

with an invitation to come back later when its plans have begun to materialize. "I think, almost inevitably, we will say, 'You've got to show us that you have the intellectual and financial resources necessary for success,'" Ashton said.

The Commissioner of Education and his advisers have shown both caution and boldness in their judgments on applications. For instance, a grant sought by a small foreign-studies school, which the site visitor described as of high quality (although its Ph.D. program was still in the planning stage), was turned down in Washington. But an application by the University of Florida for a \$458,000 grant to be used in a graduate extension program that will be taught by closed-circuit television has been approved.

Although the criteria stress both the promise of high program quality and regional need, it would appear from the grants awarded to date that, while considered, these two factors are not necessarily of decisive importance. A report on a grant application for a graduate business program observed that it would not be competitive with the program of another institution nearby because the two programs attracted different types of students. In approving a library grant for Emory University in Atlanta, the Office of Education took note of the fact that Emory would not be duplicating library resources available at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

On the other hand, one state institution with strong aspirations, but relatively feeble graduate resources, was given a substantial grant even though two strong graduate institutions are not far away. Those who reviewed this application were not all in agreement as to the wisdom of the grant.

The Office of Education has kept in touch with the other agencies that support graduate education, in order to avoid conflict and confusion. Institutions applying to OE must report any grant requests submitted elsewhere. Receipt of grants from two or more federal sources is possible. For example, the University of Chicago has been awarded a \$346,210 grant by the Office of Education for a chemistry research building that is to cost about \$5 million; the university also is getting grants of \$1 million from the National Science Foundation and \$312,000 from the National Institutes of Health, neither of which is for project space to which the OE grant will be applied.

Project space for which most NIH grants are awarded is ineligible for Office of Education grants, but the area of potential overlap between OE and NSF is substantial. If a facility is to be used for graduate teaching as well as for research, it may qualify for a grant from either agency. An institution sometimes applies to NSF first, or to NSF and OE simultaneously, because it knows that NSF can pay up to 50 percent of project cost, whereas OE can pay no more than one-third. There seems no particular reason, other than that of economy, why OE grants should be less generous, and Ashton and his colleagues would like OE to be authorized to make 50-percent matching grants, too. According to Ashton, however, OE wants to limit its new budgetary requests to the most vital matters and at present does not intend to ask for the right to make larger grants when the graduate facilities program's authorization comes up for renewal next year.

The Office of Education was authorized \$120 million in graduate facility grants for the current year, but only \$60 million actually was appropriated. OE never asked for the larger figure, which apparently was authorized because Representative Edith Green of Oregon and her Special Subcommittee on Education felt it would be required. Ashton says OE plans to ask for an appropriation of \$108 million for the fiscal year beginning next July.

The \$60 million provided for the fiscal year that ended last June appears to have been quite adequate. In fact, one could argue that, had the appropriation been somewhat smaller, at least one or two of the grants awarded might have been denied or deferred without too stringent application of the criteria. Of the 92 projects adjudged worthy of support, only seven, totaling \$4.2 million, were carried over into the current fiscal year; the delay entailed no hardship because the applicants themselves were not ready to proceed, for lack of the two-thirds matching funds or for some other reason, such as failure to acquire a building site. Nineteen requests, totaling about \$5.8 million, were rejected as not having met the criteria.

In its recent actions the Office of Education, in addition to approving 29 requests for a total of \$14.2 million, rejected or deferred action on eight requests totaling \$6.7 million. Thirty-two requests, which total \$17.4 million, have been received but not processed. Thus, the applications considered or received

since July, when the current fiscal year began, total \$38.3 million, or slightly less than two-thirds of the \$60-million appropriation. Many more requests will be received before next July, but at the moment OE does not plan to ask for a supplemental appropriation.

New claims on the Johnson Administration's next budget may be heavy and insistent enough to rule out a large increase for the graduate facilities program. The new elementary and secondary school program, established this year, is an example of a major new claimant for funds. Moreover, the unpredictable but surely heavy cost of the war in Vietnam is likely to be a factor in the shaping of many administration programs.

Office of Education officials recognize that an important factor limiting the growth of the graduate facilities program is the ability of institutions to raise the matching two-thirds funds. Ashton looks with interest to 1967, when most state legislatures hold their next general session, to see whether his program has encouraged the states to respond more generously to the needs of graduate education. This year's legislative session was regarded as a poor test of the program's efficacy as a pump-primer because state budgets were made up in the fall before eligibility criteria and other details had been announced.

Ashton and other knowledgeable observers believe that, in view of the growing demands on graduate schools, a sizable graduate facilities program will be needed for a decade or more. A parallel program, sharply increasing the number of graduate fellowships awarded under the National Defense Education Act, is meant as an assurance that the new facilities will suffer from no lack of well-qualified students or of competent faculty. In time it may be possible to measure the results of these programs against the hopes that inspired them.—LUTHER J. CARTER

### **Speaker Ban: State Assembly Kills Law Denying Forum To Communists; U.N.C.'s Status Is Believed Safe**

North Carolina's "speaker-ban" law, a unique statute which had placed in jeopardy the accreditation of the University of North Carolina and other state institutions (*Science*, 29 October and 5 November), was abolished last week by the state General Assembly. The statute made it unlawful for

(Continued on page 1194)

(Continued from page 1141)

"known communists" or persons who had pleaded the 5th Amendment in loyalty investigations to speak on state campuses.

