

velopment of guidelines for cost and budgetary analyses and control by agencies of their document and information services, the development of education and training curricula for the operators and users of the document and information systems, and the development of policies for acquisition, dissemination, and translation of unclassified foreign documents in science and technology and for the dissemination of federally produced information and data to foreign countries and organizations.

### Summary

As a result of the studies described here and the COSATI recommendations, as well as briefings and discussions at many levels of government and with professional and industrial organizations, the Office of Science

and Technology has a blueprint for action and support for forward movement in the handling of scientific and technical documents.

### References and Notes

1. VINITI is an acronym derived from the English transliteration of the Russian name for the All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technical Information, Vsesoyuznyy Institut Nauchnoy i Tekhnicheskoy Informatsii. A description may be found in the SDC report cited below. For a critical Russian review of VINITI see V. S. Malov, Results of Check of Fulfillment of Resolution of Council of Ministers of USSR, "About measure for improvement of organization of scientific and technical information in this country," *Sci. Tech. Inform. (Selected Articles)* No. 6, (1964), Report FTD-MT-65-07, Foreign Technology Division, Air Force Systems Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.
2. U.S. Department of Commerce, "Scientific and Technological Communication in the Government" (AD 295 545, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1962).
3. President's Science Advisory Committee, "Science, Government, and Information: The Responsibilities of the Technical Community and the Government in the Transfer of Information" (The White House, Washington, Jan. 1963).
4. L. F. Carter, G. Cantley, J. T. Rowell, L. Schultz, H. R. Seiden, E. Wallace, R. Watson, R. E. Wyllys, "Recommendations for National

Document Handling Systems in Science and Technology" (TM-WD-213/001/00, System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif., Sept. 1965. Available as PB 168 267 from Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information).

5. L. J. Carter, *Science* **151**, 666 (1966).
6. It is often suggested that much of doubtful value is published and steps should be taken to reduce the amount published. It is easy to agree with this point but very hard to devise methods to reduce the amount of new material. The better journals have a very high rejection rate and new journals are started continuously. Government-required periodic reports further complicate the problem. An attack on this problem should be one of the first efforts of the Capping Agency discussed later.
7. In September President Johnson appointed a National Advisory Commission on Libraries to "evaluate policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private organizations—and to recommend actions which might be taken by public and private groups to ensure an effective, efficient library system for the nation."
8. L. F. Carter *et al.* (4, vol. 2, 404 pp.) give the detailed findings of these studies. In addition, several technologically advanced systems are described and the present and probable near-future capability of the technical components needed for large automated systems are discussed.
9. Federal Council for Science and Technology, "Recommendations for National Document Handling Systems in Science and Technology" (Nov. 1965. Available as PB 168 267 from Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Va.).

### NEWS AND COMMENT

## Berkeley: New Crisis Breaks Out on California Campus

U Thant remarked recently of China that it is undergoing a nervous breakdown. The same diagnosis might be applied to the Berkeley campus of the University of California, by some measures the greatest, but by any measure the most havoc-ridden, of American institutions of higher learning.

Last week, 2 years after the Free Speech Movement (FSM) uprooted the *ancien régime* of Berkeley, the campus was again in chaos, the spark for the latest eruption being a protest against the presence of an on-campus recruiting table manned by Navy and Marine Corps officers. In the forefront of the protest was the banished hero of FSM, 23-year-old Mario Savio, returning to the scenes of old glory, like Napoleon from Elba. Savio, whose application for readmission to the university was recently denied (in a challenge of regulations barring political activity on campus by nonstudents, he conspicu-

ously handed out leaflets while his application was pending), joined several other nonstudents in setting up an anti-military table near the military recruiters. When campus police ordered them to leave, on the grounds that nonstudents, with the exception of government representatives, are not permitted to set up tables on campus, they refused. A crowd gathered, a fight ensued, some 30 outside police—reportedly quite free with their clubs—were summoned by the administration, and Savio and nine others, among them three students, were arrested. Thereupon came mass meetings at which Savio was enthusiastically received when he called for a strike. This was followed by sit-ins and a boycott of classrooms, involving, according to various estimates, 3000 to 9000 of the university's 27,000 students. To the utter despair of the administration, which, in the wake of Ronald Reagan's million-vote victory,

feels like Paris after the blitz but before the occupation, Berkeley was again conforming to its popular image as an enclave of tax-supported anarchy.

