Columbia Curbs Classified Research

The Columbia University Senate last week moved to disassociate the university from all classified research projects, whether financed by government or industry.

The student-faculty-administration body agreed on a seven-point policy which has two major themes. First, the faculty may not take on classified contracts in which the university is involved directly or indirectly. This prohibition does not extend to individual consulting arrangements. Further, if a faculty member wishes to take a classified contract in which the university would be involved, he may petition a review board (elected by the Senate) and he may appeal the board's decision to the Senate's committee on external relations and research policy. Any exceptions must be publicly announced. All existing contracts must be modified or terminated within 1 year to comply with the new rules.

The policy's second major point is that outside contractors cannot tell the university how to conduct research projects. Contractors may not regulate the religious or political affiliations or the race of persons working on projects; nor can contractors veto publication of the results.

Currently, Columbia has five classified research projects. Two projects for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration involve development of instruments for measuring the moon's heat flow and its quakes. An Air Force project involving seismic waves is designed to enable identification of underground nuclear explosions. These three are conducted at Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory in Palisades, New York. Two other projects, carried out at Columbia's Bermuda station, are for the Navy, and concern measurement of sound waves under water.

Classified research contracts now amount to three-quarters of a million dollars at Columbia; the total for all externally-funded research is $70 million.—NANCY GRUCHOW

or other metallic objects. Conversely, some detectors have been known to fail when books were actually being pilfered.

Librarians have found that apart from some technical difficulties with present detector systems, the biggest flaw is that the devices are so easily outwitted by students intent on beating the system. Librarians who have experimented with some of the desensitizing devices say that students who want books badly enough wrap them in laminated foil, with paper on the outside, and walk through screening areas undetected. At Western Michigan University, where a magnetic system has been in use since 1965, librarian Peter Spyers-Duran told *Science* that students have discovered that by placing books containing the permanently installed magnets or transistors "head to toe" and thus reversing the magnetic field, two books, instead of one, can be taken out undetected.

Librarians, while lamenting the fact that no James Bondian detector yet exists, are also complaining that the existing detection systems, often better than no system at all, are expensive. One ALA spokesman says that some manufacturers have been known to charge installation rates and rental fees that are just below the estimated losses resulting from book thefts. Opinions on this vary, just as the costs and needs for the services vary. Spyers-Duran estimates that his library loses about $16,000 a year through book thefts, even with a detection system. He says the annual cost of his library's detection system, including manpower, is at least $18,000. He figures the library's losses would be once again as great without the detector system, and estimates that most university librarians spend about 2 to 4 percent of their book budgets in replacing books that have been stolen. Stanley D. Truelson, Jr., librarian of the Yale Medical Library, declined to give figures on Yale's book losses or on the cost of its detection system, but did say that Yale finds the system it uses "less expensive than the salary of door guards."

For the most part, librarians who have used theft-detection systems criticize both the cost and the unreliability of the present detectors, but few question the need for detection systems to halt the increasing number of library book thefts. They worry particularly about losing rare books whose value cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

More and more, university and public libraries are placing books which were once in the closed stacks on open shelves in an effort to encourage people to read more, says Verner Klapp, former president of the Council on Library Resources, Inc. and former deputy director of the Library of Congress. As this happens, book losses may spiral, unless detection systems are improved, from the standpoint of reliability and cost, and more libraries begin to use them.—MARTI MUELLER

APPOINTMENTS

Jacqueline G. Wexler, former president, Webster College, to president, Hunter College, City University of New York. . . . **Harry Foreman**, associate dean, office of international programs, University of Minnesota, to director, Center for Population Studies at the university. . . . At the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, **Stewart Wolf**, professor of medicine, psychiatry and behavioral sciences, and physiology, University of Oklahoma School of Medicine was appointed scientific director, Marine Biomedical Institute and **Edward N. Brandt, Jr.**, associate dean, University of Oklahoma School of Medicine, was appointed dean, Graduate School, Galveston. . . . **Donald G. Humphrey**, professor of biology, Oregon State University, to dean, division of natural sciences and mathematics, The Evergreen State College.

RECENT DEATHS

Alexander Goetz, 72; former associate professor of physics, California Institute of Technology; 12 January.

J. Wallace Joyce, 63; deputy director of international scientific and technological affairs, U.S. State Department; 6 January.

E. J. Lund, 85; director, Institute of Marine Science, University of Texas; 28 November.