

## Anthropologists' Debate: Concern over Future of Foreign Research

Perhaps more than the members of other academic disciplines, U.S. anthropologists are apprehensive about being able to continue their "laboratory" work. Many find an increasing number of impediments blocking the foreign-area research which they feel is absolutely essential to their profession.

Last year, in the wake of the wreck of Project Camelot, the Anthropological Association commissioned its executive board to explore the profession's relationships with the agencies which sponsor foreign research. The board received a \$21,750 grant from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, and appointed Ralph L. Beals, of the University of California, Los Angeles, a past president of the association, to report on the subject.

During 1966, Beals spent 8 months preparing his report. He and Stephen T. Boggs, then the association's executive secretary, interviewed anthropologists throughout the country concerning their foreign research experience and held extensive conversations with relevant government officials in Washington. Beals traveled to Latin America to gather more data. In addition, 40 other anthropologists asked their colleagues for information on their particular areas of foreign research. It is estimated that approximately 500 anthropologists contributed to the Beals report, although some questioned the propriety of having their association inquire into such matters.

After first presenting his findings to the executive board, Beals discussed his conclusions at the annual meeting in Pittsburgh last month in preparation for proposed action by the Fellows of the association. One of the most disturbing aspects of U.S. governmental activity to anthropologists is the suspected use of anthropology as a cover for intelligence operations. On the basis of information gained from reports from the field, Beals said he can state "with considerable confidence" that:

1) "Agents of the intelligence branches of the United States Govern-

ment, particularly the CIA, have posed as anthropologists. . . ."

2) "Anthropologists . . . have been full- or part-time employees of the United States intelligence agencies including the CIA especially, either directly, or through grants from certain foundations with questionable sources of income, or as employees of private research organizations. . . ."

3) "Some anthropologists, particularly younger anthropologists, who have encountered difficulties securing financing for legitimate research undertakings, have been approached by obscure foundations . . . only to discover later they were expected to provide intelligence information, usually to the CIA. . . ."

Anthropologists react to such requests in a variety of ways, Beals noted. Some refused to give information to any representative of the U.S. Government. Others give information which they think may improve U.S. understanding and policy. Even in such cases, Beals reported, "the overwhelming majority of anthropologists believe they should give no information which might prove harmful either to the host country or to individuals in the host country."

Beals found that research grants

from the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution were less suspect abroad than were research grants from the U.S. Information Service, the CIA, and the Defense and State departments, and that most anthropologists would prefer government support from the three first-named agencies.

In addition to being concerned about intelligence operations, many anthropologists were dissatisfied with the State Department's Foreign Affairs Research Council. [The council was created after the demise of Project Camelot, to judge the foreign research proposals supported by various federal agencies (*Science*, 10 Sept. and 10 Dec. 1965)]. Beals said that the work of some anthropologists had been delayed by the review process, and that, although there was no evidence of council censorship so far, the potential of such research censorship existed. Beals also said that the council would not necessarily prevent future Camelot-type operations.

"There are strong reasons to suspect that private organizations offering 'systems' approaches but without competent social science staffs or experience with problems of foreign area research are contracting to do very large-scale Camelot-type studies in countries where this is acceptable to the U.S. Ambassador and the host country," Beals said. "Experienced personnel do not exist for research on this scale. Young, partially trained, and inexperienced people are being recruited and in some cases literally seduced by extravagant salaries." Beals warned his fellow

### Anthropologists' Vietnam Resolution

At its annual meeting in Pittsburgh last month, the American Anthropological Association adopted the following resolution:

"Reaffirming our 1961 resolution, we condemn the use of napalm, chemical defoliants, harmful gases, bombing, the torture and killing of prisoners of war and political prisoners, and the intentional or deliberate policies of genocide or forced transportation of populations for the purpose of terminating their cultural and/or genetic heritages by anyone anywhere.

"These methods of warfare deeply offend human nature. We ask that all governments put an end to their use at once and proceed as rapidly as possible to a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam."

David F. and Kathleen G. Aberle of the University of Oregon offered the resolution; according to anthropologists who attended the closed meeting, it was approved by a great majority of the Fellows present after a spirited debate.

anthropologists that, "although Camelot is dead under that name, in a sense it has only gone underground. Similar types of projects have been conducted and are being planned under different names and through other kinds of agencies."

In his report, Beals by no means blamed the U.S. Government for all the difficulties of his profession abroad. He also singled out rising nationalism and the failings of anthropologists themselves. Major difficulty is created by the sizable number of U.S. anthropologists and other social scientists who are often operating in the same area. The numbers problem is further complicated when "too many anthropologists engage in foreign area research without adequate preparation and background for the area in which they work. This is far more true, however, of social scientists in other disciplines," Beals argued.

