

the liberal Congress elected in 1964, however, reform was not quite forgotten. A joint committee on legislative reorganization was created with Monroney as chairman. After hearings the committee wrote its bill in 1966, and in 1967 the Senate passed a bill—a relatively bland measure, although Clark had sought to strengthen it. That bill

found its final repose in the House Rules Committee.

The path to enactment of the House bill this month can be retraced to the activities in 1968 of a group of young but not uniformly liberal Republicans who reacted sharply to their discovery that the House was not a very democratic institution, particularly for jun-

ior Republicans. The group, led by Representative Donald Rumsfeld of Illinois, now director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and a White House adviser, took up the cudgels for reorganization and even mounted the House equivalent of a filibuster in behalf of the cause.

The ultimate outcome was heavily

Academic Protocol: From the G. Swinger Manual

With the start of another academic year, Science is pleased to present excerpts from the Grant Swinger Manual of Academic Protocol. Following are descriptions of typical academic situations and the responses that are recommended by Dr. Swinger, director of the Breakthrough Institute and the Center for the Absorption of Federal Funds.

SITUATION. You receive an invitation to present a paper, but no mention is made of an honorarium. Delicacy, however, forbids a direct inquiry.

RESPONSE. Send a letter expressing gratitude for the invitation. Add that you are trying to determine whether your schedule permits you to make a commitment. In the meantime, "for record-keeping purposes and in line with income tax regulations, it would be helpful to be advised as to the financial arrangements."

SITUATION. Having accepted the invitation, but having done little or no preparation, you are unable to honor the program chairman's request that papers be submitted beforehand for distribution to the participants.

RESPONSE. Open with remarks as follows, preferably in a modest mumble: "I fully realize that the organization of this program calls for a formal presentation, but in the interest of rapport and the free flow of ideas, I think it might perhaps be desirable for me to state a few points; and then, perhaps, we can move on to a discussion in which we can pursue promising lines of interest. Since all of us, myself, perhaps, most of all, are here to learn, I believe this might be a more fruitful approach. So, with the permission and understanding of the chairman . . ." (who, of course, is helpless). At this point, for protective purposes, it may be advisable to add: "First, so that we can focus as quickly as possible on what, after all, is an elusive subject, let me briefly delineate what it is I am *not* attempting to discuss."

SITUATION. A member of the audience, obviously well prepared, delivers a damaging critique of your remarks.

RESPONSE. "I think that Dr. ——— has sliced directly to the heart of the matter, and, incidentally, has vindicated my belief that we would cover more ground if we did not confine ourselves to a rigid programmatic framework. Nevertheless, and I hope we will have some comments on this, I don't think our analyses are mutually exclusive. In fact, my initial reaction is to regard them as perhaps complementing one another."

SITUATION. Inquiry is made concerning your frequent absences from your regular place of employment.

RESPONSE. Jocularly observe that (choose one: Fermi, Oppenheimer, Einstein, Edison—almost any Hall of Fame figure will do) once said, "A great scientist can never be found in his own lab, but a truly great scientist can't even be found in a lab that he's visiting."

SITUATION. Inquiry is made as to your limited, perhaps nonexistent, research output.

RESPONSE. "As ——— (select name as above) once said, 'A good scientist has a good idea once a year, a great one every decade, but a truly great one, only once in a lifetime. Now, I'm not so foolish as to suggest. . . .'"

SITUATION. You fear the results if a book you have written is assigned to certain reviewers.

RESPONSE. Mention them admiringly in the acknowledgements, even if only on the basis of reference to their own works, and make certain their names are included in the index. Review editors will assume they are friendly associates and will therefore consider them ineligible on grounds of partisanship.

SITUATION. As occasionally happens through the peculiarities of academic finance, you unexpectedly acquire control over a substantial sum of money, but can conceive of no useful way in which it might be spent.

RESPONSE. Convene a symposium. Solicit expressions of interest for attending, then seek to enlarge the sum by applying for foundation assistance.

SITUATION. A committee that you chair meets at great length and accomplishes nothing. Influential members appear annoyed.

RESPONSE. Conclude the meeting as follows: "I think we've cleared away a good deal of the underbrush, and from here on we can devote ourselves more closely to examining some constructive alternatives. For this purpose, I would like to ask certain members to draw up a few specific proposals that we can toss around at the next session."

SITUATION. Students show hostility because of your good relations with the administration.

RESPONSE. Depict yourself as one who has miraculously managed to maintain communications with the administration, despite your sympathy for the students.

SITUATION. The administration shows hostility because of your good relations with the students.

RESPONSE. Depict yourself as one who has miraculously managed to maintain communications with the students despite your sympathy for the administration.

—D. S. GREENBERG