unjustified, since this sample was drawn from a very special population—members of a health maintenance organization who seek early prenatal care.

What began many years ago as legitimate differences among researchers has grown into a debate so acrimonious that many talented investigators have left the field. I call for a truce, with the time saved in fighting each other devoted to developing an effective method of validating self-reported drinking estimates. With such a method, we shall better know where the truth lies and how women may best be advised to conduct their pregnancies to protect themselves and their developing child.

RUTH E. LITTLE
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Institute, University of Washington, Seattle 98195

. . . Kolata has done a superb job of reporting and writing. Her article is very well balanced and, while I do not agree with all of the statements in it, I believe it to be an extremely fair and unbiased assessment of the current state of knowledge.

ROBERT J. SOKOL
Perinatal Clinical Research Center, Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital, and *Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44109*

Resolution of Phosphorus Chemists

We wish to report the response of the International Conference on Phosphorus Chemistry, an independent body that assembles about every 2 years, to the action by the Institut Mondial du Phosphate (IMPHOS) regarding the arbitrary deletion of the papers of two Israeli scientists from the published proceedings of the IMPHOS-sponsored conference held in Boston in April 1980 (Letters, 23 Oct., p. 390). The last International Conference on Phosphorus Chemistry was held at Durham, North Carolina, from 1 to 5 June 1981 and was jointly sponsored by the American Chemical Society and the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry. The IMPHOS action of censorship for political reasons caused great concern, and at its closing session the Conference unanimously adopted the following resolution:

It has come to the attention of the Organizing Committee of the 1981 International Phosphorus Conference that IMPHOS has excluded from the published proceedings of its 1980 Boston meeting the manuscripts of the orally presented papers of two Israeli scientists, Dr. Nathan and Dr. Ketzinel.

While we heartily commend IMPHOS on the fine spirit of international cooperation which characterized its meeting in Boston, we strongly disapprove of the last-minute decision to remove the papers of the two Israeli scientists from the published proceedings. This unfortunate act of censorship is in direct and blatant conflict with the spirit of unpoliticized scientific inquiry, which for the good of mankind must continue to characterize the interactions of scientists. If it is still the desire of IMPHOS to enlist the participation and good will of phosphorus chemists on a truly international basis, it should renounce its policy of censorship.

L. D. QUIN
Paul M. Gross Chemical Laboratory, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706
W. W. CLELAND
Department of Biochemistry, University of Wisconsin, Madison 53706
A. H. COWLEY
Department of Chemistry, University of Texas, Austin 78712
K. M. MISLOW
Department of Chemistry, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08540
K. MOEDRITZER
Monsanto Agricultural Products Co., St. Louis, Missouri 63122
F. RAMIREZ
Department of Chemistry, State University of New York, Stony Brook 11794
A. D. F. TOY
14 Katydid Lane, Stamford, Connecticut 06903
J. G. VERKADE
Department of Chemistry, Iowa State University, Ames 50011

Biomedical Research Funding

The biomedical research communities in our universities, medical schools, and hospitals are facing a serious dilemma which could have far-reaching consequences unless resolved satisfactorily.

Government has provided a remarkably successful funding mechanism for the biomedical sciences through the agencies of the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation in particular. This has permitted spectacular advances in understanding basic biological principles and has provided important technology for the understanding and treatment of disease. This government-organized mechanism has also provided a remarkable degree of intellectual freedom essential for scientists to function creatively.

In the name of economic emergency the government has begun a serious, across-the-board reduction in support of research and simultaneously has encouraged the research community to seek funding from the private sector. These two developments may or may not have been synchronized but have resulted in a sudden and rapid increase in a variety of interactions between academia and industry. Government agencies and members of Congress have become worried about the possibility that knowledge, the acquisition of which has been heavily and effectively supported by taxpayers' dollars, will be transferred to industry for commercial profit. Interpretation and proposed implementation of a recent patent law would make it extremely difficult for a scientist to be supported by both sectors and perhaps impossible for industrial investigators to effectively collaborate with researchers funded by government agencies. The new law requires an accounting of the origin of every dollar applied to any particular project, the clear implication being that any government funding involved will invalidate contractual arrangements with the private sector.

The government cannot have it both ways. Since it will not provide adequate support for academic research, we may quickly lose to industry the cutting edge of the national academic effort. We are in serious danger of an academic brain drain to industry. With increasing access to university laboratories through contractual arrangements and an ability to provide better salaries with the promise of developing excellent in-house institutes, industry may well entice away our best young scientists. The market must remain open, but universities must also remain competitive.

The inclusion in each contract (and perhaps even consultation agreement) of an additional, significant unencumbered contribution to the recipient institution, solely for research, would help redress the balance. Tax incentives would encourage this practice.

In any event, it is quite unlikely that the private sector can substitute for effective government support of basic research in the universities. It is therefore essential that seeming conflicts of interest between government and industrial modes of research support be resolved so that our present international leadership in biomedical science will not evaporate.

JEROME GROSS
Developmental Biological Laboratory, Harvard Medical School, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston 02114