

foreign sensitivities." As was noted, they do suggest that such research needs should be handled by nonacademic institutions, but no attention is paid to the likelihood that perhaps it is a bit too much to expect suspicious natives, educated or otherwise, to be tuned in to the institutional peculiarities of American scholarship. Just who is working for whom at any given time is sometimes difficult to tell in the affluent American academic community, and the guidelines do nothing to clarify such matters. In fact, it is stated that they "were not designed to deal with consultant relations between an individual scholar and a government agency. . . ." Furthermore, the guidelines, in their suggestion that nonacademics be favored for classified duties, fail to note that an anthropologist in the employ of a Defense Department think-tank is not readily distinguishable from an anthropologist who works for a university. If the guideline writers think that the former can poke into sensitive areas without implicating the latter, then they are acting as though Camelot never happened.

However, the guidelines are not addressed to such matters, nor do they brush more than lightly over the relationship between foreign suspicions and classified research projects; nor is there offered any explanation of why the ban on covert support is applicable only to academic institutions. Is it permissible, let us say, for an intelligence agency to support foreign area social science research by a commercial contractor without the host country's knowing who is really behind the project? The new guidelines do not constitute any impediment to such practices, though presumably the State Department, as part of its post-Camelot review procedures, systematically screens government-supported foreign area research to avoid embarrassing situations.

On the issue of whether foreign governments are to be informed of the social science research projects that the U.S. supports on their territory, the guidelines are somewhat unclear. They state, for example, that "the [U.S.] government should under certain circumstances ascertain that the research is acceptable to the host government. . . . For example, when the U.S. Government supports a classified research project involving substantial field work abroad by scholars associated with American universities, sufficient information about the project should be

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **HARVARD DENTAL EDUCATION:** A committee appointed by Nathan W. Pusey, president of Harvard, has recommended that Harvard continue its graduate and postgraduate dentistry programs, but with changes in admission procedures, in curriculum planning and content, and in clinical training practices. Among the committee's recommendations were that dental students be admitted separately from medical students; that the dental faculty be more active in planning the dental students' first 2 years; and that dental students' clinical training be pursued in hospital settings rather than in the clinic of the School of Dental Medicine.

● **UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND:** A department in the University of Maryland's School of Medicine, tentatively known as the department of developmental research, has been approved by the university's board of regents. Samuel P. Bessman, professor of biochemistry and pediatric research, will head the department, which will be concerned with all phases of human development. The department will be staffed initially by members of the university's pediatric laboratory and senior members of the Rosewood State Hospital Research Laboratory.

● **DOCTORATE PRODUCTION:** The National Academy of Sciences has issued the sixth in a series of publications on the production of doctorates in the United States. Titled, *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities 1958-1966*, the report traces the educational pattern followed by doctorate recipients and lists the number and types of degrees awarded by each university. Among the trends documented by the report is that public universities are steadily widening the gap of doctorate production over private universities. Of the top five universities in doctoral output, four are public. The report lists the top five as Illinois, Wisconsin, California at Berkeley, Harvard, and the University of Michigan. In 1920, four of the top five and 12 of the top 20 were private institutions. Other developments cited by the report include (i) doctorates in engineering have almost quadrupled since 1958; (ii) the ranks of states in doctorate production has remained "remarkably stable" since

1950—with New York in the lead; (iii) the time between baccalaureate and doctorate is 5.1 years for scientists; and (iv) most new doctoral recipients are first employed by colleges and universities. Copies of the report may be obtained for \$8.50 from the National Academy Printing and Publishing Office, 2101 Constitution Ave., Washington, D.C. 20418.

● **AUSTRALIAN SCIENTISTS ON VIETNAM:** In an advertisement in the November issue of *The Australian Journal of Science*, 677 Australian scientists, both in and out of the academic community, urged the Australian and U.S. governments to adopt UN Secretary-General U Thant's proposal toward preliminary negotiations on Vietnam. The advertisement said, in part, ". . . it is particularly to be deplored that a technologically advanced country such as Australia should spend vast sums of money and effort dedicated to the deliberate destruction of food and depletion of the necessities of life in a region of the world where the two greatest threats to humanity, excessive population growth and food shortage, exist side by side. . . ." A view differing from that of the Australians was made public 19 December when 14 American scholars and specialists on Asian affairs released a statement warning that a Communist victory in Vietnam would likely lead to larger, more costly wars. The specialists described themselves as moderate members of the academic community.

● **STAMLER ENDORSEMENT:** Four AAAS board members, signing as individuals along with 11 AAAS fellows, have sent a letter to AAAS Council members asking them to support Chicago heart researcher Jeremiah Stamler in his court fight against the House Un-American Activities Committee (*Science*, 8 Dec.). The signers stated, "It seems quite appropriate that we in science give whatever support we can to this important effort in behalf of constitutional rights. We need to be jealous of these rights if the atmosphere necessary for our intellectual freedom is to be safeguarded." The board members who signed the letter in support of Stamler were Barry Commoner, Hudson Hoagland, Alfred S. Romer, and H. Burr Steinbach.