

Canada's
new high-
containment
lab

Refocusing science
in Korean
universities



FRANCE


Top Scientists Lock Horns in Research Reform Debate

PARIS—A nationwide debate on the future of French research heated up last week, as some of the country's leading scientists presented often conflicting reform proposals at a day-long hearing held here at France's National Assembly. The 9 June hearing, attended by about 200 researchers and conducted by parliamentary deputies Pierre Cohen and Jean-Yves Le Déaut, was the penultimate event in a parliamentary inquiry launched last February by Prime Minister Lionel Jospin at the request of research minister Claude Allègre (*Science*, 5 March, p. 1442). The inquiry will conclude on 26 June with a mass colloquium in Paris, after which the deputies will make their recommendations to Jospin.

Allègre had resisted the notion of holding a national debate before moving ahead with what he considered essential reforms. But his attempts to forge closer relations between the universities and public research agencies—such as the basic research agency CNRS and the biomedical agency INSERM—provoked such fierce resistance from many researchers, who feared the measures would dilute the quality of French science (*Science*, 18 December 1998, p. 2162), that the government was obliged to consult with France's scientific community, via a Web-based forum and numerous small hearings and consultations held throughout the country.

The latest hearing, which featured two invited panels—one made up of established researchers and the other of younger scientists—was largely dominated by the divergent views of two well-known figures in the debate: molecular biologist Pierre Chambon, director of the Institute of Genetics and Molecular and Cellular Biology near Strasbourg, and chemist Henri-Edouard Audier of the Ecole Polytechnique

near Paris. Chambon briefly presented his “wish list” of reforms—originally drawn up by a committee commissioned by Allègre and headed by Chambon but never published—which include ending the “researcher for life” status of French public service scientists. Chambon argues that the universities should be given the major role in recruiting young researchers and that once researchers have obtained university or research agency positions, they should undergo evaluations by international scientific committees every 5 years to continue receiving research funds. Those who fail to pass muster, he says, should be assigned to teaching or administrative duties.



Reformer. Pierre Chambon wants to end “researchers for life.”

As for the public research organizations, Chambon argued that the research funds of agencies such as the CNRS should be given only to the best scientists—whether they are university teachers or full-time public researchers—rather than being spread around only among their own staff, as is currently done. “We must transform the research organizations into powerful granting agencies,” he said. Chambon also advocated eliminating the current rung of permanent entry-level positions in the universities and research organizations and replacing them with temporary postdoctoral positions, which are rarely available in France at present.

But the Chambon plan drew criticism from Audier and some other members of the panel. “I am absolutely opposed to replacing [the entry-level positions] with postdocs,” Audier said. “How can we hang on to the best scientists if we offer them a mediocre salary over 4 or 5 years when industry can offer them a good salary right away?” And panel member Alain Deshayes, a former researcher with the National Institute for Agronomic Research who now

serves as a research director for the Swiss corporation Nestlé, expressed concern about the consequences of “sending researchers in decline into teaching.” Audier agreed: “Pierre Chambon thinks creativity is a function of age. I don't believe that.”

Chambon countered that it is “competence, not age” that matters most, adding that if a scientist is brilliant enough to pass an evaluation every 5 years he or she could still be a researcher for life. As for the lack of funding for postdoctoral positions in France, Chambon argued that its major effect is to force French researchers to do their postdocs abroad. “It doesn't seem to bother anyone if [they] take on insecure positions in the United States,” he said. But although the panel members disagreed on many issues, all were in accord that no serious rapprochement between the universities and the research agencies would be possible until the current heavy teaching loads of young university teachers were reduced. “It leaves us little time for research,” said panel member Isabelle Kraus, an assistant professor of physics at the Louis Pasteur University in Strasbourg. “We have to do research in the evenings and at the weekend.”

Given these differing visions for French research, and the high stakes for France's future scientists, the final colloquium of the inquiry on 26 June is sure to be heavily attended: Cohen and Le Déaut have reserved the 1000-seat auditorium at the Sorbonne for the event.

—MICHAEL BALTER

ARCHAEOLOGY

How Aztecs Played Their Rubber Matches

When 16th century Spanish clerics came to the New World, they were enthralled by a fast-paced and sometimes bloody sport. Teams of up to six athletes would whack heavy, solid balls through hoops several meters above the stone courts using anything but their hands or feet. Apart from the occasional postgame human sacrifice, what most astonished the Spanish were the ricocheting balls. “I do not understand,” wrote Pedro Martyr, the official historian of the Spanish court in 1530, “how when they hit the ground they are sent into the air with incredible bounce.” For Europeans used to playing with pigskins, the rubber balls were practically miraculous.

The native Americans made their seem-