

Senate Hearings on Campus Disorders

Senator John McClellan's Permanent Investigations Subcommittee is continuing its investigations of radical activities on the nation's campuses. Since the first of the month, it has heard from several presidents of universities that have experienced serious student disruptions, including Stanford, Howard, North Carolina A&T, and Voorhees Junior College; listened to testimony by students representing the politics of the center and right; and kept Harvard President Nathan Pusey cooling his heels while a fourth-year Harvard teaching fellow criticized the Harvard faculty and administration for "yielding to force."

At the end of May, the subcommittee subpoenaed more than 15 universities with the announced intention of determining whether federal aid should be withdrawn from students involved in disruptive activities. The investigation now appears, however, to be focusing on another major issue: whether universities and colleges which suffer disruptions are willing and able to maintain order themselves or whether they need a helping hand from Congress.

In the incident involving Pusey, the committee's time was consumed by L. C. Helms, a graduate student described by other Harvard students at the meeting as a member of a "right-wing" minority on campus. During lengthy testimony in which he read from mimeographed sheets and old newspaper clippings, Helms told McClellan he was "seeking to indict the Harvard Administration" for not being tough enough on radicals. Afterward, McClellan indicated that the committee would recall Pusey, but committee sources say that no date has been selected.

Testimony by Stanford officials was typical of the views expressed by most administration witnesses on the question for federal punitive measures. They stressed the need for the university to solve its problems from within. Kenneth Pitzer, president of Stanford, testified that the punitive riders that legislators are attempting to attach to appropriations bills "do more harm than good" to the cause of restoring and maintaining peace on the nation's campuses. Pitzer said that the measures aimed at individuals—which involve the possible withdrawal of federal funds to persons found guilty of disruptive acts—could seriously undermine the efforts of universities to strengthen their own campus judicial mechanisms. He said that measures aimed at institutions—requiring them to set federally acceptable disciplinary standards against unruly students as a prerequisite for receiving aid—threatens the university's autonomy.

William Rambo, director of Stanford's Applied Electronics Laboratory, which was occupied by students in mid-April (see *Science*, 2 May 1969), testified that antiriot amendments could have an "enormous negative effect." Rambo, whose office was occupied by students who renamed it the "Che Guevara room" less than 3 months ago, said that any attempt taken by the federal government, outside of court action, to limit student disruptions by threatening universities or individuals with punitive restrictions may be regarded as a more serious threat than the disruptions these measures have been devised to prevent.

The questioning that followed revealed differences of opinion between the powerful committee chairman, John McClellan (D-Ark.), and committee member Charles Percy (R-Ill.). McClellan had indicated that if the universities aren't willing to cooperate fully, they may well get a push from Congress. McClellan flatly insisted, "When people resort to crime, I don't believe the university should become a sanctuary." Percy, on the other hand, says that campus disruptions and punitive actions are better resolved out of Washington. He fears that Congress, in a moment of rashness, might pass legislation that would be futile. He says Congress must not take a "get in there and let them have it" attitude, and warns against "feeding the flames of insurrection on campus."

The McClellan hearings are scheduled to continue through the rest of July.—MARTI MUELLER

"a flagrant example of unfairness in the security check process."

Those wishing to be commissioned usually attempt "to find a job" within the PHS before they are actually commissioned to ensure that there will be a spot for them. Kahn went to the PHS's Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta in May 1968 to interview for a position there in the Epidemic Intelligence Service. All went well and he applied for a commission in May of last year. In mid-August, Kahn learned both by letter and by telephone that his application was sponsored by the Epidemic Intelligence Service and that, subject to approval, he would begin active duty in July 1970. On 19 August, Kahn notified the Epidemic Intelligence Service of his acceptance. "They wanted me and I wanted them," Kahn explained to *Science* in an interview. In mid-October, Kahn said, he was told by the Service that he had passed his physical examination and that the only remaining step in processing his application was a "routine security check." However, on 12 December Kahn was informed by HEW that he "did not meet the standards" for appointment in the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service. Kahn's efforts to determine the specific security grounds on which he had been excluded proved completely unsuccessful until Senator Brooke's office began to make inquiries.

According to Alton C. Frye, one of Brooke's top assistants who has worked on this matter, an HEW official explained the Kahn rejection with the statement "These kind of people can be very troublesome." In Frye's opinion, the information which HEW produced to explain its rejection of Kahn amounted to "nothing, nothing at all. It was absolutely insubstantial."

Kahn has now filed suit against the relevant officials of the federal government to stop his imminent induction into the military and to overturn his denial of a PHS commission on security grounds. The case opened in early July in the U.S. District Court in Boston. Kahn's lawyers, who are supported by the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, argue that denial of a PHS commission on security grounds "has served to damage the plaintiff's reputation, character and loyalty, and will foreclose any future employment or association with the Government or any private institution receiving funds from the Government." They also argue that Kahn "has no