.

Spokesmen for higher education have almost unanimously opposed the Erlenborn proposal. Perkins on 16 June held a day of hearings before the full committee with witnesses he himself had picked. University of Michigan president Robbin W. Fleming was the main witness of the day and spoke strongly against the requiring of certification, as did other witnesses including university presidents Frank A. Rose of Alabama, Morris Abram of Brandeis, and Darrell Holmes of Colorado State, who were invited by Perkins.

The American Council on Education, the largest higher education association, opposes the Erlenborn proposal on principle. In a letter to Mrs. Green, it protested that it had not had the opportunity to testify on the specific legislation. The ACE also has appointed a special committee on campus disruptions to propose ways to strengthen self-regulation by universities which is clearly intended to reassure Congress that higher education can handle its own disciplinary problems.

In the committee both sides insist that their aim is to protect the universities. Where they differ is in the reading of the emotional barometer on the issue in Congress and although the holding action in the Labor and Education Committee has been successful, the issue is still in doubt.

An absolute consistency does not govern congressional politics, and there are some obvious ironies in the debate. Liberals who deplored the possibility of federal intervention in university affairs are likely to approve existing civil rights legislation which provides for the cutoff of federal funds to universities not in compliance with civil rights statutes. Conservatives asking that the federal government act punitively to guarantee that federal funds spent in universities are not wasted are usually the loudest in inveighing against federal control of education.

Student unrest is a new social phenomenon in the United States and, in dealing with it politically, elected officials are understandably uncertain and uneasy. Some of them must be pondering the implications of the fact that the "youth vote" is now bigger than the farm vote and growing, and that, unlike the farm vote, it is a factor in every state and congressional district.

—JOHN WALSH

Harvard: Faculty Organizes in Response to Crisis

Cambridge, Massachusetts. The Harvard faculty found itself cast in an unfamiliar political role during the last 2 months as it made a series of major policy decisions ranging from the university's general relations with the surrounding community to the specifics of a black studies program. The faculty finished the spring semester by approving a new set of guidelines for student behavior. Many observers of Harvard's internal politics credit the faculty's effective mobilization in the midst of crisis to the development of two groupings of faculty members who strove to achieve consensus on a series of issues.

Called the moderate and liberal caucuses by their members, these groups at times resembled political parties in their bargaining and lobbying activities. Organized politics within the faculty is something of a revolutionary idea to many Cambridge academics, but both caucuses seemed eager to avoid the personal animosity and factionalism that have often afflicted faculties in other major campus crises.

At Harvard, President Nathan M. Pusey's decision to use state and local police to "bust" student demonstrators last April jolted many Harvard faculty members and students into questioning the administrators' and governing boards' traditional authority. The police bust also had the effect of intensifying student pressure on specific issues, such as the abolition of ROTC, at the very time when the university's administrative troubleshooters were weakest.

The 725-member Faculty of Arts and Sciences suddenly found itself in an unfamiliar mediating position between students and administrators and confronted with major policy decisions, but it lacked an organizational framework for rapid action. Before the crisis of 9 April, the faculty had relied on a simple committee system to process resolutions, but these traditional committees were concerned mostly with conventional educational matters; the university's basic administrative structure—coordinated by a small number of overburdened deans—and the faculty's own committee system had not been overhauled in recent years.

Ultimate faculty authority is exercised through the decisions of general faculty meetings at which tenured faculty and assistant professors have been entitled to vote. In February, the faculty distressed many of its own members when it overturned an Administrative Board decision to punish anti-ROTC demonstrators who had occupied the faculty's meeting hall.

Some 40 professors, many of whom questioned this repudiation of an established university committee, began meeting regularly at 2 o'clock Sunday afternoons in various faculty homes to discuss issues before general faculty meetings. The nucleus of the moderate caucus thus evolved in February and March, while its liberal counterpart sprang up almost overnight at the time of the police raid.

"After the bust, there was basically no legitimate authority in the university," government department chairman Samuel P. Huntington, a moderate caucus member, observed. "We had the choice of either continued mass politics and violence on the one hand