

ture for health services. This will provide for expansion or contraction of personnel and facilities as needed. It will assure a continued improvement in the quality of health services. This will make it possible for the new legislation to achieve its avowed goal of bringing to all citizens the blessings which it has made their birthright.

### Contract Research by Private Corporations

It seems likely that certain developments in bioengineering or studies on the distribution of medical care, which by their nature are multidisciplinary, might best be undertaken outside the organizational framework of the university. Development of artificial organs, which require collaboration of the medical scientist, the engineer, and the materials expert of industry, is an example. We feel strongly that the organization, staffing, and operation of such developmental laboratories should be accomplished through the universities. Only the universities have the per-

sonnel today necessary to make such enterprises flourish. To let their professional and scientific staffs be hired away by private developmental organizations, flush with funds from governmental contracts, would be most disruptive. As an alternative to bringing private industrial practices into competition with the educational institutions for staff, their prime possession, we suggest corporations set up by universities in the image of the Lincoln Laboratories of M.I.T., or the Associated Universities operation of Brookhaven National Laboratories. We would strongly urge that an educational role be assumed by such large developmental laboratories since they provide unique opportunities for the student to see the fresh fields which lie between the established, cultivated disciplines. We think such organizations would complement our medical schools and their affiliated teaching hospitals.

In conclusion, we support the judicious statements made by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, regarding govern-

mental support, the universities, and biomedical research (3). We think it timely to reassess their interdependency, to reaffirm practices which have proven fruitful, and to strengthen others which will lead most quickly, and sustain for years to come, an abundant flow of practical benefits to the health needs of our nation.

### References and Notes

1. It is appreciated that, as the major repository of understanding, the university is being called upon increasingly by government to apply its expertise to the solution of pressing social problems. This function is especially apparent in the professional schools of the university and it is in fact this trend with respect to medicine that prompted this statement.
2. G. Pake, *Science* **157**, 517 (1967).
3. J. W. Gardner, *ibid.* **153**, 1601 (1966).
4. This statement was prepared initially as a focus for discussion by a group of Boston educators and scientists: from M.I.T., Drs. James R. Killian, Jr., Jerome B. Wiesner, and Jerrold R. Zacharias; Dr. Robert W. Wilkins from Boston University; Dr. Samuel Proger from Tufts University; Drs. Robert H. Ebert, Maxwell Finland, Howard H. Hiatt, George W. Thorn, and myself from Harvard Medical School. The statement has been considerably revised during further discussions with Drs. Jerome Gross, Kurt J. Isselbacher, John H. Knowles, W. G. Austen, and Mr. David C. Crockett from the Massachusetts General Hospital. In its present form it has been accepted as a policy statement by the Committee on Research of the Massachusetts General Hospital.

### NEWS AND COMMENT

## "Pot" and Politics: How They "Busted" Stony Brook

*Stony Brook, N.Y.* In the early hours of 16 January, 73 cars, carrying 198 policemen, unobtrusively took up positions near several dormitories and off-campus student residences of the State University of New York at Stony Brook. With watches synchronized and radios silenced in accord with a 107-page tactical plan titled "Operation Stony Brook," the police waited until 5 a.m. At that time, and without prior notice to university officials, they entered the buildings, presented arrest and search warrants, and took into custody on drug charges approximately 35 college-age persons, a little over half of whom were enrolled at Stony Brook.

All the prisoners were handcuffed and immediately taken to jail, where

they were booked and held until friends, family, and school authorities had provided for bail bonds, which ranged from \$1000 to \$5000. In the hours following the raid, which came during the university's examination week, several others surrendered themselves or were apprehended. Among them was a student who was summoned out of an examination room, handcuffed, and taken away. The total number of arrests eventually reached 47. Of those arrested, 38 were charged with selling or possessing marijuana or other drugs, in secret felony indictments that a grand jury had handed down during the previous week. Each indictment was based on alleged sales of drugs by the defendants to police undercover agents who had been circulating on campus

during the previous few months. The remainder of those arrested were apprehended at the scene on various drug charges.

In the course of these raids, the police said, they came upon 10 pounds of marijuana; 1 pound of hashish; various other drugs, including substances suspected to be LSD; a pistol; assorted smoking pipes and auxiliary paraphernalia; two teen-age girls sleeping with boyfriends; and a married couple with two young children in a college dormitory room. The courts will, of course, have the final say on the legal significance of whatever evidence the police choose to present in making their case. But accompanying the raiders, as invited observers, were ten newspaper reporters, and, on the basis of their accounts, it appears that the police did in fact find what they said they found.

