

there is being held up as an example of what *not* to do by the newer breed of what might be called militant handicapped. Jim Gashel of the National Federation for the Blind thinks that the development of special offices for disabled students is a "growing and distressing trend." He says the Urbana system is "very custodial . . . worse than nothing." He says handicapped students resent the fact that they are compelled to fill out special forms that contain all kinds of irrelevant questions such as "neck size." He says special housing for the handicapped is unnecessary and segregationist, and that the university makes things so easy for handicapped students that they don't have to bother to develop their own resourcefulness—and resourcefulness is crucial for them when they get back into the real world.

Gashel represents an extreme view because blind people do indeed require far fewer physical accommodations than those who are wheelchair-bound. Nonetheless, his opinions are echoed by Eric Gentile, an engineer and wheelchair user who runs "programs for handicappers" in the office of the provost at Michigan State University which has 45,000 students, 500 of whom are handicapped. Gentile is the mastermind behind "project access," a ten-phase project, initiated before the passage of the Rehabilitation Act, whose ultimate aim is to make the entire 100-building campus totally accessible to every kind of user. Gentile says his model is totally opposite to the one at Urbana which he characterizes as "the medical model—very prejudicial and segregatory." "Disabled" is a dirty word at MSU because it implies total incapacity. "Handicapper" is preferred because it implies that the individual himself decides whether or not he is handicapped.

Gentile says auxiliary aids are not foisted on anyone, and are supplied only on request. The physical remodeling is done in such a way that the handicapped do not use special entrances and are not relegated to particular housing. Instead of ramps, for example, all buildings are gradually being refitted with railing-free "grade level entrances" that everyone uses. (They are also easier to plow in winter.) The university also "enhances" a random selection of dorm rooms (tubs instead of showers, levers instead of doorknobs and so forth) so the handicapped live with everyone else. Gentile says that although it will cost a half a million dollars a year over the next 10 years to reach phase 10, many changes can be made cheaply, through clever maintenance. Dial phones, for example,

are replaced by touch-tone phones; and whenever a doorknob falls off it is replaced by a lever handle.

Estimates of the number of handicapped in this country vary according to the definition. Perhaps 1 percent of Americans are what might be called severely handicapped: blind, deaf, or significantly orthopedically limited. But that percentage takes a quantum leap when others are taken into account, such

as the elderly, people with heart problems and degenerative diseases, and those with disadvantageous medical histories such as psychiatric hospitalization, cancer, alcoholism and, finally, those temporarily impaired from accidents. It should be remembered that as increasing numbers of adults return to school there will be more students with limited capacities resulting from advancing age.

Briefing

Lewis of NBS Accused of Plagiarism

An official at the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) in charge of aiding industrial innovation has been accused of plagiarizing entire sections of a well-known, 1967 report in a speech given to a small audience in Chile. The official admits he "made a mistake" but denies that the error constituted plagiarism, because "I never intended to benefit from someone else's work."

Jordan D. Lewis, director of the Experimental Technology Incentives Program (ETIP), of NBS, has admitted that the first 5½ pages of a 30-page keynote address that he gave at a meeting in Santiago last June were "excerpted" without attribution, from a report by a Commerce Department advisory panel headed by Robert Charpie, president of the Cabot Corporation, on ways in which federal action stimulates or discourages innovation. The Charpie report is a centerpiece of the literature on innovation, and some people maintain that the ETIP program, which Lewis heads, is indirectly an outgrowth of the Charpie panel's report.

Lewis admitted his error after Daniel V. De Simone, who was executive secretary for the Charpie panel in 1966 (he is now deputy director of the Office of Technology Assessment), wrote Lewis in November that while he was reading a copy of Lewis' talk, "I found myself in full agreement with your remarks," because, "the principal part of your paper is excerpted from a published volume . . . which I spent the greater part of 1966 in writing." Portions of the two texts are almost identical, except for slight word changes to make the text suitable for use in a speech.

In reply, Lewis first apologized and said that his own "ineptitude" rather than "an intent to slight" was the basis of the

error. After offering to send a note correcting the error to anyone De Simone wished, however, Lewis also suggested that he "allow" De Simone "to excerpt, without attribution, any material you wish from the balance of my talk." Lewis withdrew this suggestion after De Simone, in another letter, wrote "it dramatizes your insensitivity to what is involved here."

Now, after a second exchange of letters, the two are still at odds about what constitutes appropriate credit. Lewis proposed adding a footnote and redistributing the text of his talk; the footnote acknowledged the report only as a Commerce Department document. To *Science* Lewis maintains that that is all he is ethically required to do.

De Simone has objected to the proposed footnote in a letter to Lewis. "It does not say who wrote the volume you plagiarized. For all anyone would know . . . the cited reference could have been written by *you*." De Simone told *Science*, "What is wrong with his calling it the Charpie report? That way people would know what was being referred to. The people who labored on it, Bob Charpie, Pete Peterson, myself, and others, were real flesh and blood people. They ought to get credit."

"According to his standard, anybody is entitled to purloin words put together by any advisory panel to a government department and then cite only the big gray bureaucracy."

The tempest goes slightly beyond the Commerce Department's teapot, however, since Lewis had distributed copies of the original talk to a number of government advisers who now are going to get some sort of correction. Then, of course, there is the question of the 30-odd members of Lewis' audience when he gave the speech at the opening of the First Inter-American Conference on the Commercialization of Technology in Santiago last June, to whom amends may also properly be made.—D.S.