

will also be influenced through their membership on the boards of universities, foundations, and other institutions—and through the membership of university officials on corporate boards.

Since the explosions of student unrest at Berkeley, Columbia, Harvard, Stanford, and other institutions, nearly all major universities are, in various ways, allowing students an increasingly large voice in university policies. Columbia provides a striking case in point. There, a student-sponsored resolution, calling for the trustees to support the Campaign GM proposals for the election of public representatives to the GM board of directors and for the appointment of a shareholders' committee on corporate responsibility, was adopted by a vote of 60 to 7 last week by the new University Senate. This body, in which students and faculty (nontenured as well as tenured) hold more than three-fourths of the votes, is the first of its kind to be established in a major American university. It was created last year as a direct outgrowth of the student demonstrations in the spring of 1968. On a matter such as the Campaign GM proposals the trustees will not have to accept the Senate recommendations but, if they do not, they will be expected to give an accounting.

Liberalizing Trends

So, while prominent industrialists, corporation lawyers, and businessmen are still heavily represented on many university governing boards, their role is often one of accommodating university policies to student and faculty pressures. At Stanford, the corporate responsibility issue is being considered by a board of trustees which includes a number of major figures from industry and business. But the makeup of this board is undergoing liberalizing changes, two professors (from Berkeley and the University of Washington) and a former president of Stanford having replaced three industrialists who left the board last year. Moreover, over the next 3 years eight Stanford alumni will be added to the board, and four of them must be no older than 35. One indication of the way the board is swinging with the times can be seen in the fact that the small trustee committee now reviewing the Campaign GM proposals includes a student and a professor among its members.

As it happens, none of GM's executive officers are members of the M.I.T. Corporation. But, James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the M.I.T. Corporation,

is a GM director and he could soon find himself arguing for corporate responsibility proposals within GM's own councils. M.I.T. is approaching the Campaign GM proposals cautiously, but there seems a good possibility that it will send a delegation to the GM shareholders' meeting with instructions to support certain corporate responsibility proposals.

All of the Campaign GM proposals were not endorsed in a report recently approved by the M.I.T. undergraduate assembly but several were, including the one for the election of public representatives to the GM board of directors. While the establishment of a shareholders' committee on corporate responsibility was also recommended in the assembly's report, exception was taken to the Campaign GM plan to have the members chosen by a panel on which Campaign GM and the UAW would have the majority voice. The corporate responsibility issue is now under study by the M.I.T. Corporation's Joint Advisory Committee. Last week this committee, on which the Corporation, the faculty, and the student body are represented equally, conducted a hearing at which witnesses from General Motors and Campaign GM appeared. The questioning of these witnesses is reported to have been penetrating and thorough.

For Campaign GM, the few weeks remaining before the shareholders' meeting on 22 May are critical. Regents at the University of Texas as well as those at the University of Michigan have refused to support the campaign. And last week the University of California regents rejected a proposal to support Campaign GM, electing instead to let their investment committee decide how to vote the university's 100,000 shares. An action by the University of Pennsylvania trustees' investment committee has been widely interpreted as a commitment to support Campaign GM; but, in fact, the committee merely gave its chairman, Howard Butcher III, a conservative Philadelphia broker, discretionary authority in the matter.

As noted earlier, a number of major institutions still have the Campaign GM proposals under study. This is true at Yale, for example, where the campaign has a partisan in Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York (a Yale trustee), who has asked that his city's employee pension system support the campaign proposals calling for a greater effort by GM in air pollution control and mass

transit. At Harvard, George F. Bennett, the treasurer, appeared to give short shrift to a request in early March by the Harvard Young People's Socialist League for the university to support Campaign GM. Since then, however, the Harvard Corporation has taken up the question and asked for further student and faculty comment.

If some major institutions do support Campaign GM and thus endorse the corporate responsibility concept, another question immediately arises. Is it even possible for an institution such as M.I.T., holding stock in scores of companies, to determine which of these are socially virtuous? Some type of corporate responsibility index clearly is needed—a kind of "Dunn and Bradstreet" rating system by which criteria with respect to such things as pollution control, land-use practices, product safety, minority hiring, and the makeup of boards of directors would be applied. To devise such an index would not be easy and the problem of gaining access to reliable information would be formidable. The committee on corporate responsibility at Stanford's Graduate School of Business has, however, undertaken to develop such an index, at least experimentally, over the next year and a half.

Not Morally Neutral

Campaign GM rests on the proposition that to invest in a company is not a morally neutral act and that the investor should use his influence as a shareholder, such as it is, in the interest of good corporate behavior. To this there is the corollary that universities have never really been aloof, as institutions, from the tensions, the social struggles, and the "environmental violence" (to use Nader's phrase) associated with corporate behavior. By their policy of taking only financial performance into account, these institutional shareholders have made their comment on events. Campaign GM is pressing them now for an explicit comment on the social dimensions of corporate behavior, demanding in effect that they put their consciences where their money is.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

Erratum: In the article "Dominance and the niche in ecological systems" by S. J. McNaughton and L. L. Wolf (p. 131, 9 Jan.), equation 4 on page 132 should read

$$W = \left[\frac{\sum (y_p \cdot p^2) - [\sum (y_p \cdot p)]^2 / \sum y}{\sum y} \right]^{1/2}$$

Erratum: The title of the report by L. Ehrman (p. 905, 6 Feb.) should have read "Simulation of the Mating Advantage of Rare *Drosophila* Males." Through an oversight, this correction was not made here.