Following the raids, two state legislative committees announced plans for investigations, and the grand jury that had handed down the indictments summoned campus administrators to testify at a further inquiry into Stony Brook's affairs. Meanwhile, the police commissioner who masterminded the raid



**UNDER ARREST:** Suspects from the raid on Stony Brook are led handcuffed to the Suffolk County jail for booking.

Newsday

charged not only that the campus administration had wittingly tolerated the use of drugs, but that a university official somehow had got word of the raid and attempted to tip off various students. This was instantly denied. It was also publicly alleged that, in one way or another, several faculty members were more than casually associated

with the use of drugs on the campus.

Thus was "busted" Stony Brook, the 5300-student, 840-acre jewel of New York State's young and burgeoning system of higher education. Sometimes referred to as "instant Caltech" or "the Berkeley of the East," Stony Brook, 60 miles from New York City, on Long Island's North Shore, is now, quite



**AFTER THE RAID:** Stony Brook President John Toll (left) with County Executive Dennison (center) and Police Commissioner John Barry, who masterminded "Operation Stony Brook," following the predawn raid on the New York campus.

Newsday

understandably, in a semicatatonic state following its bludgeoning by the law. And since, in terms of institutional and personal futures, a great deal hinges on the outcome of various judicial and legislative proceedings under way or impending, this is perhaps not the most fruitful time to attempt to divine what happened and why. Nevertheless, Stony Brook's trauma properly merits attention on the part of anyone who is concerned for the viability and integrity of the nation's academic institutions. For, though the Stony Brook story has its own peculiar characteristics, it is, at the same time, in general harmony with one of the most conspicuous characteristics of contemporary life in the United States—namely, academe's accelerating alienation from the values and purposes adhered to by national and local authorities and, very likely, by the population at large.

This alienation goes far beyond the traditional "town and gown" conflict. On the subject of drugs, as well as on Vietnam, the draft, civil rights, foreign policy, the arms race, sexual mores and even hair styles, it is the campus that is the bastion and staging area for nonconformity or dissent from law, policy, or majority custom. It is true—but also irrelevant—that active dissent is manifested by only a relatively small proportion of academe's populace. For that segment, as was demonstrated most prominently at Berkeley and then at scores of other campuses throughout the country, has shown itself to be, first of all, not so small in numbers; second, it is ingenious and energetic in identifying and exploiting grievances so as to evoke at least the tacit support of those who, for whatever reason, choose not to report at the barricades. Thus, it has to be recognized that the campus has become an effective spawning ground for opposition to established authority. What must also be recognized is that the campus-spawned nonconformity and dissent have become extremely painful for those who are committed to existing law, policy, and majority custom, and that, not surprisingly, reactions are beginning to manifest themselves. Against this background, and allowing for some wondrously convoluted local peculiarities, we can proceed to examine the recent events at Stony Brook.

The first thing to be said about use of drugs at Stony Brook is that there was a good deal of it, though whether more or less than on other campuses is

neither determinable nor relevant. But throughout the campus community, from President John S. Toll downward, it is readily acknowledged that, among Stony Brook students, the use of drugs—mostly marijuana and hashish, some mescaline and amphetamines, and, occasionally, LSD—was no rarity. Thus, under the law as written, the police had clear-cut grounds for taking action. This being the case, the most interesting question is why, in cracking down at Stony Brook, they chose to behave as though they were going after a platoon of Bonnies and Clydes holed up in a fortified camp, when in reality they were going after a ragged collection of confused, frightened, and often pathetic students and dropouts.

The book-length tactical plan, "Operation Stony Brook" (its cover bearing a coat of arms consisting of a narcotics-squad shield, a plumed helmet, and assorted leaves and flowers), contains a page of descriptive text for each of the suspects, plus a detailed map of the neighborhood and premises where the police expected to find them. In virtually all cases, the text states, "it is not known if defendant carries a weapon, but because of his use of drugs, he should be considered dangerous." No resistance was offered during the raid, no one tried to escape, and all suspects who were missed by the early morning roundup docilely turned themselves in soon afterward. Furthermore, the legal objective of the raid was not to catch the defendants in the act; presumably that had been done some time before by the undercover agents whose testimony evoked the grand jury felony indictments. The object simply was to haul in the defendants, most if not all of whom would have quiveringly turned themselves in upon receipt of a telephone call or registered letter. (The police contend that felony indictments require instant apprehension, but old-timers in Suffolk County say that on those occasions when the law chooses to go after well-established hoods, they often are accorded the courtesy of being allowed to turn themselves in.)

