

Supporting the new structure is an array of faculty cabals that might almost be described as incipient political parties. The most notable of these is a sizable liberal bloc organized into an informal caucus known as "the 200." This group, which played an important role in the passage of the December resolution, sprang into action again after Kerr and Meyerson resigned. It was influential in formulating a guarded request for them to stay on and in engineering its passage through the Senate.

Two other factions, which are generally referred to as "conservative" and "moderate," are also at work. The conservatives appear to be a small minority who opposed the December resolution and who feel Kerr should have taken swift disciplinary action against the students. While not particularly influential with the faculty as a whole, these men, some of whom appear to have independent connections with the Regents and state legislators and are believed to be working behind the scenes for Kerr's ouster. The "moderates" were less enthusiastic about the December resolution and generally more enthusiastic about Kerr than either the liberals or the conservatives. Some representatives of the moderates negotiated with representatives of "the 200" in developing the endorsement for Meyerson and Kerr in March.

Administrative Grievances

Underlying the resurgence of faculty politics was the almost total collapse of the administration at Berkeley, signified by its spectacular failure to deal effectively with the students. There are two "administrations" at Berkeley, the campus authority represented by the chancellor and the statewide authority represented by the president. In theory the president is supposed to devote himself to the problems of the mammoth statewide system and stay relatively uninvolved in the day-to-day operations of the nine campuses. In practice, however, the relations between Berkeley and the statewide officers have always been uniquely close, partly because the administrative offices are physically adjacent to the Berkeley campus, partly because until 1952 the university president also acted as chancellor at Berkeley. In Kerr's case, this relationship was reinforced in two ways. First, there were personal ties—he had been an influential member of the Berkeley

faculty and served as Berkeley chancellor for 6 years before becoming president in 1958. And, second, the Berkeley chancellor, Edward Strong (a philosophy professor who was a top administrator of the radiation laboratory at Berkeley during World War II) is reported to have been progressively isolated from the Berkeley community during the crisis and unable to lead the campus effectively himself. Why this is so is unclear: where the responsibility for the fiasco really lies will undoubtedly be debated at Berkeley till doomsday. But, in any event, much of the blame was attributed to Strong, and this left Kerr increasingly responsible for managing the Berkeley campus. (Strong was replaced by the Board of Regents in January, and resigned formally in March.) Alarm at the form Kerr's management was taking soon combined with a variety of other grievances to produce a degree of faculty-administration estrangement overwhelmingly exceeding what is usually endemic to such relationships.

The faculty is irritated by the administration's plans for a calendar reform that would replace the present semester system by a quarter system in order to bring about a state unhappily referred to as "year-round operation of the plant." The administration is acting at the behest of the legislature, and has been supported by the Regents, who have just turned down a faculty request for postponement. But the faculty feels it has been inadequately consulted about a project which not only involves enormous work revising courses but which some feel may interfere with more serious efforts to promote curriculum reform. There is some tension as Berkeley, historically the favored campus of the university, tries to integrate into a growing statewide system and as the campus reaches the end of a period of rapid growth dictated by the state's master plan. President Kerr referred to this obliquely when he hinted that the resolution of 8 December (to which he was in some measure unsympathetic) could be partly explained by Berkeley's jealousy of the other campuses—a remark which infuriated the faculty. (There was wry amusement when the alumni magazine underscored the change in Berkeley's status by opening its factual article on the crisis, "The semester began almost as inconspicuously as any other—with President Clark Kerr in Tokyo dedicating the latest center in the university's

Education Abroad Program.") There is resentment against what many faculty members believe is a tendency of the administration to play one campus against another for its own purposes. And there are increasing complaints as the seemingly unstoppable growth of the bureaucracy makes life more cumbersome for the individuals within it.

Political differences also separate Kerr from the Berkeley faculty. How deep the feelings are, or how high the numbers, it is difficult to judge. But there appear to be significant numbers of faculty members who feel that Kerr has consistently and unjustifiably taken credit for the general liberalization of campus political activity that has accompanied the waning of McCarthyism, and that in his response to a variety of campus issues he has shown himself to be not a liberal at all. He is criticized particularly for his handling of a recent case involving academic freedom, for his failure to defend individual faculty members publicly when they were attacked by members of the state legislature, and for a statement in which he alleged that "Maoist" and "Castroist" elements had been involved in the student uprising. Some faculty also resent the rather unflattering view of faculty character and aspirations implied by certain passages in Kerr's recent book, *The Uses of the University*. At the other end of the political spectrum is a considerably smaller group of faculty conservatives who opposed some of the liberal innovations when they occurred and are distressed by their extension under pressure from the FSM. Differences between these groups, together with its other difficulties, leave the university facing its external antagonists extremely confused and divided.

