sphere makes legislators more willing to settle for symbolism rather than substance. And the equal access amendment, which was put forward by prayer-in-the-school proponents, offered a sufficiently gingerly handling of the church-state issue to win the assent of a bipartisan majority.

Grafting of the equal access amendment to the science and math education bill was in part an artifact of the Senate rules that allow a more promiscuous style of amendment than the House, which has a stiffer germaneness rule. However, the bill came through bristling with amendments, in part, simply because education bills have been such a rarity lately. Also adorning the bill were amendments providing for an asbestos cleanup program in the schools and for the establishment of so-called magnet schools. Also attached was an amendment prohibiting the teaching of "secular humanism," which though undefined and little debated, won the attention of anticensorship forces.

Had the usual conference process been followed, it is likely that the resulting legislation would have incorporated elements of the House version, whose provisions in respect to implementing rules were more congenial to NSF partisans. But House Science and Technology Committee chairman Don Fuqua (D–Fla.), whose committee has jurisdiction over NSF affairs, backed Perkins's tactics and voted for the equal access amendment. Staff sources in the House say that Fuqua and many of his committee colleagues saw the choice as being between the Senate version of the bill and no bill at all.

A footnote of some poignancy was the death of Perkins less than 2 weeks after the House vote. Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee since 1967, Perkins, 71, had a record of unwavering support for liberal federal education and social programs, but sided with conservatives in seeking to open the way for student religious groups to meet in the schools. His last legislative coup served these two propensities.

As for the broader implications of the new law, the episode leaves prospects for federal science education programs still highly uncertain. And until the presidential election is decided and NSF gets its education act together, that is unlikely to change.—JOHN WALSH

A European Academy of Science?

Paris. French dreams of creating a single European scientific community came a step nearer fruition on 17 September when government ministers from 21 European countries endorsed a joint declaration committing themselves to increasing their mutual cooperation in science.

The declaration was made at the end of a 1-day meeting hosted in Paris by the French government and organized in collaboration with the Strasbourg-based Council of Europe. During the course of the day's discussions, various proposals were made for specific ways in which such cooperation might be increased. France, for example, has suggested that all European scientists should be provided with a European research worker's card giving them access to special privileges, such as reduced travel rates and exemptions from customs duty for scientific equipment transported temporarily from one country to another.

The Swedish government put forward the suggestion for a European research fellowship scheme, which would provide funding for the exchange of postgraduate research workers. Perhaps the most ambitious proposal came from the United Kingdom, which suggested the creation of a new European science academy—perhaps modeled loosely on the U.S. National Academy of Sciences—to act as a focus for the concept of a "European research worker."

All such proposals are now being carefully studied to see the extent to which they may fulfill the aims set out in two resolutions passed unanimously by the meeting. One encourages the development of new and existing networks linking research institutions with common interests in different European countries in 22 separate fields of science, and the other emphasizes the need to increase the mobility of European scientists.

However, the long-term significance of the Paris meeting is expected to lie less in the specific measures emerging from preparatory discussions than in the political visibility it is expected to give to collaboration. Some collaboration already exists in fields such as space research and particle physics but has frequently been lacking in other more modest scientific fields. The European Science Foundation—a body set up just over 10 years ago, which now brings together officials from 48 scientific organizations from 18 different countries—was identified by the ministers as the main channel through which specific proposals for greater collaboration between scientists should be developed.

Both the development of networks and increased researcher mobility, it was argued by the research ministers present, are necessary to give Europe's scientists the sense of cohesion needed to remain competitive at both the scientific and technological level with the United States and Japan.

In opening the meeting on Sunday evening, French Prime Minister Laurent Fabius suggested that Europe has no alternative to increasing its scientific collaboration if it wishes to remain competitive with other world powers. "It is a question of uniting to survive."

Similar views were expressed by almost all other government officials who spoke at the Paris meeting, including the West German minister for Research and Technology, Heinz Riesenhüber.

The proposal for a European academy was put to the meeting by Peter Brooke, the British minister responsible for science, who suggested that it might help to overcome barriers stemming from "History, psychology, and prejudice" which often prevent European scientists from working easily together. Mr. Brooke said that, although such an academy might receive substantial government grants for specific activities, such as the organization of postgraduate exchanges, the core of its funding should be raised from private corporations and foundations.

The initial fellows might be made up of all European Nobel Prize winners, who would then select new members, and the total figure might eventually reach between 2000 and 3000. Brooke added that the British Government was prepared to help organize initial discussions about how such a European academy might be set up, although it was important that the main initiative should come from the scientific community itself.—DAVID DICKSON