It was stricken not by outright repeal but by a gutting amendment—a device adopted to mollify the proponents of the speaker ban and to permit them to save face. This was the course of action recommended by a commission named by Governor Dan Moore and the presiding officers of the North Carolina Senate and House of Representatives. The amendment, which passed the House by a vote of 75–39 and the Senate by 36–13, directs the boards of trustees of state institutions to adopt a policy and regulations governing the appearance of Communists and 5th Amendment pleaders.

Even before the legislature had met in special session to abolish the law, however, the boards of trustees of U.N.C. and the other institutions had adopted the "speaker policy" recommended by the commission. The policy is that the appearance of speakers of the kind proscribed by the speaker-ban law should be "infrequent" and that on these "rare occasions reasonable and proper care should be exercised by the institution."

"The campuses shall not be exploited as convenient outlets of discord and strife," the policy statement continues. "[The] trustees together with the administration of this institution shall be held responsible and accountable for visiting speakers on our campuses." A preamble says, "It is highly desirable that students have the opportunity to question, review and discuss the opinions of speakers representing a wide range of viewpoints. It is vital to our success in supporting our free society against all forms of totalitarianism that institutions remain free to examine these ideologies to any extent that will serve the educational purposes of our institutions and not the purposes of the enemies of our free society."

The speaker-ban commission concluded that no evidence had been turned up to justify "charges of irresponsible radicalism at Chapel Hill." Moreover, it observed that testimony taken in public hearings indicated that, since the late 1930's, fewer than a dozen "extremist" speakers had appeared on the Chapel Hill campus, and that not all of them were alleged Communists.

Ha. Ha. Ha. The Ban Is Dead!



Cartoon from the *Daily Tar Heel*, U.N.C.'s student newspaper.

U.N.C. officials would have preferred an outright repeal of the speaker ban but found the amendment proposed by the commission acceptable. The university would have resisted a proposal that it place any class of speakers under "prior restraint." President William Friday says the policy adopted by the trustees will not impede the university's participation in exchange programs in which bona fide scholars from Soviet-bloc countries are invited to the United States. The speakers whose appearances are to be "infrequent" and "rare" are the domestic spokesmen and agitators for totalitarian doctrines.

The university is confident that the actions of the General Assembly and of the trustees will satisfy the regional accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, which will review the matter when it meets in Richmond next week. The Association has warned against "political interference" in the university's affairs.

—L.J.C.

## Announcements

The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation has presented its award for basic medical research to Robert W. Holley, professor of biochemistry at Cornell, and its award for clinical research to Albert B. Sabin, distinguished service professor of research pediatrics at the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine. The Basic Medical Research Award recognizes fundamental biological and medical investigations that provide techniques, information, or con-

cepts needed for the elimination of the major causes of death and disability.

The Clinical Research Award is presented for research that has contributed directly to the alleviation or elimination of a major cause of death or disability and to prolonging the prime of life. Each award includes an honorarium of \$10,000. This year's recipients were chosen by a panel headed by Michael E. DeBakey, chairman of the department of surgery at Baylor. The citations are as follows.

### Robert W. Holley, Ph.D.

Working during the past 7 years with a total of approximately 1 gram of highly purified RNA, Dr. Holley and his group were the first to determine the chemical structure of a nucleic acid. The structure that was determined was that of an alanine transfer ribonucleic acid (RNA). Transfer RNA's function as specific carriers of activated amino acids, and during protein synthesis they interact with other cellular compounds to determine the structure of the protein that is being synthesized.

Dr. Holley with his co-workers succeeded in separating the individual transfer RNA's corresponding to each of the 20 amino acids in proteins and recognized that there may be two or more transfer RNA's for the same amino acids. He obtained in pure form the transfer RNA's for a few amino acids. One of these was the transfer RNA for alanine. After several years of painstaking, precise, and most ingenious work, during which he split this RNA into fragments of different size and base composition, he put together the pieces of this intricate puzzle, thus establishing the order of its 77 bases.

Knowledge of the order of the bases in transfer RNA is essential for understanding its unique biological function: the transfer and attachment of amino acids to the correct position on the protein assembly line.

For this work, which not only turns a page in biological and medical history, but also opens and illuminates a wide breach for further exploration of the basic molecular mechanism of heredity, evolution and life itself, the 1965 Albert Lasker Basic Medical Research Award is given.

### Albert B. Sabin, M.D.

In recognition of his fundamental contribution to the understanding of the nature of poliomyelitis, and the development of a live vaccine that can