ously vindictive decision to eliminate a pay raise and to cut the budget of the Academic Senate, this seems to be an overly paranoid interpretation. As one campus administrator told *Science*: "The Reagan administration has made budget cuts in everything. It's not easy to prove that the university has been singled out for discriminatory treatment."

University Blamed for Own Woes

Although campus liberals regard Reagan as the biggest threat to the continued excellence of the university, the Reagan administration itself claims the major threat comes from the university's failure to police its own ranks and uphold its standards. This was the view expressed in an interview with *Science* by Alex C. Sherriffs, a former vice-chancellor at Berkeley who is now the governor's chief educational adviser and who is almost as unpopular as the governor in campus leftist circles. Sherriffs was particularly harsh in denouncing abuses that took place at Berkeley and other campuses when courses were "reconstituted" during the period following the Cambodian invasion. "The minute my colleagues use the classroom to push their own biases and give grades for services rendered to their own particular beliefs, the minute they give 46 credits to one student in one quarter [15 is usual], the minute they start saying, 'This system is so lousy I'm going to give you all A's or let you grade yourselves because it doesn't matter anyway,' the net result is that we lose academic freedom and the university deteriorates," Sherriffs says.

As Sherriffs sees it, Reagan is not inflaming public opinion against the university but is actually protecting the university from vigilante attacks by an increasingly hostile public. Sherriffs says that in a 10-day period during the Eldridge Cleaver controversy the governor got 77,000 letters, overwhelmingly in favor of his position, but most of the letters were reasonable in tone. Then when the Angela Davis case came up, he says, a tone of impatience crept into the letters, and when radicals burned down a bank in Santa Barbara, "suddenly people started talking about taking the law into their own hands—that's what worries me." Sherriffs suggested that if the public didn't regard Reagan's attitude toward the university as "tough," they would have moved against the university some time ago. Sherriffs also claimed the administration gets about 100 letters a week from faculty members, many of them saying, "We don't agree with you, Governor, but you're the only one who can save us from this idiocy."

Sherriffs insisted that the popular image of Reagan as anti-intellectual is false. He said Reagan had appointed more Ph.D.'s to the board of regents than any other governor and had provided "a larger dollar increase to higher education than previous governors." Although it is true that the university hasn't gotten all the money it asked for, Sherriffs said, this is partly because "the university upped its requests when they saw Reagan coming."

As the fall term approaches, university administrators are devising plans—certain to be controversial—to curb possible academic abuses and lessen some of the faculty's power in hopes this will give the administration greater control over the campuses and thus ward off attacks from the regents and politicians. The mood on the campuses seems filled with distrust. President Hitch and other administrators are suspected by the regents of being apologists for the faculty, and suspected by the faculty of being lackeys of the regents. Roger Heyns, chancellor of the Berkeley campus, is back at work after suffering a mild heart attack, but he is said to have been marked for purging by some of the conservative regents. The Los Angeles *Times* even reported that Reagan himself sharply criticized Heyns and other campus heads and discussed the possibility of ousting them at a "secret meeting" last June with about 30 conservative faculty members.

Where it will all end nobody knows. Institutions have a way of surviving indefinitely, so it is premature to count the university out at this point. Optimists believe a solid majority of the regents, faculty, and administration are sincerely interested in maintaining the university's preeminence and they suggest that good will ultimately prevail. But regent Coblentz is not so sure. "I'm not very sanguine about it," he says. "The university is caught in an economic and political pinch. There has been no appreciable drop in quality yet, but the sands are drifting out."

—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

Campus Unrest: Which Tack for President's Commission?

The President's Commission on Campus Unrest was created by President Nixon on 13 June, after the slayings of students at Kent State University in Ohio and Jackson State College in Mississippi. It was the latest in a long line of study groups, stretching back to the Johnson Administration, which were charged with examining campus disorders. With almost unvarying consistency, however, the reports presented by these groups have been ignored by the White House. There is little reason to believe that the fate of the Commission's report, scheduled to be completed by mid-September, will be different.

The President does not lack recommendations about what he can do to curb campus disorder. Time and again he has been told what to do: end the war in Vietnam, ask Vice President Agnew to restrain his speech, show some concern for people, especially black, poor, and student people. The two most recent reports that contained these recommendations were issued last June. One was by Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, and the other by James Cheek, president of Howard University. It has been reported that these studies met with an icy reception at the White House. Nixon and his advisers were reportedly furious because the reports placed so much blame for student unrest on the Administration and so little on students.

Yet the main cause of campus unrest does, indeed, lie with Mr. Nixon. His decision to invade neutral Cambodia triggered campus violence across the country and led to the deaths of the students at Kent and Jackson State. His law and order rhetoric has given some

law enforcement officials confidence that they can take any steps they want without fear of Presidential rebuke or legal action by the Justice Department.