What happens next is beyond forecast, but, on the basis of a week of conversations at Berkeley just prior to this latest eruption, it is clear that the peace of Berkeley was indeed fragile and that, if the presence of the military recruiters had not provided the precipitating event, another would have served as well. For, 2 years after FSM, Berkeley still had not resolved the basic question of just what it is a university is supposed to be in this rich and turbulent society, and, all along, the tensions evoked by that question have been wrenching the innards of the university community. To which it should be added that, while 2 years of post-FSM skirmishing gave the campus administrators great expertise in crisis-management, it also rendered them so punchy that, just prior to last week, many of them readily expressed concern about the durability of their patience in the face of what they considered to be incessant provocation by a small group of ingeniously disruptive students and campus hangers-on. As Vice Chancellor Earl Cheit, who summoned the outside police in the absence of Chancellor Roger Heyns, put it 2 weeks ago "The administration

is getting weary about the losses of opportunity to do good things for this university. Opportunities slip through our fingers because guerrilla warfare goes on all the time." On that very same day, Mario Savio, looking weary from long hours at the bartending job that he holds near the campus, emphatically predicted, "FSM Two is in the making."

The issue to which these Berkeley executives, Cheit and Savio, were addressing themselves was already running up the campus's political temperature when the military trio from the Alameda Naval Air Station arrived to sign up recruits for naval pilot training. (The Navy, incidentally, reports unprecedented success in its 3-day visit to the campus, having received 150 applications for flight school. "We're having a good drive," the head of the recruiting team told the Associated Press, "because the students know we're here.")

#### Noon Rallies

The issue was the noontime loudspeaker-broadcast rallies on Sproul Hall steps, instituted at the height of the FSM crisis 2 years ago and, ever since, not only a living, holy symbol of the revolution but also an enormously useful, perhaps indispensable, crowd-gathering device for Berkeley's well-packed spectrum of politics, which, at points, has evolved from one man, one vote, to one man, one party. [Berkeley is undoubtedly the only place in the country where a member of the Soviet's Washington embassy, on a lecture, tour has been picketed for Russia's failure to give more aid to North Vietnam. This occurred on 14 November, when members of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) demonstrated against Igor Rogochev, first secretary of the embassy. The pickets, in turn, were picketed by other SDS members, who said the picketing was not authorized by SDS.]

Aimed directly at the great crowds that regularly move along the main artery on which Sproul Hall borders, the booming loudspeakers serve nicely to excite Berkeleys' political atmosphere, giving virtually anyone—without discrimination as to party, veracity, logic, or mental balance—an opportunity to sermonize, debate, exhort, and rave before the passing thousands. As a symbol of the triumph of the revolution and the ensuing consensus for rehumanizing the university, the micro-

phone ranks with the original cross, but, as far back as the last academic year, doubts began to spread about there being a necessary relationship between free speech and voice amplification on a main thoroughfare. H. L. Mencken once wrote, "Living with a dog is messy—like living with an idealist"—and that is how the administration and a good portion of the faculty had begun to feel about the Sproul Hall microphone. In fact, John Searle, the FSM-supporting philosophy professor whose appointment as special assistant to the chancellor more or less institutionalized the revolution, stated that he, too, now favored removal of the microphone from the steps. Said Searle, "I helped put the microphone there, but now I feel like the Austrian statesman who helped start World War I, and when it was all over said, 'That wasn't what I meant.'" Nevertheless, while Heyns's steadying leadership was serving to bring the battle-weary faculty into harmony with the administration, large portions of the student body still remained suspicious of the administration's intentions—and looked to the microphone as the measure of the administration's commitment to the FSM reforms.

