

been canceled. Moreover, activities pointing toward extended manned lunar exploration after the initial moon landings are now limited to studies. And while the 1973 Mars mission has not been eliminated, fewer instruments will be landed on the Martian surface than had been planned, and fewer scientific data will be returned.

In sum, the MacDonald panel's recommendations are unlikely to be of

immediate consequence. By discounting the scientific importance of manned planetary missions, however, the panel report may, in the longer term, have a perhaps unintended political impact. The war accounts largely for the scarcity of money for the space program today, but the demands of the urban crisis and other domestic problems will compete formidably with NASA for funds tomorrow.

As many have observed, the glamor of space exploits is wearing off, and some people now yawn at talk of a U.S.-Soviet space race. In such circumstances, NASA will want to offer the strongest possible scientific justification for its proposals, especially those which carry a high price. To offer such justification may not win political approval for a project, but failure to do so may well kill it.—LUTHER J. CARTER

University of Hawaii: More Storms Lash the Palmy Groves of Academe

On 3 September a two-man team from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) will begin its on-the-scene investigation of the hotly disputed case concerning the tenure of Oliver M. Lee at the University of Hawaii. This ad hoc AAUP committee, composed of Samuel H. Baron, chairman of the history department at the University of California at San Diego and Glen A. Love of the English department at the University of Oregon, is expected to have its report completed within a few months. If the AAUP's Committee "A" decides to publish the report in the AAUP Bulletin, and if, then, it votes to recommend censure of the University of Hawaii, such a recommendation will be considered by the AAUP's annual meeting in April.

If censure is approved, it will be a severe blow to the upwardly mobile University of Hawaii. Like many other universities, Hawaii has some trouble attracting topflight faculty members, a condition which is aggravated by its somewhat isolated location, by the steep cost of living in Honolulu, and by a salary scale that is not exceptionally high (the average faculty member at Hawaii receives a salary of \$11,589, according to the latest AAUP survey). As one Hawaii professor, George K. Simson, wrote earlier this year, "How many factors beyond censure and low pay does a smart professor need in order to cross off Hawaii?"

The man around whom the dispute arose is Oliver M. Lee, a political scientist who is a militant critic of the Johnson administration on Vietnam. Lee has been a controversial figure at the University of Hawaii almost from the time he arrived 5 years ago. The controversy surrounding him became much sharper in early June of 1967, after a student group for which Lee served as adviser issued a statement urging infiltration and forceful disruption of the U.S. armed forces. Shortly before the statement was issued, Lee had been given a letter indicating the intention of the university administration to grant him tenure. After the furor about the statement of the student group, the university administration revoked the letter of intention to grant Lee tenure. In the months that have followed, the regents have consistently upheld the administration's decision, while faculty groups have questioned it. On 22 December the Faculty Senate Hearing Committee concluded that the administration had failed to follow due process in dealing with Lee and his department and that it did not have reasonable cause to revoke the letter of intent to Lee. On the next day, Thomas H. Hamilton, protesting the committee's decision, shocked the state by announcing his resignation as president of the university. (For a description of some of the earlier events and details of the case, see *Science*, 1 March.)

The tumult which followed Hamil-

ton's resignation did not end quickly. During late May the usually placid campus was rocked by 11 days of demonstrations, with students demanding review of the decision on Lee, and occupying, Columbia-style, the administration building at the main Manoa campus. On 21 May police arrested 152 students and faculty members (including Lee) who refused to leave the administration building. To pacify the rebellious students, the regents came on campus the next day to announce that Hamilton's resignation was effective immediately; this brought cheers from the demonstrators. The regents then slipped the students the bitter pill: the announcement that Lee would not be granted tenure and that his employment would be terminated immediately, with a year's severance pay thrown in. Lee is currently teaching at the university's summer school. When this assignment ends, he will stay on in Honolulu without an academic job to fight his case, as he said, "until my rice bowl is empty."

In late June, the other central administration figure in handling the Lee case, W. Todd Furniss, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, announced his resignation. Furniss had been criticized by the demonstrating students, by some faculty members, and by the Honolulu press for his role in the affair. In January he will take a post in Washington as director of the American Council on Education's commission on academic affairs. (Shortly after the regents proclaimed their immediate acceptance of Hamilton's resignation it was announced that Hamilton, who served as president of the State University of New York system before coming to Hawaii in 1963, had accepted the position of head of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau.)