—ELINOR LANGER

(A second article will discuss the deepening crisis touched off by the obscenity issue and the increasing pressures on the university from outside.)

Education: Scholars Organize a National Academy Intended To Advance Educational Scholarship

Establishment has been announced of a National Academy of Education, which its founders hope will parallel in prestige the National Academy of Sciences, but which will not have the quasi-governmental status of NAS.

In announcing formation of the academy, its first president, Ralph W. Tyler, director of the Center for Ad-

vanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, at Palo Alto, said that the academy is intended to create "a forum which will set the highest standards for educational inquiry and discussion."

Twenty-seven charter members have been named, in four categories (see box), and the academy constitution calls for an eventual membership of 50 active members. In addition there are plans for naming ten honorary members "selected from among distinguished citizens who have served the cause of education without necessarily having a professional background." Twenty-five associate members from other countries may be elected, and also ten members-at-large chosen because of their contribution to the field of education specifically through their writing.

The charter members are, virtually to a man, university scholars who have made notable contributions with writings on educational theory, history, or economics but are known in the academic community as psychologists, historians, or economists, rather than as educators with a capital "E".

There are no university presidents among the charter members nor are there any representatives of the professional education establishment based in the public education system and the teacher training institutions. Administrators, no matter how august, apparently are excluded from the academy's active membership unless they have published writings of recognized originality and weight.

The judgment of a man's publications by fellow scholars, then, is the touch-stone of membership in the new academy, as it is in the National Academy of Sciences. This standard works to the exclusion, for example, of people who have been prominent in the curriculum-reform movement in recent years—notably scientists and mathematicians—but who have not themselves published scholarly work on education. It is likely, however, that some of these will be highly eligible as honorary members.

The founders obviously decided to let the chips fall where they might in not allowing geographical distribution to influence them. Fifteen of the charter members are from East Coast universities, with Harvard and Columbia predominating. Six are from California institutions, and six others are from a few Midwest universities. Neither the South nor the Southwest

is represented, though the members hope that this can be rectified on the basis of merit in the future. So far, also, no government officials are members, and no women.

The idea seems to have been in the air for several years, but the direct impetus for the establishment of the academy came fairly recently from a group of influential men which included university presidents, foundation executives, and James Bryant Conant, who in his studies of American educational practice has obviously grown more concerned with educational theory. Original support for the

effort was lent by the Carnegie Corporation.

In January eight scholars came together to draft a constitution, designate categories of membership, and name the balance of the charter members. These original eight were Jerome S. Bruner, Roald F. Campbell, Lawrence A. Cremin, Lee J. Cronbach, William K. Frankena, Richard Hofstadter, Theodore W. Schultz, and Ralph Tyler.

The new academy sought a charter from the New York State Board of Regents and was granted one 2 weeks ago. While the National Academy of Sciences' constitution served as a

National Academy of Education

Charter members of the NAE, listed in the organization's four categorical sections, are as follows.

Category 1: The History and Philosophy of Education

Bernard Bailyn, Harvard University;
Lawrence A. Cremin, Columbia University;
William K. Frankena, University of Michigan;
Richard Hofstadter, Columbia University;
Isaac L. Kandel, Professor Emeritus of Education, Columbia University;
Israel Scheffler, Harvard University;
Robert Ulich, James Bryant Conant Professor of Education, Emeritus, Harvard University.

Category 2: The Politics, Economics, Sociology, and Anthropology of Education

Stephen K. Bailey, Syracuse University;
Gary S. Becker, Columbia University;
Paul Lazarsfeld, Columbia University;
Fritz Machlup, Princeton University;
Robert K. Merton, Columbia University;
David Riesman, Harvard University;
Theodore W. Schultz, University of Chicago.

Category 3: The Psychology of Education

Bruno Bettelheim, University of Chicago;
Jerome S. Bruner, Harvard University;
John Carroll, Harvard University;
Lee J. Cronbach, Stanford University;
Ernest R. Hilgard, Stanford University;
Sidney L. Pressey, Professor Emeritus of Psychology, Ohio State University.

Category 4: The Study of Educational Practices

Roald F. Campbell, University of Chicago;
Arthur I. Gates, Professor Emeritus of Education, Columbia University;
John I. Goodlad, University of California, Los Angeles;
Robert J. Havighurst, University of Chicago;
T. R. McConnell, University of California, Berkeley;
Patrick C. Suppes, Stanford University;
Ralph W. Tyler,* Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

* Officers in addition to Tyler, who is president, are two vice presidents, Cremin and Becker, and secretary-treasurer, Bailey.