#### Heyns's Proposal

On 8 November, just 3 weeks before the latest eruptions and a few days after an outburst against a Veterans Day observation on campus, Chancellor Heyns went before the Academic Senate to point out that various campus organizations, among them the senate of the broadly based Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) and the campus Rules Committee, had last spring proposed moving the voice amplification equipment from the Sproul steps. (However, last week ASUC, as now constituted, voted 9 to 8 to support the Savio-called strike, and it is now doubtful that the organization would reaffirm last year's endorsement of moving the microphone.) "Because of its value in assembling a crowd," Heyns said, "the microphone has become the prize of those whose style and, often, whose purpose is destructive of academic values. I am not talking about passion or innocence of speech. I am talking about an anti-intellectual posture. We are unintentionally fostering a style of speech that is often vicious in intent, dishonest, laced with slander and character assassination, indifferent to evidence and

truth, contemptuous of disagreement and often charged with hatred. . . . We find ourselves spending altogether too much of our time dealing with the fallout from the discussions on the microphone. . . . The governance of this University is just too difficult and too unrewarding and in the end too boring with this powerful weapon where it is."

It can be argued that Heyns was engaging in rhetorical overkill, since only a relatively small portion of the noon rally verbiage fits his picturesque description, but the chancellor made it clear that, whatever the dimensions of this irritant, he was determined to get rid of it.

Heyns proceeded to announce the following changes, involving two phases. Eventually, but not yet, the sound equipment would be moved 134 yards west, to the lower plaza, out of the mainstream of pedestrian traffic on campus. The noontime rallies on the steps could continue, but without voice amplification. He proposed, however, a preliminary change. The loudspeaker would be permitted to remain on the Sproul steps, but, first, with 10 minutes shaved from each end of the noon hour to reduce traffic jams in the plaza; second, with the sound volume reduced, "so that it will be less obtrusive"; and finally—the most ominous change for users of the microphone—with "a more strict enforcement of the standard of conduct against those who use our free forum for slander, intimidation and deliberate misrepresentation."

In view of the events that took place last week at Berkeley, Heyns's closing remarks were particularly revealing: "The days of doing business on this campus by coercion or the threat of coercion are over."

#### "Nonnegotiable"

The response from Savio was that the placement of the Sproul steps sound equipment was "nonnegotiable."

Heyns subsequently deferred making any changes at all, at least until the end of the quarter; meanwhile, the Berkeley community burst forth with controversy. An ASUC poll of one out of every 67 students in the Sproul Hall directory, for a total of 182 respondents, found 59.3 percent against moving the microphone, 21.9 in favor, and 18.8 undecided. The faculty, which had not expressed itself formally on the microphone issue at this writing, at least gave the wandering in-

quirer the impression that it had had enough of amplified rhetoric on the Sproul Hall steps and was in sympathy with the chancellor. This sympathy was affirmed Monday in connection with the current crisis when the Academic Senate expressed confidence in Heyns and called for an end to the strike. On the other hand, all student organizations were reported in support of the classroom boycott that followed the arrival of the police.

In any case, the disorders, while nothing new at Berkeley, are taking place against a political background with an altogether new ingredient, Governor-elect Ronald Reagan. Just where Reagan stands on Berkeley or most other issues did not come through at all clearly in his campaign, but the rugged lawman of screen fame chose to make Berkeley an issue during the election. Early in the campaign he declared that he favors free speech and the right to criticize, but "preservation of free speech does not justify letting beatniks and advocates of sexual orgies, drug usage, and 'filthy speech' disrupt the academic community and interfere with our university's purpose. . . . As governor," he said, "I would consider it my responsibility to take the lead in returning the university to its original purpose as an institution of learning and research."

#### Investigation

At one point Reagan said he favored a legislative investigation of Berkeley, but later he said that this would establish a precedent for "political interference" with the university. His preference, he stated, would be to have the university investigated by a "blue-ribbon" commission headed by John A. McCone, former head of the Central Intelligence Agency and head of the commission that investigated the Watts riots. Campaigning around the state, he said, had convinced him that the people of California are disturbed about conditions at the university and want to be assured that, "if there was something wrong, it is being corrected; if there was a responsibility for what is wrong and this still remains, that something will be done."