Foreign officials and scholars often

contend that American scholars are "mining" local social science materials without sufficient return to the host country. Some U.S. scholars fail to send back copies of their reports or theses, do not publish in the local journals, and do not assist in developing the educational resources of the host countries. In Senate testimony in July Stephen T. Boggs, former executive secretary of the Anthropological Association, said that this kind of "neocolonialism" means "treating the world as if it were your own oyster: exploiting the world on your own terms, rather than with an eye to the needs of the people involved."

Social scientists entering foreign-area research "generally exhibit a high degree of ethnocentrism," Beals reported; "Astonishingly . . . so do a great many anthropologists." Beals also suggested "that many anthropologists are lacking in elementary tact and courtesy," and that anthropologists have a reputation

for being "eccentric." "We are a gossip profession," he added, "and some of us apparently enjoy gossiping about colleagues to outsiders. The data suggest we would do well to confine our gossip to intramural situations."

For a variety of reasons, Beals noted, "it seems clear that there is a trend toward more restriction and greater criticism of the anthropologist and his research." Beals regards the problems arising out of the Cold War ideological competition as the greatest single source of problems facing anthropologists engaged in foreign research.

The Executive Board of the association was "extraordinarily happy" with the Beals report, Charles Frantz, executive secretary, said in an interview with *Science*. After receiving the report the board members formulated a series of policy resolutions which they presented to the Fellows for consideration. The statements included the following:

- "Effective anthropological field research is incompatible with governmental demands for clearance" and demands for excessively detailed research plans.

- Anthropologists employed or supported by the government should be given "the greatest possible opportunities" to participate in planning research projects and to publish their findings.

- When queried in the field, anthropologists should provide information about their professional qualifications, their sources of support, and the objectives of their research.

- Anthropologists should carefully consider the nature and requirements of organizations sponsoring research and should be aware that the sponsorship of "the Department of Defense and other mission-oriented branches of the Government" may "create an extra hazard in the conduct of field work and jeopardize future access to research opportunities in the areas studied."

Anthropologists present at the closed meeting of the Fellows report that there was general agreement concerning the desirability of the above statements and in favor of a declaration of policy defining the proper relationship between the federal government and their profession. There was also reported agreement on two other major points made in the statement, but the Fellows of the association could not agree on the wording which the board had provided. One of these points stressed the need to keep anthropology separate from intelligence operations: "The name of anthropology or the title of anthropologist should not

### Test Detection: Dispute Over DOD Experiment Settled

A Defense Department seismological experiment that appeared to be capable of developing into a minor international incident has gotten underway peaceably and with no signs of further difficulty.

The experiment is part of Vela Uniform, a program of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) concerned with detection of underground and undersea nuclear tests. The purpose of the experiment is to investigate the possible existence and magnitude of travel-time anomalies occurring in the area of the Kurile Islands. Such anomalies are important in the determination of the location of seismic events; last year the U.S. Long Shot experiment at Amchitka established the existence of anomalies in the Aleutian arc, an area similar in structure to the Kuriles.

The Kurile experiment called for placement of a temporary network of ocean-bottom seismographic stations in international waters off the Kurile Islands. In addition, the experiment included a series of about 24 underwater chemical explosions, each of 1 to 5 tons, in the area to calibrate the seismographic network, and some smaller explosions to establish orientation of horizontal seismometers.

When the experiment was announced this fall it evoked protests from the Soviet Union and from Japan. The Japanese, who communicated with the State Department, argued that fish in the area would be harmed. The Russians made no formal protest but complained through *Tass* that the experiment would damage their earthquake-warning system and their tsunami-warning network, and that it would also harm fish and fur-bearing animals in the vicinity of the islands. ARPA thought not, but, having been criticized for threatening sea otters with Long Shot, was particularly anxious to avoid difficulty; it agreed to change the proposed location of some of the seismometers in order to meet Russian and Japanese objections. The U.S. also stressed that data obtained from the tests were to be made publicly available, and invited the Japanese and Russians to send observers. Only the Japanese accepted, but the Russians have done no further complaining, and, as far as ARPA is concerned, no news is good news. The tests began on 21 October and are expected to conclude by the end of this month.—E.L.

be used as a cover for intelligence activities in foreign countries," the board's recommendation concluded. The other point specified that academic institutions should not lend themselves to "clandestine operations" or "the collection of secret data," except in case of Congressional declaration of war.