How the Commission will deal with these problems and how they will phrase their criticism of the Administration remain to be seen. The real significance of the Commission, however, does not lie in whatever its report may say, for many of the recommendations it will most probably make have been made many times before. What makes the Commission particularly interesting, perhaps even unique, is the method it has employed to conduct its investigations. Instead of shrouding its investigations in secrecy and revealing the results in one big, dull report, the Commission has opened its operations to the public and the media, taking full advantage of television to give the Commission an impact on the public. The Commission has chosen to view itself as responsible to the public more than to the President who created it and who will dispose of its report as he sees fit.

This tactic has largely eliminated one effect that the President had hoped the Commission would produce. In creating the Commission, the President had hoped that its deliberations would give him time during which tempers would cool and that with this time maybe the problem would go away. This is an old Presidential tactic. Instead of letting the public forget about campus unrest, however, the Commission has kept the problem on the front pages.

The nine members of the Commission represent some of the more liberal and progressive elements which have been involved in campus disputes. The chairman of the Commission is William Scranton, former Governor of Pennsylvania, and its members include, among others: James Ahern, Chief of Police of New Haven, who is credited with guiding his city peacefully through the tense weekend of the Black Panther demonstration on 1 May; James Cheek, president of Howard University; and Martha Derthick, associate professor of political science at Boston College, who wrote her Ph.D. thesis on the training and operations of the National Guard.* Four of the nine commissioners are from the academic community; two are law enforcement officials; one is a lawyer, one a journalist, and one (Scranton) a politician.

The most controversial member of the Commission is Joseph Rhodes, a 22-year-old junior fellow at Harvard whose field is the history of Victorian England. Rhodes, a graduate of the California Institute of Technology, where he was president of the student body, sees himself as the student voice on the Commission and has become progressively more radical and more outspokenly critical of the Nixon Administration during the summer. He is a resident of Harvard's Adams House, a dormitory that houses some of Harvard's most radical undergraduates.

Rhodes received national attention when he came under attack by Vice President Agnew in June. Rhodes, who had just been appointed to the Commission, announced that one of the things he would like to investigate was the influence of Agnew's rhetoric on campus disturbances. Agnew called for his resignation from the Commission and accused Rhodes of "immaturity."

Rhodes was unruffled by the Vice President's tongue lashing and has exerted a strong influence in directing the course of the Commission's investiga-

* The other members of the Commission are Edwin D. Canham, editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*; Benjamin O. Davis, director of Public Safety in Cleveland, Ohio; Bayliss Manning, dean of the Stanford University Law School; and Revius O. Ortique, a New Orleans attorney and former president of the National Bar Association.

Yugoslavs Appoint Science Attaché

The first Yugoslav science attaché ever to serve in the United States has assumed his post in Washington, D.C. He is Milorad Mladjenovic, a nuclear physicist, and his arrival is a sign of increasingly close relations between scientists in Yugoslavia and the United States.

The decision of the Yugoslav government to appoint a science attaché in the United States stemmed from an agreement reached during a visit last September to Yugoslavia by Lee DuBridge, President Nixon's then science adviser. Marko Bulc, the Yugoslavian government's top science official, will pay a return visit to the United States 12 to 14 October.

Mladjenovic is one of Yugoslavia's leading scientists. He is a research director at the largest nuclear plant in Yugoslavia and a member of the Serbian Science Assembly. The science assembly is a key body in the distribution of funds for scientific research and development in Yugoslavia. The assembly of each Yugoslavian Republic every year draws up a science budget which is then voted by the parliament of the Republic and given back to the assembly to distribute. The assemblies are composed only of scientists. Half are elected by colleagues in their special fields, one-quarter are appointed by the parliament, and one-quarter are appointed by industry. All are scientists, and, in an interview with *Science*, Mladjenovic stressed this point as being indicative of the fact that in his country science is controlled primarily by scientists.

Like many of his fellow Yugoslavian scientists, Mladjenovic received his training abroad. He studied in France and received his doctorate degree in Sweden. "We are traditionally a very open country," he said. "Our scientists travel a lot. It is felt that a good scientist, on the average, should spend about 20 percent of his time abroad."

One recent development that has raised the need for increased international cooperation in science is the worldwide concern for environment. In Yugoslavia public concern for the environment has not achieved the crisis level that it has in the United States, largely because Yugoslavia does not have as many big industrial centers or as many cars as we do. Among scientists, however, this concern is increasing. Mladjenovic said that one of his primary functions as science attaché will be to stimulate the exchange of environmental information between Yugoslavia and the United States.

The increased relations between the scientific communities of the two countries began after World War II and has expanded at an ever-increasing rate since. At the present time the Ford Foundation, the Fulbright Program, and the National Academy of Sciences have programs in Yugoslavia. The United States has had a science attaché in Belgrade for the last 2 years. Twenty-one foreign embassies in Washington now have science attachés.—T.P.S.

tions, opening up its hearings to the public, gaining widespread publicity for the Commission, and broadening the scope of the Commission's work.

To achieve this last goal, Rhodes established his own "mini-commission" centered in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The mini-commission consists of undergraduates, graduate students, professors, lawyers, and journalists. It is funded through private gifts and has produced reports, submitted to the Commission members in Rhodes' name, on such matters as the training of National Guardsmen, the use of undercover police agents as provocateurs at Hobart College, and the effect of repressive legislation on the campus.