Why, then, was Stony Brook accorded the gangbuster treatment?

The quest for an answer requires an examination of (i) the well-intentioned but muddled manner in which the Stony Brook administration sought to deal with drug usage on campus and (ii) the roiling party and police politics of Suffolk County, Long Island, whose Commissioner of Police John L. Barry,

## A POINT OF VIEW

*Secretary Robert S. McNamara, in his statement of 1 February to Congress on the new defense budget, explaining why he is recommending that spending for research be increased from the \$371 million appropriated for the current fiscal year to \$450 million for fiscal 1969:*

If we are to maintain a vigorous research program in all of the principal disciplines of concern to the defense effort, we must assure the university participants some reasonable degree of stability in the level of support we give them. This does not mean we should not change the level or focus of effort over a period of time as our interests shift but it does mean we should avoid sharp year to year fluctuations. The university researchers who are of most value to us are those who have achieved a certain unique knowledge of their respective fields of endeavor, and one of the important prerequisites in this regard is continuity of effort. In fact, without such continuity, we cannot expect to retain their interest in our problems.

Indeed, after examining all the evidence in this area for some years, I believe we should be willing to give first priority in the R & D program to a reasonably sustained level of research spending, taking into account the inevitable price and wage increases from year to year. During FY 1965-68, after adjusting for inflation, research funding declined. But it is quite clear that we must now reverse this trend and support more vigorously many scientific fields that show great promise and clear relevance to our future security.

a Republican and mastermind of the raid, had been publicly accused, just 2 weeks earlier of "insulting insubordination" by the County Executive, H. Lee Dennison, a Democrat. At issue was a dispute over the distribution of police services—a matter that, from a distance, seems esoteric and purely "technical," but such is the stuff of which local politics is made.

When Stony Brook reopened last fall for the 1967-68 academic year, its administration knew that it had a "drug problem" on its hands. During the previous year, some half-dozen students had been arrested on drug charges, and in at least two of these instances the arrests were made on the basis of information provided the police by university officials. In view of recent events, however, perhaps the most important effect of this cooperation between campus authorities and police was simply intensification of the built-in suspicion and, at times, animosity, that students feel toward their academic elders. At Stony Brook these attitudes were, and are, in ample supply even without the complicating factor of a drug problem. Someday, by all indications, Stony Brook will be what is commonly referred to as a "great university," but

today it is a university under construction, with enrollments annually increasing by at least 25 percent; with many students tripled up in dormitory rooms designed for two; with unpaved roads, vast areas of mud, and overwhelmed library facilities; and, on top of all this, with virtually all the nettlesome problems that plague even the best-settled, best-equipped of the nation's universities.

As student bodies go, Stony Brook's is not, in the vernacular of today's campus activists, especially "political." The great majority of the students come from within 50 miles of the campus and are the offspring of parents who never went beyond high school. "Deadheads" is the description applied to them by a young faculty member who came of age in that pioneering center of student political activism, the University of Michigan. Pointing out that Stony Brook is an isolated enclave, remote even from a movie house or an off-campus hangout, he speculated that "they 'turn on' so much because there isn't anything to do here." Nevertheless, the student body, however apolitical, did manage to stir itself now and then to protest conditions on campus. Last year fairly large meetings were held to pro-

## NEWS IN BRIEF

● **THERMAL POLLUTION HEARINGS:** Dates of field hearings on thermal pollution from nuclear power facilities in Maine and Vermont have been set by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works. The hearings will be in Portland, Maine, on 13 February and in Montpelier, Vt., on the 14th. Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.), chairman of the subcommittee, stated that because of increasing public concern about the effects of thermal pollution, the subcommittee may expand its field hearings to include a review of the proposed nuclear power plants on Biscayne Bay, Florida, Lake Michigan, and thermal pollution of the Columbia River and of the coastal waters of Hawaii.