The recommendations were offered at a session late in the association's meeting, and many Fellows felt it was not possible to iron out the differences in wording among the hundreds of anthropologists present. Also, the Fellows had not received a copy of the Beals report on which the statements were based. Therefore, the executive board was directed to rewrite the recommendations and mail them to the Fellows; they are to receive, within the next few weeks, copies of the Beals report and of the revised recommendations, upon which they will then vote. Several anthropologists, including the association's executive secretary, told *Science* that they thought the majority of Fellows agreed with the tenor of the recommendations, and that they would be surprised if the recommendations were not adopted.

Perhaps more than members of most social-science disciplines, U.S. anthropologists have attempted to grapple with the ethical and scholarly problems raised by government subsidy of research. Since anthropologists are so dependent on access to foreign cultures, they, especially, have been compelled to consider the world-wide effect of U.S. government activities on foreign research. Beals plans to turn his report on foreign research problems into a book-length study; both his book and the recommendations eventually passed by the association are likely to command the attention of other academic disciplines.

But, whatever the recommendations that are passed by the association, many anthropologists will remain pessimistic about the possibility of improving their working conditions in other countries. Noting that anthropologists from small countries do not face such great problems of access, William Sturtevant, a Smithsonian anthropologist, comments: "These difficulties are the price we pay for being citizens of one of the two behemoths." Although many U.S. anthropologists are resigned to paying the research price that their citizenship entails, they will no doubt continue their efforts to prevent their government from making the price any higher than it need be.—BRYCE NELSON

## NEWS IN BRIEF

● **HUMANE ANIMAL CARE:** The Department of Agriculture has published proposed standards regulating transportation and handling of laboratory animals. The regulations, issued in accord with humane legislation passed by the last Congress (*Science*, 25 Mar., 19 Aug., 2 Sept.) cover housing, feeding, watering, sanitation, ventilation, shelter, and veterinary care for research animals ranging from rabbits to primates. They also include a proposed system of record keeping and identification for dogs and cats in interstate commerce. The proposed standards are a monument to humane intentions but, as it stands now, the Agriculture Department lacks the means to make them enforceable. The administration proposed an enforcement budget for fiscal year 1967 of \$1,650,000, but the House cut out the funds altogether and the Senate allowed only \$800,000. A compromise sum of \$300,000 was finally allocated, but unless these funds are supplemented soon, the enforcement program will get off to a tortuous start. The regulations were drawn up with the assistance of the Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources of the NAS-NRC. Interested parties have 30 days to comment; the target date for issuance of final regulations is 24 February; and compliance is supposed to begin on 24 May for animal dealers and on 24 August for research facilities. Copies of the regulations are available from the National Society for Medical Research, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

● **NSF AIDS INDIA:** The National Science Foundation will begin serving as adviser to the Indian government on improving teaching methods and curricula in science, mathematics, engineering and technology. Under an agreement with the Agency for International Development, NSF will advise the newly created Indian National Council on Science Education on a variety of matters affecting secondary school and college teaching. The new project is an extension of ongoing programs of co-operation between the United States and India, including the joint sponsorship in the past 4 years of over 200 summer institutes in India for training high school and college teachers. Present plans call for about 100 additional training sessions in the summer of 1967.

● **ROCKEFELLER AWARDS:** Among the 1966 recipients of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards is Edward F. Knipling, director of the Entomology Division of the Agriculture Research Service, who received the prize for science, technology, and engineering. The annual awards of \$10,000 each are administered by the Woodrow Wilson School of Public International Affairs of Princeton University, and recognize distinguished service to the U.S. government. Knipling is known both for his work in sterile insect control and as director of the Orlando, Florida, laboratory that developed DDT and other insecticides and repellents for use by the Armed Forces during World War II.

● **CREWE RESIGNS AS ARGONNE HEAD:** Albert V. Crewe has submitted his resignation as director of the Argonne National Laboratory, but has agreed to remain in the post until a successor is appointed. Crewe, who became director in 1961, plans to return to fulltime teaching and research in physics at the University of Chicago. Crewe previously served as director of Argonne's particle accelerator division.

● **TEACHER CORPS DIRECTOR:** Richard A. Graham, a former Peace Corps administrator, and a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, has been sworn in as the first director of the National Teacher Corps. Now a little more than a year old, it has been limping along on meager government appropriations. The budget for the current fiscal year was reduced from the administration's \$31 million request to \$7.5 million. Graham indicated that the Teacher Corps needs a supplementary appropriation from Congress early next year for its survival, and that his job is to convince Congress that the program is worthwhile.

● **HEALTH MANPOWER BUREAU:** Leonard D. Flenninger, medical director of the University of Rochester's Strong Memorial Hospital, will head the new Bureau of Health Manpower in the Public Health Service. The bureau is one of five major subdivisions established in PHS under the reorganization plan which becomes effective 1 January (*Science*, 2 December).