After the election, University President Clark Kerr was quoted as saying that Reagan's proposed investigation was "a partisan proposal in a partisan campaign." Reagan responded, "I think Dr. Kerr will find that the people of the state have some questions they

want answered and there's a need to restore confidence"—all of which has increased speculation that the days of Kerr's presidency are numbered. The 24-member Board of Regents, on which Reagan and his lieutenant governor will serve ex officio, is currently the object of much ideological nose-counting, most of which comes up with the finding that the existing pro-Kerr coalition, protected by the board's system of 16-year appointments, is likely to remain dominant for at least a few years. However, while the board is well insulated from politics in running the university, its appointments are made by the governor, and state appropriations for the university must pass through the governor's office. If Reagan wants to get at the university, this will be difficult, but certainly far from impossible. Those who fear him most, however, seem to find a good deal of solace in the belief that his political ambitions extend beyond California, and that, since liberal academics now radiate considerable influence in both major national political parties, Reagan would be harming himself by acquiring a reputation for repressive action against one of the nation's leading universities. On the other hand, it can be argued that liberal academics will never love him, no matter what he does, and that, furthermore, there are various ways for the governor to get at Berkeley without leaving any fingerprints, among them being budgetary allocations that favor the development of other campuses in the state system.

#### Reagan Statement

Reagan's comments on the current Berkeley crisis have been on the tough side. Students, he said, should "accept and obey the prescribed rules or get out." He added that "no one put a gun to their heads forcing them to go to the University of California. The people of California provide free access to an education unmatched anywhere in the world. They have a right to lay down rules and a code of conduct for those who accept the gift." As for faculty support of the student strikers, Reagan said, "if any employee of the university does not do his job he has served notice" of his intent to quit.

Since there is a grand array of people and parties who contend that Berkeley is doomed if it is not managed in the fashion they prescribe, all past and current disorders there have been hailed

as vindication of their belief and fulfillment of their prophecy. Probably few if any other major universities in the country could retain any academic distinction amidst the circumstances that have plagued Berkeley in recent years, starting with the Loyalty Oath crises of the early 1950's and continuing on through the FSM battles and the current disruptions. But a decade after the Loyalty Oath affair—which was widely hailed as the death of Berkeley—the university was deemed to be the most distinguished in the nation in a comprehensive study conducted by the American Council on Education (*Science*, 27 May). Academic body snatchers across the land gleefully now look to Berkeley's distinguished faculty and lay plans to acquire its stars. The fact is, however, that, despite the massive trouble that besets that campus, the Berkeley faculty has not disintegrated. Pre-FSM, its tenured faculty, which numbers in excess of 1000, annually lost 10 to 20 professors; last year the number was 30. Acceptances of admission by high-ranking graduate students has clearly declined in many departments, but this has occurred at a time when federally subsidized new centers of excellence are beckoning throughout the land. Inquiries by the Berkeley administration also show that most refusals are motivated by the reduction in out-of-state tuition waivers which the legislature put into effect this year. The reduction was clearly inspired by the belief that it would cut down the numbers of out-of-state trouble-makers, and, to that extent, the university, statewide, is paying a price for Berkeley's being a center of political agitation.

But the prognosticators of doom might as well recognize that Berkeley is still there as a great university and is likely to remain there indefinitely. In assessing that tumultuous institution at any given moment it might perhaps be useful to keep in mind the fact that there are individuals who regularly have nervous breakdowns but who nevertheless continue to be brilliant, productive, and worth while. After 2 years of almost continuous crisis at Berkeley and other universities, perhaps it is time to recognize that nervous disorders of the institution are now part of the academic scene in the United States, and that Berkeley, a pioneer in so much else, is also a pioneer in this regard. The situation is neither tidy, pretty, nor pleasant but, apparently, neither is it fatal. —D. S. GREENBERG