eled as individuals and without fanfare. Congressional "fact-finding" missions often turn into road shows which seem to be quests for publicity as much as serious searches for information. In addition to acquiring a closer acquaintance with a complex problem and filing a useful report, the traveling congressmen seem to have made a valuable innovation in the way Congress educates itself on the problems it faces.

Spokesmen for higher education have almost unanimously opposed the Erlenborn proposal. Perkins on 16 June held a day of hearings before the full committee with witnesses he himself had picked. University of Michigan president Robbin W. Fleming was the main witness of the day and spoke strongly against the requiring of certification, as did other witnesses including university presidents Frank A. Rose of Alabama, Morris Abram of Brandeis, and Darrell Holmes of Colorado State, who were invited by Perkins.

The American Council on Education, the largest higher education association, opposes the Erlenborn proposal on principle. In a letter to Mrs. Green, it protested that it had not had the opportunity to testify on the specific legislation. The ACE also has appointed a special committee on campus disruptions to propose ways to strengthen self-regulation by universities which is clearly intended to reassure Congress that higher education can handle its own disciplinary problems.

In the committee both sides insist that their aim is to protect the universities. Where they differ is in the reading of the emotional barometer on the issue in Congress and although the holding action in the Labor and Education Committee has been successful, the issue is still in doubt.

An absolute consistency does not govern congressional politics, and there are some obvious ironies in the debate. Liberals who deplored the possibility of federal intervention in university affairs are likely to approve existing civil rights legislation which provides for the cutoff of federal funds to universities not in compliance with civil rights statutes. Conservatives asking that the federal government act punitively to guarantee that federal funds spent in universities are not wasted are usually the loudest in inveighing against federal control of education.

Student unrest is a new social phenomenon in the United States and, in dealing with it politically, elected officials are understandably uncertain and uneasy. Some of them must be pondering the implications of the fact that the "youth vote" is now bigger than the farm vote and growing, and that, unlike the farm vote, it is a factor in every state and congressional district.

—JOHN WALSH

Harvard: Faculty Organizes in Response to Crisis

Cambridge, Massachusetts. The Harvard faculty found itself cast in an unfamiliar political role during the last 2 months as it made a series of major policy decisions ranging from the university's general relations with the surrounding community to the specifics of a black studies program. The faculty finished the spring semester by approving a new set of guidelines for student behavior. Many observers of Harvard's internal politics credit the faculty's effective mobilization in the midst of crisis to the development of two groupings of faculty members who strove to achieve consensus on a series of issues.

Called the moderate and liberal caucuses by their members, these groups at times resembled political parties in their bargaining and lobbying activities. Organized politics within the faculty is something of a revolutionary idea to many Cambridge academics, but both caucuses seemed eager to avoid the personal animosity and factionalism that have often afflicted faculties in other major campus crises.

At Harvard, President Nathan M. Pusey's decision to use state and local police to "bust" student demonstrators last April jolted many Harvard faculty members and students into questioning the administrators' and governing boards' traditional authority. The police bust also had the effect of intensifying student pressure on specific issues, such as the abolition of ROTC, at the very time when the university's administrative troubleshooters were weakest.

The 725-member Faculty of Arts and Sciences suddenly found itself in an unfamiliar mediating position between students and administrators and confronted with major policy decisions, but it lacked an organizational framework for rapid action. Before the crisis of 9 April, the faculty had relied on a simple committee system to process resolutions, but these traditional committees were concerned mostly with conventional educational matters; the university's basic administrative structure—coordinated by a small number of overburdened deans—and the faculty's own committee system had not been overhauled in recent years.

Ultimate faculty authority is exercised through the decisions of general faculty meetings at which tenured faculty and assistant professors have been entitled to vote. In February, the faculty distressed many of its own members when it overturned an Administrative Board decision to punish anti-ROTC demonstrators who had occupied the faculty's meeting hall.

Some 40 professors, many of whom questioned this repudiation of an established university committee, began meeting regularly at 2 o'clock Sunday afternoons in various faculty homes to discuss issues before general faculty meetings. The nucleus of the moderate caucus thus evolved in February and March, while its liberal counterpart sprang up almost overnight at the time of the police raid.

"After the bust, there was basically no legitimate authority in the university," government department chairman Samuel P. Huntington, a moderate caucus member, observed. "We had the choice of either continued mass politics and violence on the one hand

or the creation of new legitimate institutions."

Recognizing this vacuum of authority, politically minded professors such as Stanley Hoffman, John K. Galbraith, and Michael L. Walzer quickly merged some small, informal discussion groups into what came to be known as the liberal caucus. Meeting first on the day of the police raid, the liberals eventually congregated, at the School of Public Administration and elsewhere, on a regular basis and developed the same sort of informal organization that the moderates had.

Caucus organizers had to contend with a prevailing tendency on the part of their colleagues to shy away from political organizations, especially in an academic context.

"Political scientists had to do an educational job on the way a democracy works," Huntington said. "We had to persuade our colleagues that the caucuses were not just a necessity but a desirability."

