

clear who is using whom. The project seems to have originated in the mind of a Delaware athletic coach who then persuaded Carpenter to finance the project. The project ultimately involved researchers from the university's psychology and electrical engineering departments and its computer center, as well as an instrument specialist from the Du Pont Company. Bruce Lutz, professor of electrical engineering, says he is delighted that Carpenter is willing to finance his work. And in fairness to Carpenter, it should also be pointed out that he has previously anted up funds that enabled the university to attract an engineering dean and develop its athletic facilities.

The university has long had a rather "repressive" atmosphere, with students and faculty chafing at what they regard as "unreasonable" restrictions. Students are not allowed to drink on campus (nor are faculty for that matter); most

are not allowed to possess cars; and, until recently, they were not allowed to live off-campus, except in university-approved housing. They also feel they have little voice in university affairs. A 1967 survey of Delaware seniors, conducted by the university, revealed that a surprising 55 percent strongly agreed that "the college administration here generally treats students more like children than like adults" as compared to only 13 percent who expressed this belief in a 1963 national sample of undergraduates.

At the faculty level, a reporter visiting the campus is struck by the fact that many faculty members are critical of the administration's "heavy-handedness" but are afraid or reluctant to voice their complaints publicly. "Who wants to be a martyr?" explained one full professor. The campus is full of stories of faculty members, even department heads, who were allegedly "bawled out"

for incurring the administration's displeasure. And a resolution adopted last December by the faculty of arts and science refers to a "long-standing cleavage between the university's faculty and administration."

The resolution was prompted by the university's handling of a student-faculty protest last fall against compulsory ROTC courses. The twists and turns of this campus battle are too detailed for chronicling here, but the upshot of the dispute was that a group of students disrupted an ROTC drill, a number of students were suspended, and three faculty members who participated in some aspects of the protest were disciplined. The administration's attitude was perhaps revealed by the university's public relations director who proclaimed at a public meeting, according to a transcript, that the protest was supported by "all of the kooks around, all of the ultra-liberals, all of the Communist subversives, or whatever else we have around here. . . ."

Last December the trustees, after conferring with the administration, ordered the acting president to send condemnatory letters to the three faculty members most directly involved and a general warning letter to the entire faculty. The letter to the three individuals called them "disloyal" and "unprofessional" and informed them they could no longer advise any student organization or be associated with any "disruptive" demonstrations. (Later, the university failed to renew the contract of one of the three men under circumstances that provoked further controversy.) The letter to the entire faculty warned that "any effort . . . to obstruct the legitimate operations of the university or to encourage or assist students to do so is, in the opinion of the trustees and officers of the university, an act of 'gross irresponsibility' and constitutes grounds for non-renewal or even termination of contract."

The arts and science faculty, by a vote of 104 to 69, denounced the letters to the three faculty members as "unacceptable in both content and tone," but voted down, 98 to 95, another resolution critical of the general letter to all faculty. Later the faculty, which had been pondering the ROTC problem in desultory fashion for some time, voted overwhelmingly to make the military courses voluntary.

As an ironic footnote to the affair, the university's alumni publication prepared a detailed account of the ROTC

Visa Refused for French Critic of U.S.

The State Department has denied a visa to Laurent Schwartz, an internationally renowned French mathematician who has been a leader of various protests against American policy in Vietnam.

Schwartz, who holds the Field award—mathematics' equivalent of the Nobel prize—was a member of the so-called International War Crimes Tribunal, which last year held the United States guilty of crimes in Vietnam; he is a leading figure in the French National Vietnam Committee, and is reported to have been closely involved in assisting American military deserters in France. Earlier this year he organized an anti-American appeal that drew the endorsement of many leading French scientists (*Science*, 1 March 1968).

Schwartz was invited by Chancellor Roger Heyns of the University of California, Berkeley, to deliver a scholarly talk later this month in connection with U.C.'s centennial observation. According to State Department sources and American colleagues of Schwartz, the Heyns invitation was followed by an invitation to speak about Vietnam before the Berkeley Faculty Peace Committee. In applying for a visa at the American Embassy in Paris, Schwartz stated that his visit would be for the purpose of making both talks.

In the normal workings of the visa process, persons with far-left-wing or strongly anti-American political associations are ineligible for admission to the United States, but the State Department, at its discretion, may request the Justice Department to issue a waiver. Generally, such requests are routinely made and granted in the case of visiting scientists who have such associations. According to a State Department official, Schwartz, who in the past has been granted waivers to visit the U.S., was asked at the Paris Embassy whether he would refrain from political activity while in the United States. He said he would not, the official reported, and the State Department then decided to end the matter there and not even ask the Justice Department to issue a waiver. The State Department declined to give a reason for its decision, but, in response to an inquiry from *Science*, a Department official said, "What do you think?"—D.S.G.