

hour of the AEC's recent nuclear shot on the island of Amchitka in the Aleutians, some 100 students held a "peace prayer" on campus, but this was quite orderly.

Student and faculty life has its attractive aspects, especially for those who like the outdoors. A good many faculty people have comfortable homes in the forested hill country within a few miles of the university, and moose browse guilelessly in their gardens. Some students live in cabins back in the woods and come in for classes on their skis, though the onset of deep winter usually drives them into dormitory housing.

Some faculty members say that a principal shortcoming of the university is that it has not yet found an identity of its own—that, too often, it lends itself to Alaskan boosterism. They recall, as a recent example of this, the letter that Earl H. Beistline, dean of the College of Earth Sciences and Min-

eral Industry, wrote last March to the director of the FWPCA's Alaska Water Laboratory, complaining about a laboratory report that had described placer mining as a source of stream pollution. Beistline said the report "belittled" the gold-mining industry. He suggested that if clean water was important to tourism, so too is the sight of a busy gold dredge.

A tendency of the university to yield to mindless boosterism would be especially unfortunate now, when the oil rush is accelerating Alaskan development, producing huge new state revenues, and raising important questions of environmental protection. Through programs of research and analysis related to current Alaskan issues the university can help to identify policy alternatives and raise the level of public discussion and decision-making at a critical time.

The university's research institutes are, in fact, engaged in research arising

from the oil rush; most of these studies are under oil industry sponsorship. The Institute of Marine Science is now making some studies at places which might be subjected to oil spills, such as along the arctic coast and in Valdez Arm, at the southern terminus of the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline, which will extend from Prudhoe Bay, on the North Slope, southward for 800 miles to the port of Valdez. The Institute of Arctic Biology is researching ways to revegetate and restore tundra and taiga disturbed by the pipeline construction or other oil industry activities. And the Arctic Environmental Engineering Laboratory has been helping the industry determine how best to construct the pipeline, which must be laid in or over hundreds of miles of permanently frozen ground (permafrost).

(Not all of the university investigators seem to understand one another, however. For instance, in an interview with *Science* last summer, Charles E.

HEW Blacklisting Issue Ignites Again

The fact that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) has been excluding scientists from parttime advisory panels on the basis of security and suitability checks came to fuller attention last week.

The exclusion of many noted scientists from HEW's scientific panels was first publicly revealed and documented in *Science* (27 June and 18 July). After attracting some outside attention, the subject lay somewhat dormant until last week when *New York Times* reporter Richard D. Lyons wrote four extensive articles on HEW blacklisting procedures. Other news organs quickly picked up the story; major stories on HEW's practices appeared on NBC TV's Huntley-Brinkley show, on CBS TV's national news programs, and on the national educational television hookup.

Previously, the HEW leadership had seemed to give little attention to complaints by scientists and scientific organizations on HEW's security practices. However, on 9 October, the day that the first front-page *New York Times* story appeared, HEW hastened to announce that it has appointed a committee to examine HEW's security procedures including the exclusion of scientists from its panels. The committee will consist of five HEW officials: Undersecretary John G. Veneman, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Roger O. Egeberg, general counsel Robert C. Mardian, executive assistant L. Patrick Gray, and Frederick H. Schmidt, who has served as the head of HEW's controversial security office for the past 16 years. Harlan Reid Ellis of Columbia University will assist the group.

The HEW spokesman said that the committee had been appointed 2 weeks ago, but the existence of this committee was not mentioned to the representatives of various scientific organizations who met with HEW

Assistant Secretary James Farmer on 7 October to protest exclusion of scientists from these advisory panels. In view of the timing of HEW's announcement, it seemed as if the committee might well have been created primarily in response to the press attention which HEW was receiving on this matter.

The 7 October meeting between the scientific organizations and Secretary Farmer resulted in no assurance that the current system would be changed in HEW. However, with the mounting adverse publicity which began on 9 October, HEW officials may now take the matter more seriously and may finally summon up the energy to reexamine this system.

The scientific groups concerned about the HEW security system plan to continue their efforts to force revision. The organization primarily responsible for rallying the support of other scientific groups is the American Orthopsychiatric Association, which has its headquarters in New York City. Dane G. Prugh, a past president of the association, said last week that he plans to continue the fight to change the HEW security system for years if necessary and urged other scientific organizations to bolster his association's efforts with time and money.

By maintaining its security system through many Administrations, HEW has made itself a sitting duck for impassioned and persuasive attack. One of the most forceful comments appeared in the *Washington Post* on 11 October. In a fiery editorial entitled "Blacklisting for the Fun of It," the *Post* concluded, "Queried by *Science* last June, HEW Secretary Robert Finch said that he was 'looking into' the matter of blacklists. How does he like what he sees? Does it make any sense? Is it honorable? Does it comport with the American concept of freedom?"—BRYCE NELSON