Membership Remains Small

Caucus meetings rarely attracted more than 80 professors, and total membership of both caucuses probably included no more than a third of the faculty, with some professors attending both caucuses. These groups were thus too small to act as voting blocks in themselves, but their careful preparation of resolutions and their consensus-building often prevented opponents from changing specific resolutions once they reached the floor at general faculty meetings. Their success in pushing through caucus compromises essentially intact raised the ire of some "independent" faculty members who saw their own proposals repeatedly outvoted.

The moderate caucus contained a larger proportion of senior faculty than did its liberal counterpart; the liberals permitted instructors and students, as well as tenured faculty members, to attend its discussion sessions. However, few other generalizations about caucus membership seem valid although some professors claimed to detect a tendency of scientists to remain aloof from political activity in general.

"The average scientist has been less aroused and less concerned with catharsis," observed Paul M. Doty, professor of biochemistry. "Scientists and economists have been on the Washington circuit more often than nonscientists, and they have an internal calibration of what's possible." Although this generalization rings true to other observers, scientists did figure prominently in the activities of both caucuses, and, of the ten faculty members elected to a crucial policy committee at the height of the crisis, three were scientists—physicist Gerald Holton, biologist John Edsall, and mathematician Donald G. Anderson.

Caucus members insist that their groups have no basic philosophical differences: they differ only in style or tactics, and, even at that, each caucus is extremely diverse. The liberals seem more concerned with developing new, orderly procedures reflecting a new student-faculty consensus for university governance, while moderates stress the maintenance of the university as a place for scholarship by adapting committee procedures that have worked well in the past.

Behind the comity was what some professors describe as an overwhelming desire to cooperate in "saving the institution"—a slogan that reformers and conservatives alike have wielded to counter student extremists' attempts to shut down the university. Harvard's professors seem very much aware of the experience of Berkeley and Columbia, where, they say, factionalism poisoned the academic atmosphere and prevented the faculties from taking effective action.

"What has saved us is civility," said liberal-caucus member Juan Marischal, chairman of the romance languages and literature department. And civility at Harvard has progressed to the point where some liberals have tacitly agreed not to call the moderates conservatives if the moderates refrain from calling their opposite numbers radicals.

The caucuses' basic willingness to cooperate has produced a negotiated agreement between the two groups on almost every major issue. Perhaps the most crucial example of caucus negotiations was the design and selection of a student-faculty study group called the Committee of 15. This body was charged with the threefold task of disciplining students involved in the April building seizure, examining the causes of the upheaval, and recommending reforms of the university's governance system. On this issue of the committee's selection, the caucuses' lobbying and bargaining resembled the activities of full-fledged political parties.

Unofficial delegations of three faculty members from each caucus met several days before the general faculty meeting was to consider the selection. Fearing that leniency in this disciplinary case would encourage future student disorders, many moderates hoped to reduce the power of those advocating total amnesty for the demonstrators by minimizing student voting power on the committee. Hoping to enhance the committee's "legitimacy," liberals wanted to maximize student representation, and eventually a compromise was reached; as a result, five students were accepted.

The caucuses then assembled slates of nominees for the faculty seats and waged a brief election campaign, complete with telephone canvasing and the equivalent of party block captains. Ultimately, the liberals won six seats, and the moderates took three.

Committee Offers Behavior Code

A few days before Commencement, the Committee of 15 announced its first major decision. It proposed a set of guidelines for unacceptable campus political tactics and individual behavior, and recommended that 16 students involved in the seizure of University Hall be suspended. The moderate caucus had earlier accepted a similar set of guidelines, and moderates, liberals, and students ironed out the details within the Committee of 15. The major provisions of the guidelines specifically banned "forcible interference with the freedom of movement of any member or guest of the University," class disruption, willful destruction of university property, or interference with an invited speaker. Students who refuse to halt such activities are to be summarily suspended, pending completion of regular disciplinary proceedings.

The faculty's strong vote of confidence endorsing the Committee of 15's guidelines represents something of a reversal of Harvard's earlier tolerance of student political demonstrations. Faculty members justify the new, tough rules by pointing to an accelerating trend in obstructive demonstrations at Harvard, which started with a demonstration against Defense Secretary Robert McNamara 2 years ago. They claim that discipline in these earlier cases had remained relatively mild, in order to avoid restricting student political thought, in the process of punishing militant political tactics. The guidelines, they hope, will make it easier to separate tactics and ends in judging campus political demonstrations.

Many professors now claim that a "new social contract has to be struck," if the university is to develop a new equilibrium. Another, less important factor influencing faculty approval of

the guidelines was a fear of external interference. Some professors noted the possibility that Harvard's governing boards might revoke the faculty's delegated authority over disciplinary matters if violent demonstrations had not been restricted, and others saw a more immediate threat of congressional action to restrict lenient institutions. But even professors who voiced these fears are quick to point out that the faculty's vote on the guidelines would have had the same outcome even if no external threat existed, and that the guidelines are chiefly an internal necessity.

