

Dees and Riecken Leaving NSF

Several veteran officials of the National Science Foundation have recently left or soon will be leaving for other jobs.

Bowen C. Dees, associate director for planning, who joined NSF in 1951, will leave around the beginning of July to become a vice president of the University of Arizona. Dees has long been one of the most influential and widely respected members of the NSF leadership. At about the same time, Henry W. Riecken, associate director for education, will leave to become a vice president of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). Riecken joined NSF in 1958 and skillfully directed one of NSF's most politically perilous efforts, support of research in the social sciences. In his new position he will head an office that the SSRC plans to open in Washington.

In March, Charles B. Ruttenberg, deputy general counsel and a member of NSF for 12 years, left to become general counsel to the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. Early last month, James F. King, head of NSF's Office of Congressional and Public Affairs for the past two and a half years, resigned to become Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Public Affairs. Another planned departure is that of Gordon Lill, who will return to the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation after serving since February 1964 as Mohole Project director.

The only replacement announced so far is for King, whose position was filled by Clarence C. Ohlke, director of the Office of Economic Impact and Conversion of the Atomic Energy Commission.—D.S.G.

side raids on the faculty—and the faculty responsiveness to them—seems to be increasing. A number of nationally eminent professors—including, for example, social scientists Seymour Martin Lipset and Lewis Feuer—have already decided to leave, and a number of others are privately playing “Can you top this?” with a variety of other institutions. Martin Meyerson, the present dean of the school of environmental design, who was acting chancellor during much of last year's crisis, has accepted an offer to become president of the University of Buffalo. Even the unspoken ban on competition among campuses of the U.C. system seems to be breaking down; a surprising number of professors are reliably said to be eyeing the innovating new university branch at Santa Cruz, and vice versa.

What these omens mean is another question. Applications always fluctuate—the 15-percent figure is down from a high point last year. Buying and selling are part of the academic ritual. And it would be surprising if Santa Cruz, with its intellectual promise and physical charm, were not a kind of siren for the beleaguered inhabitant of Berkeley. Berkeley heads many lists of the country's distinguished universities, but the net result of the

undercover goings-on is nonetheless a kind of defensiveness. Berkeley feels itself, as one observer commented, to be “Avis country.”

Another concrete source of uneasiness is the deterioration of Berkeley's political fences within the state. Tension is endemic to university-public relations, and a fairly high level of adult fuming at the politics and morals of the young is taken at Berkeley as a matter of course. But, in some instances at least, the state legislature has passed beyond fuming. The results are so destabilizing that professors not intrigued by the particular problems of mass public education have little incentive (other than affection for the hills, the Bay, and San Francisco) not to go elsewhere. “I can do the same work at M.I.T. as here,” commented one physicist currently being wooed, “and in Cambridge I won't have to worry about the legislature.”

Attacks Renewed

In the past few weeks Berkeley has been afflicted by a resumption of attacks by the Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities of the state legislature. To understand the attack, it is necessary to understand the specialized perspective of its authors, as

reflected, for instance, in an early paragraph of its current report, which states, “Before turning to President Kerr's specific criticisms of our 1965 findings, it is essential to acquaint our readers with a brief summary of the developments and purposes of the International Communist movement.” This is like saying that to understand Italian politics it is necessary to begin with a brief review of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, but the senate committee takes it all quite seriously. Its first report on Berkeley, issued last June, quotes a discussion of United Front tactics by Georgi Dimitroff before the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International (in 1935) and devotes 5½ pages to the San Francisco general strike of 1934. Its latest report devotes 12 pages to reprinting the 1943 and 1944 course offerings of the California Labor School.

The subcommittee's allegations of Communist domination of the Free Speech Movement were subjected to detailed rebuttal by President Kerr in October. (Kerr pointed out, among other things, that even our most prominent ideological scorekeeper, J. Edgar Hoover, had concluded that the FSM was not “Communist originated or controlled.”) Two weeks ago the committee came back with a rebuttal of the rebuttal, which repeated the earlier charges and further attacked Clark Kerr—long a favored whipping boy of California conservatives—for an alleged failure to enforce a university-wide prohibition against the employment of Communists. The main theme of the report is that the administration's “concessions” to the FSM—chiefly, the lifting of the prohibition of political advocacy and fund-raising on the campus—has left Berkeley a hotbed of left-wing politics. The report also added a new charge—widespread sexual deviation among the students.

The importance of the new report is difficult to calculate at this stage. Whatever the cogency of its particular charges, the subcommittee has a reputation for demagoguery, and not very many influential Californians appear to take it all so seriously. While the report was endorsed by the *Oakland Tribune*, the *Los Angeles Times* called it “a thinly veiled attempt to harass the university administration and embarrass Governor Brown,” and the *San Francisco Chronicle*, another of the state's major newspapers, described it