

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 Some U.S. scholars fail to send back copies of their reports or theses, do not publish in the local journals, and do not assist in developing the educational resources of the host countries.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.