

the project's image in the students' minds. Harvard and M.I.T. professors stressed that the project involved only basic research on computer methods, that the advisory committee and not the Pentagon had authority over the research done by the project, and that no classified work was involved.

Critics of Project Cambridge among the faculty and graduate students pin their objections to the project on the question of DOD financing and its influence on social science work. Some of them, like M.I.T. political scientists Joseph Weisenbaum and Hayward Alker, have refused to participate in CAM if it has DOD funding. Chad Gordon, a member of the Harvard department of social relations, summed up much of the feeling in a memo to the CAM advisory board: "As the Defense Department's posture in the world becomes increasingly bizarre and dangerous, any participant in such projects will undoubtedly feel called upon to account for his actions to colleagues, students, and the wider public." It is this issue of accountability that troubles many at Harvard, an intellectual community that shelters perhaps a wider range of academics—from big-time entrepreneurs to ivory tower medievalists—than any other scholarly community in America.

University-Wide Debate

By now Project Cambridge has become the subject of a university-wide debate at Harvard and M.I.T. involving the wider questions of the role of the Defense Department in funding any kind of social science or computer work (even basic and unclassified research), the role of technology in the development of the social sciences, and the effect of large-scale government funding on the university and its autonomy. According to dean of Engineering and Applied Physics Harvey Brooks, who heads a subcommittee (on Project Cambridge) of the Committee on Research Policy, which will report to the dean and faculty of Arts and Sciences, his group is looking into three sets of issues. One question is whether the availability of such a large sum of money from a source outside the university will distort the teaching and pattern of hiring in the social sciences at Harvard. Another question is whether "the Administration can delegate out to an autonomous group of Harvard professors who are part of a group involving non-Harvard professors the authority to administer such a large project."

Brooks says also that the committee investigation "will include the question of Defense Department support, which many people at Harvard are concerned about." Harvard University does not, as an institution, accept classified research, a position adopted in 1954. Brooks reports that about 7.5 percent of Harvard's operating budget comes from the Defense Department, and a large portion of ARPA money goes to his Division of Engineering and Applied Physics.

Debate at Harvard on Project Cambridge will undoubtedly focus on the Brooks report because of the influence of the School of Arts and Sciences on the rest of the university. The Brooks subcommittee report has been submitted to its parent committee, the Committee on Research Policy, which is expected to vote on the recommendations this week. Although the results have not been made public, it is known that the subcommittee's report was in fact two reports, with differing recommendations, and that the committee itself is divided. Publication of the report will, therefore, not settle the questions. Because of the likelihood of campus demonstrations and the widespread feeling that taking on such a huge Defense Department project at this time would be a reaffirmation with national implications of the Pentagon's role in university research, it is unlikely that the committee will recommend that Harvard as an institution should participate.

Several professors, including Philip Stone, Joseph Weisenbaum, and Marshall Smith of Harvard's Center for Educational Policy Research, are beginning an effort to get Project Cambridge transferred to the National Science Foundation or to get a large-scale commitment from Congress and NSF to begin funding computer work in a substantial way. NSF and ARPA officials, although enthusiastic about the idea in the abstract, do not think that once the project is transferred, Congress or NSF would agree to spend that much money per year on one project, given the meager size of NSF's budget for computer sciences. For these Harvard professors the difficult question is whether or not to take money from a source that they may object to but that is the only available source.

The transfer of the project to NSF or Harvard's refusal to participate as an institution, although important opening wedges in ending the Pentagon's monopoly over the financing of social

sciences, will not settle the kind of wider questions that students and younger faculty members are asking about the social sciences. The operational question would remain: Should Harvard, having decided not to participate in CAM, ask individuals not to participate? But more seriously, young social scientists on many American campuses are troubled by the effect of computers on American life and by the substance of their research. What about these problems of privacy? Can anything important for solving the inequities of American society be learned from computerized social science? Might \$7,600,000 for Project Cambridge be better spent on substantive research with direct social payoff, or even on purposes other than scholarly research? Project Cambridge like Project Camelot, raises difficult and disturbing questions, but it is also leading to useful soul searching about the purposes of the social sciences.

—JUDITH COBURN

Miss Coburn is a free-lance writer and a visiting fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C.

APPOINTMENTS



C. R. Wharton



K. M. Endicott

Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., vice president, Agricultural Development Council, to president, Michigan State University. . . . **Kenneth M. Endicott**, director, National Cancer Institute, NIH, to director, Bureau of Health Professions Education and Manpower Training, and **Carl Baker**, associate director, National Cancer Institute, to acting director of the institute.

Erratum. On page 726 of the 7 November issue, in the last paragraph of the article "The population crisis: Rising concern at home," a quotation that should have been attributed to Representative Henry S. Reuss was attributed to Judith Blake Davis through a misreading of a hearing transcript. The quotation was that the public at large is "still under the impression that children are glorious, the more the merrier" and that the idea of a growing population producing a deteriorating environment is not one that generally figures in the calculus of the average American.