● **SONIC BOOM REDUCTION:** The most realistic prospects for reducing aircraft sonic booms are for minor reductions brought about by refinements in conventional aircraft design, a better understanding of theory, and improvements in propulsive efficiency and operating procedure, according to a National Academy of Sciences report. The report was pessimistic about the likelihood of a dramatic solution to the sonic boom problem through unconventional aircraft designs. The brief report, *Generation and Propagation of Sonic Boom*, recommended five areas in which additional study of the problem is needed: theory, topographic effects, acceleration and maneuvers, design, and statistical compilations. The subcommittee on Research of the National Academy's Committee on the SST-Sonic Boom Study prepared the report which is available at \$2 a copy from the Printing and Publishing Office, NAS-NRC, 2101 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20418.

● **NATIONAL PARKS HEARINGS:** The House Interior Committee has announced plans for field hearings on the proposed Redwoods and North Cascades national parks. Hearings on the Redwoods measure will be in California on 16 and 17 April, while those on the North Cascades bill will be in the state of Washington on 19 and 20 April. Specific sites for the hearings have not been selected. The Senate approved the creation of the parks late last year.

● **R&D COMPILATION:** The fifteenth publication in the National Science Foundation series, *Current R&D in Scientific Documentation*, is now being prepared. Individuals or organizations in research and development activities who would like to complete questionnaires for the study should contact the NSF contractor preparing the publication at Project CRDSD No. 15, Herner and Company, 2431 K St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

● **LOYALTY OATH RULING:** The Supreme Court on 22 January affirmed a lower court ruling which upholds a 1934 New York law requiring New York teachers to swear to uphold the constitutions of the United States and the State of New York. The New York law, which is similar to laws in several other states, requires all teachers in public schools and teachers in private schools with tax-exempt status to take the oath. The question of the constitutionality of the New York law was carried to the Supreme Court after a three-judge federal panel ruled against a suit brought by 27 members of the teaching staff of Adelphi University. Their suit contended the required oath "infringed freedom of speech." The Supreme Court decision would appear to mean the court has no objection to affirmative loyalty oaths. In the past, the court has overturned loyalty oaths which require public employees to swear that they were not members of subversive organizations.

● **LABORATORY ACCIDENTS:** A woman technician was killed and four other persons were injured on 26 January when an oven exploded in a Harvard Medical School laboratory in Thorndike Memorial Building of Boston City Hospital. Miss Urda Traenkee was killed by fragments of glass from the oven doors. The explosion was the third within a month in facilities affiliated with the medical school. On 5 January a woman technician was burned during an explosion and fire in a histology laboratory in the medical school, and on 18 January a woman physician received burns when fumes ignited in Children's Hospital Medical Center in Boston. The center is affiliated with Harvard Medical School; however, the physician was not a Harvard employee.

test, among other things, dormitory crowding, inadequate garbage collection, and poor lighting. The effect of all this was to sensitize the new and, in large part, relatively inexperienced administration to the need for tactful and explosion-free dealings with the student body. Those were charged with building a great university in the state which had been the last in the Union to adopt a system of public higher education did not want to see their baby battered by any intensification of student-administration hostility. And so, despite nudgings from the police, the administration, in response to the drug problem, adopted what can only be described as a fairly permissive attitude backed up by gentle and low-keyed admonitions and urgings to stay away from drugs.

As was stated in a revised set of campus regulations issued last September, "The University believes that the most effective approach to drug and alcohol misuse is prevention through educational and counseling programs." The regulations, which permitted, for the first time, consumption of alcohol in dormitory rooms by students over 18, stressed that disciplinary action would be taken for any use of drugs, or for abuse of the alcohol privileges. But, as one of the students who was arrested—an extremely bright science major about 20 years old—pointed out in an interview with *Science*, "At first we used to look over our shoulder when we took 'pot,' but we never saw anything, so we even stopped bothering to look. You know," he added, "it's like atomic weapons. When you first learn about them, you're scared. But they never go off, so you stop worrying about it." While the students apparently stopped worrying about it, and even got the idea that the administration was shielding them from police action, the administration was actually groping for methods to deal with the problem. An open symposium on drug problems was held last fall; the student resident assistants in the dormitories were sent articles and other literature on drugs, and the administration sought counsel from drug authorities at nearby public institutions.

Meanwhile, the administration was under the impression that it had arrived at some sort of *modus vivendi* with the local police. The nature of these arrangements, to the extent that they actually existed, is impossible to determine, for, quite obviously, whatever deal was made was *sub rosa* and, in the final analysis, illegal. But among per-

sons in the Stony Brook administration there was an impression that the police were in some sympathy with the administration's perceptions of the difficulty of the campus drug problem, and that while the administration sought a solution, the police would exercise restraint.