The Commission's official investigative staff consists largely of lawyers and is headed by William Matthew Byrne, Jr., a former United States attorney for southern California. In addition to the investigative team, the Commission also has a staff of writers, headed by Paul H. Weaver, assistant professor of government at Harvard, to assist in drawing up the report.

The backbone of the Commission's activities has been a series of open hearings held in Washington, D.C.; Jackson, Mississippi; Los Angeles; and Kent, Ohio. Among the hundreds of witnesses have been college administrators, professors, student leaders, law enforcement officials, and political figures. The full transcript of these hearings will not be published, but many of the concepts presented in them will be included in the Commission's final report. In addition, the investigative team has also conducted inquiries in Lawrence, Kansas, scene of the recent slaying of two University of Kansas students.

A sticky political problem that the Commission faces in writing its report is whether to name names or to confine itself to more general recommendations. In its report on the Kent State slayings, for example, it could make specific accusations against National Guardsmen. Such a step, however, might jeopardize the legal proceedings now under way to investigate the incident. It is more likely that the Commission will limit itself to general recommendations about what can be done to improve police actions in riot situations and will leave indictments of individuals to grand juries.

Perhaps the most crucial problem that the Commission faces is lack of faith in it by radical students. Radicals generally feel that the appointment of the Commission is a meaningless gesture by the Administration, designed to lull students into thinking that something is being done about Administration policies while those policies actually continue unchanged. H. Daniel Cohn, an assistant professor of physics at Brandeis University and a member of Rhodes' mini-commission, acknowledged the problem and admitted that he shares some of the radicals' apprehensions about the Commission. "None of us have too many illusions about the effectiveness of a Presidential commission," Cohn said, "but we feel that the very existence of the report means that it should be an appropriate one." Cohn said that radicals are generally unwilling to participate in the work of the Commission or even of the mini-commission, but he dismissed this problem as a relatively minor one. "I don't feel inadequate to reflect radical thinking," he said. "The split is between all of us and the people who run the country, not between radicals and liberals on campus."

The split between radicals and liberals may be more serious than Cohn thinks. One radical student, a Harvard senior, explained the difference this way: "Nixon has tricked some liberal students into thinking that the answer to campus problems lies in more communication. We don't want more communication. We know what Nixon thinks, and he knows what we think. What we want is for him to give in. We want action, not talk."

The Commission has been ordered to complete its task by 1 October. The investigative work is now largely finished, and the Commission has begun writing its report, which will be ready by mid-September. Exactly what it recommends remains to be seen. It is unlikely that its report will be vastly different from many of its predecessors. In any case, regardless of what the Commission recommends, the larger question will remain: What will actually be done? Indications are that the level of violence on campus will increase this year, and all the investigations and recommendations in the world will not halt that violence.

In the end, the reduction of campus violence depends not on reports but on action. Such action can only be taken by those in power, and power still rests primarily with Richard M. Nixon.

—THOMAS P. SOUTHWICK

A junior at Harvard this year, Thomas P. Southwick worked this summer as a Science *intern.*

APPOINTMENTS

In the Atomic Energy Commission, **Joseph J. DiNunno**, assistant to the AEC general manager for environmental affairs, to head, new Office of Environmental Affairs, and **Gerard F. Helfrich**, technical assistant to Commissioner Wilfred E. Johnson, to AEC's scientific representative in Tokyo. . . . **Alexander R. Martin**, professor of physiology, Yale University School of Medicine, to chairman, physiology department, University of Colorado School of Medicine. . . . **Donald A. Fraser**, head, tree physiology section, Petawawa Forest Experimentation Station, to chairman, geography department, Sir George Williams University, Montreal, Quebec. . . . **Joel Wiesenfeld**, professor of civil engineering, Rutgers College of Engineering, to chairman of the civil and environmental engineering department at the college. . . . **Earle W. Sapp**, Captain, USN, in the office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, to director, Naval Research Laboratory. . . . **Davis B. Bobrow**, professor of international relations, Johns Hopkins University, to director, Center for International Studies, University of Minnesota. . . . **Earnest F. Gloyna**, director, Center for Research in Water Resources, University of Texas, to dean, College of Engineering at Austin. . . . At the University of California at Riverside, **James S. Earley**, chairman, economics department, to dean, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and **Donald T. Sawyer**, chairman, chemistry department, to dean, new College of Physical Sciences. . . . **Reid A. Bryson**, director, Center for Climatic Research, University of Wisconsin, to director, Institute for Environmental Studies at the university. . . . **Malcolm H. Forbes**, academic dean, Cazenovia College, to dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Milliken University. . . . **G. Richard O'Connor**, associate director, Francis I. Proctor Foundation for Research in Opthalmology, University of California, San Francisco, to director of the foundation. . . . **Harvey L. Garner**, professor of electrical engineering, University of Michigan, to director, School of Electrical Engineering, University of Pennsylvania. . . . **William S. Gaither**, special assistant to the president for planning and development of marine studies, University of Delaware, to dean, new College of Marine Studies.