One of the points at issue in the dispute had been the refusal of the



Thomas H. Hamilton, who served as president of the University of Hawaii for the past 5 years, will become head of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau in September.

regents to release the relevant reports in the case. In May the reports were released. Since they contained little new information, the Honolulu press understandably commented that there was no reason why they couldn't have been released earlier. One point which did emerge with greater clarity was the fact that, in the period when the intention to grant Lee tenure was under review by the university administration, Lee's superiors in the political science department were, on several occasions, assured that the decision on tenure was not being reconsidered. One of the two major newspapers in Hawaii, the *Honolulu Advertiser*, which was generally sympathetic to the administration's case, editorialized:

Furniss' handling of the matter understandably inflamed members of the department. His statements to them were ambiguous, and it has to be said that Furniss, not President Hamilton, is basically responsible for much of the trouble that ensued.

Such editorial commentary was indicative of the great attention which was paid to the university dispute by the press and community in Hawaii. In an interview in his Washington office, AAUP associate secretary Jordan E. Kurland, who specializes in tenure cases for the organization, said "I've never seen anything like it," and noted that detailed tenure procedures had been publicly debated and aired in the press to a greater extent than in any other instance he has seen.

There are several possible reasons why the Lee case has attracted so much attention in Hawaii, besides the obvious drama of the events. The university is located in Honolulu, by far the largest city in Hawaii and the state communications center for television, radio, and for its two principal newspapers. The University of Hawaii is the only university in the state (and the only one within a 2000-mile radius); many of the state's residents are highly interested in their university's activities. Some people also argue that, because of the state's isolation, disputes in Hawaii become more heated than those in many other locations. A case involving a left-wing protestor against the Vietnam war was especially likely to create a furor in an area which has major U.S. military concentrations, which is a principal staging area for Vietnam, and which is the home of many important military officers, both retired and on active duty.

Concern over the university's affairs is found in many places—from the letters-to-the-editors column to the top ranks of the state's leadership. The question of whether or not the AAUP would eventually censure the university over the Lee case has been frequently and passionately discussed. Governor John A. Burns, who has supported the regents in the Lee case, has publicly stated that he doubts that the AAUP will censure the university, and so has Robert E. Potter, the university's associate dean for academic development. The AAUP has yet to take formal action on a somewhat similar case at the university. In May 1966, John Wise, then acting head of the economics department, received a letter of intent to grant tenure from Dean Furniss; the letter to Wise was revoked in March of 1967.

Although in the May disturbance the students used the technique of occupying a university building, the demonstrators were widely praised for the peaceful nature of their protest. They also picked up some unexpected support. Hawaii's lieutenant governor, Thomas P. Gill, told them, "I am sure that many of us don't agree with the Board of Regents decisions," and a former president of the university, Laurence H. Snyder, said, "As long as the students continue to act without violence and without going outside the law, I shall support their stand." Zoologist Robert W. Hiatt, now acting president of the university, is reported to

have said that the demonstration was "a major awakening of the University of Hawaii. . . it has given us a new lease on life." As of this writing, the regents have not yet announced the appointment of a new president to replace Hamilton.

These are some of the more recent developments in the heated and sometimes bizarre struggle which has disturbed the palm-shaded surroundings of the University of Hawaii during the past 15 months. When this reporter visited the university in late December, President Hamilton suggested that he read Mary McCarthy's *The Groves of Academe*, and noted the similarity of the situation at the University of Hawaii to that depicted in the novel. In the novel, a liberal college president sends an outspoken professor a letter stating that his appointment will not be renewed. The professor fights back, eventually involving the faculty in the controversy; he protests the president's breaking of promises and indicates that his own left-wing political views are the real reason for his dismissal. In an angry concluding scene the professor shakes his fist in the president's face and threatens to expose him to the AAUP. The president then decides that the college will never rid itself of the offensive faculty member unless he himself resigns. The president does resign, confessing that he feels like Samson bringing down the temple on the Philistines.

Five days after President Hamilton recommended *The Groves of Academe* to this reporter, he resigned as president of the University of Hawaii.

Sometimes, fiction anticipates fact.

—BRYCE NELSON

RECENT DEATHS

Raphael Demos, 76; professor emeritus of philosophy at Harvard who had taught at Vanderbilt and McGill universities since his retirement from Harvard; 3 August.

A. Hollis Edens, 67; former president of Duke University and former vice-chancellor of the University system of Georgia; 7 August.

George P. Larrick, 67; former Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration; 11 August.

Richard H. Wilhelm, 59; chairman of the department of chemical engineering, Princeton University; 6 August.