However, while the Stony Brook administration looked upon counseling and education as the solution to the drug problem, police undercover agents—unbeknownst to the administration and posing as casual drop-ins—had been making drug purchases on campus over a period of several months. Clearly, with drug consumption as blatant as it was, they could have moved in at any time. (One faculty member commented, "I've been around, but I've never seen any drug 'scene' as wide open as the one here. Christ, you'd see bunches of kids 'turning on' in public lounges!")

Why the police chose to move when and as they did is their own secret. But it was on 3 January that the horn-locking between Police Commissioner Barry and County Executive Dennison took place. At issue was Barry's decision to become party to a lawsuit that a policemen's group had brought against Dennison and others in an effort to prevent a reduction of police services in certain parts of the county. On 9 January, following Dennison's allegations of insubordination by Barry, the police commissioner withdrew his name from the suit—amidst much local newspaper coverage that did little for the commissioner's public image. On the fol-

lowing day, Barry's undercover men went before the grand jury to present their evidence on Stony Brook. One week later the raid took place. And, though it is widely asserted that Dennison, as the county's top elective officer, is supposed to be informed beforehand of any unusual police activities, Barry pulled off the raid without telling Dennison—though he called all the local newspapers to invite reporters to accompany the raiders.

Barry, in an interview with *Science*, expressed surprise at the furor over the techniques used by the raiders. No, he said, there is no requirement that the county executive be notified of raids: sometimes we do, sometimes we don't. It all depends. As for notifying the campus authorities beforehand—well, why would we do that? They knew about the drugs, and they failed to do anything to stop it. We were just doing our job, the police commissioner explained. A predawn raid—198 policemen to round up 38 young suspects? Why not? We had felony indictments. It's standard procedure; no different, he said, "from the way we'd go after a bunch of burglars hiding in a motel." The public reaction, he explained, has been very good. Picking up a file of correspondence, the police commissioner pulled out a letter—typical of 35 or so that he had received within a few days after the raid. "More power to you," stated the letter, "and I hope, if necessary, we'll have more raids on campuses." Stated another, in reference to the university faculty, "Most of these long-haired unshaven idiots haven't the

brains to hold such responsible jobs."

Following the raid, the Stony Brook administration announced that it has hired a drug specialist, who comes equipped with a former addict, to head up a new and forceful campaign against drugs on campus. The campaign will include counseling, security patrols to keep out casual drop-ins, and strict enforcement of drug regulations.

How the students perceive the events of recent weeks is difficult to assess, since they view them from many vantage points and with a variety of values. But a good many of them feel little but pure disgust for the performance of their elders. They know that the law proscribes drugs, but they regard the law as inane, and, furthermore, they wonder why, of all departures from law, the police single out the consumption of "pot" as the object of their crackdowns. "The mafia's running loose around this country," said one student, "Why don't they get the mafia?" Said another, "They say we can have alcohol, but we can't have marijuana. This university is made up of scientists; they know there's nothing in the literature that says 'pot' is harmful, but you can fill a library with solid findings on the harmfulness of liquor."

Meanwhile, those throughout the country who are responsible for the affairs of academe might note that (i) the drug situation at Stony Brook was not unique, and (ii), in view of the way a large part of the public feels toward what goes on in universities, this isn't a bad time for a policeman to make a reputation.—D. S. GREENBERG

## Population Control: U. S. Aid Program Leaps Forward

Although the U.S. government's interest in helping the developing nations reduce their birth rates has been steadily rising since early in the Kennedy administration, the ratio of rhetoric to effective action has been high. Now, however, the Agency for International Development (AID), with strong congressional encouragement, is at last

mounting a significant program to try to foster and assist "family planning" in nations where the Malthusian prophecy is written plainly on the wall.

Evidence of this is found chiefly in the fact that during fiscal 1968, which ends 30 June, AID expects to spend \$35 million on its family planning program, as opposed to the \$4.2 million it

spent the previous year. Further signs of a major positive change in AID's population program are these: (i) The agency now has some 50 people working full time in this field, including 28 serving on the central staff. Next year the number will grow, though how much is uncertain. While not large, the number of those now in the program has increased more than threefold over the past year. (ii) AID policy, reflecting changes in public attitudes in the United States and a relaxation of the political constraints that have arisen in the past from religious and moral beliefs, now permits the distribution of contraceptives to developing nations. (iii) Changes in United States law, and in the attitudes of a number of aid-receiving nations, allow hope that some