However, a small minority in the faculty objected to the guidelines' summary suspension procedures. "The analogy in a democracy," said Hillary Putnam, a politically active philosophy professor who has been one of the Harvard administration's most outspoken critics, "would be to proclaim a permanent state of national emergency and then only later institute due process. In a democracy you would have a constitutional crisis on your hands."

The behavior guidelines have also come under heavy fire from some Harvard undergraduates (the guidelines do not apply to the professional schools where demonstrations are rare) who claim that the rules are aimed specifically at them and shift attention from the administration's use of violent police tactics. About 50 seniors walked out of Harvard's graduation in protest over the guidelines and the suspension of the 16 students.

Faculty supporters of the guidelines counter this criticism by denying that the guidelines are one-sided. The faculty also recommended that administrators consult student and faculty groups before using police against future demonstrations, a recommendation that they claim sufficiently reprimands the administration for the style of its police action.

"The guidelines were designed for all the individuals in the community," one supporter said. "We would be glad to protect Hillary Putnam from other outraged faculty members or to protect one student group from another."

Although faculty members deny any desire to shift administrative power from the present administration to themselves, many predict that the extraordinary disciplinary cases defined by the guidelines will eventually fall under the jurisdiction of some student-faculty group similar to the Committee of 15. In the coming months, the committee will undertake a thoroughgoing review of the university's governance and will recommend possible changes in the membership and authority of the university's governing boards and in the relations of Harvard's faculty, administrators, students, and alumni.

Many senior faculty members feel quite satisfied with their organizational achievements of the last 2 months, but the reign of cooperation which they proudly point to as a Harvard hallmark may prove unstable.

Faculty supporters of the Committee of 15 had originally hoped that the committee's five student members would give its decisions—disciplinary or otherwise—a degree of broad acceptance that has actually failed to materialize since April. Undergraduate representatives were chosen by an unpopular election procedure, and a radical student boycott of committee proceedings further undermined what little support the five had. "The five students on the committee have the power but they have no constituency," observed biologist George Wald. Many observers agree that, even if the committee did enjoy significant student support, militant activists would probably defy its "deterrent" guidelines as long as the Vietnamese war continues.

The caucus system itself has also received increasingly heavy criticism from faculty members, especially young liberals, who claim that caucus negotiators have "sold out" on crucial points, as an expedient to promoting faculty harmony. "If they think they have trouble now," commented one assistant professor, "just wait until next year when they have a hundred new junior people on their hands." Only a handful of the radicals on Harvard's teaching staff currently have the right to vote at faculty meetings, but their ranks may increase significantly next fall thanks to a new policy giving all teaching Ph.D.'s the enfranchised rank of assistant professor rather than instructor.

The cooperation that has characterized caucus relations so far has not dispelled many professors' fears that permanent left- and right-wing factions incompatible with professional scholarship might evolve from organized campus politics of this sort. Thus, most caucus members see these groups as temporary and expect the caucuses to die out once the present student unrest ceases or the faculty and governing boards accept the Committee of 15's final governance proposals. But so long as Harvard's faculty continues to make major policy decisions under pressure, caucus members consider these new political institutions to be a regrettable necessity.—MARK W. OBERLE

An intern in the science news department for the summer, Mark W. Oberle will enter his senior year at Harvard in September.

RECENT DEATHS

Frederick A. Courts, 61; chairman of the psychology department at Reed College; 25 May.

James Dadakis, 60; chairman of the physics department at Westchester Community College, New York; 12 June.

Clarence L. Hay, 84; archeologist and former secretary of the board of the American Museum of Natural History; 4 June.

Charles E. Johnson, 48; acting president of the University of Oregon; 17 June.

Henry B. Kirkland, 66; retired chief medical director of the Prudential Insurance Company; 13 June.

Harold F. Lang, 48; Navy aeronautics, space, and guided missile engineer; 4 June.

Frederick J. Lewy, 68; former director of medical education for the American Heart Association; 25 May.

Robert K. Lippman, 70; former head of the medical board of Mount Sinai Hospital, New York; 8 June.

Jack C. Mickle, 56; director of Veterans Administration Hospital, Walla Walla, Washington; 2 June.

Thomas V. Moore, 91; former head of the psychology and psychiatry departments at Catholic University, Washington, D.C.; 9 June.

Stuart A. Rice, 79; former chairman of the Nuclear Commission on Statistics, United Nations, and former vice president of AAAS; 4 June.

William C. Root, 65; former chairman of the chemistry department of Bowdoin College; 13 June.

Wilfred F. Ruggiero, 62; professor of surgery at New York Medical College; 28 May.

Arthur Schifrin, 65; medical director of the Port of New York Authority; 11 June.

Nathaniel B. Wales, Jr., 54; nuclear physicist and inventor; 12 June.

I. Ogden Woodruff, 89; former head of the Welfare and Health Council of New York City; 26 May.