Ralph W. Tyler

model for the new academy's, a decision was made fairly early not to seek a congressional charter. Apparently it was felt that the NAE would be more effective if it were free from a close relationship with the government. The intention is that the academy will operate with private and foundation funds.

The NAE constitution, which is still being circulated among members for final revisions, does provide that the academy shall serve as a source of counsel to public and private agencies and organizations, but, as one of the original members put it, the academy was "not founded to influence public policy."

The main business of the academy, as its founders see it, will be to suggest and perhaps sponsor fruitful lines of research. The initial effort, says one member, will be to develop "a community of discourse." It is expected that "proceedings" of the academy will be published. The rule of the British Academy that each member is entitled to read a paper of his own or someone else's will probably be honored by opening the pages of the proceedings to what, hopefully, will be examples of high-quality research in education.

One significance of the academy is that it serves as a reminder that there are now several "establishments" in American education and asserts that university intellectuals, particularly in the social sciences, feel they have a definite role to play, along with the administrators, the pedagogues, and the curriculum reformers.—JOHN WALSH

Announcements

The **National Science Foundation** this week consolidated all of its Washington administrative offices in a new downtown building at 1800 G St., NW.

The foundation, which has grown from 6 to 900 employees since 1951, has spilled out of its Constitution Avenue headquarters in recent years and was occupying six annexes around the city. The Constitution Avenue building will be taken over by the Interior Department's Bureau of Indian Affairs. The marble structure was built in 1931 for the Public Health Service. During World War II it was occupied by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and it later served as headquarters for the Atomic Energy Commission until NSF occupied it in 1958.

In the new building, which is privately owned, NSF is renting the third, fourth, and fifth floors, and parts of the sixth. The mailing address remains unchanged: National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550.

Meetings

The Association of Southeastern Biologists will hold the first of three annual symposiums on **man's pollution of his environment** at the University of Virginia, 15 April 1965. Frank E. Egler (Aton Forest, Inc., Norfolk, Connecticut) will give the principal address, "Communications—sound and unsound—in problems of pollution." Discussants will be John Cairns (Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia) and Lawrence S. Givens (Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, Atlanta, Georgia). (C. W. Hart, Jr., Academy of Natural Sciences, 19th and The Parkway, Philadelphia, Pa.)

The three **divisions of AAAS** plan to hold their annual meetings this spring and summer. Additional information on each is available from the division secretary or from the other participating organizations. The meetings are:

Southwestern and Rocky Mountain Division, 2–6 May, Arizona State College, Flagstaff; secretary, Marlowe G. Anderson, P.O. Box AF, University Park, New Mexico 88070. The meeting will be in conjunction with the Arizona Academy of Science and the eastern district, western region of

Beta Beta Beta Biological Society. In addition to sectional meetings, the major symposium will be on the biology of arid lands.

Pacific Division, 21–26 June, University of California, Riverside; secretary, Robert C. Miller, California Academy of Sciences, Golden Gate Park, San Francisco 18. The divisional symposium will be on arid zone biology: the physics of the soil-atmosphere interface and the biology of the interfacial region. The participating societies will be listed in the Forthcoming Events Calendar for June.

Alaska Division, 30 August to 1 September, Juneau; secretary, George Dahlgren, Department of Chemistry, University of Alaska College. Two symposiums are scheduled, on the North Pacific Fisheries and Alaska's future, and the quality of the natural environment. Meetings are also scheduled on the biological, physical, and social sciences.

The second symposium on **radio-astronomical and satellite studies of the atmosphere** is scheduled 19–21 October in Boston. It will be sponsored by the radio-astronomy branch of the space-physics laboratory, Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratory. Attendance will be limited to 300 persons. Papers are invited on the following topics: scintillation studies, satellite propagation, atmospheric emission by radio-astronomical techniques, instrumentation, total electron content, absorption by riometer techniques, and absorption, refraction, and scintillation by the lower atmosphere. Deadline for receipt of 200-word abstracts: 1 May. (G. A. Cushman, Wentworth Institute, 550 Huntington Ave., Boston, Mass.)

Columbia University's 16th annual **industrial research** conference is scheduled 22–28 August in Tuxedo, New York. The aim of the workshop is to pinpoint the role of industrial research managers and the relation of the industrial research complex to the total operation of a corporation. Speakers will include specialists in psychology, psychiatry, anthropology, industrial engineering, and research management. (R. T. Livingston, School of Engineering and Applied Science, Columbia University, New York 10027)

Erratum: In Eric Olausson's review of *The Deep and the Past* (19 Feb., p. 854), column 2, line 25, should read ". . . and date the last interglaciation. . . ."