

Test-Maker Sues Stanford

David Campbell, the junior developer of the widely used Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, is suing Stanford University, which owns the test, in an attempt to prevent its management from being turned over to a commercial firm.

Campbell claims that his own contract with Stanford has been violated because the new arrangement was made last year without his consent. Campbell, who is "furious" and "indignant," says his chief concern is that transfer of the test from its academic base will result in a long-term deterioration of the test, and, with it, his reputation.

The venerable inventory, designed to reveal a person's vocational leanings by identifying clusters of related interests, is administered to close to 900,000 people a year. It was developed in 1927 by Edward Strong at Stanford. Continuous research and updating of the test has been done since 1960 at the University of Minnesota's Center for Interest Measurement Research. Campbell worked there with Strong and his name was added to the test in 1966.

Campbell relinquished his scientific rights over the inventory in 1974 when he moved to the Center for Creative Leadership, a consulting and testing firm in Greensboro, North Carolina. He continues to receive modest royalties under his 1966 contract with Stanford.

Last year, Stanford University Press entered into an exclusive licensing arrangement with Consulting Psychologists Press (CPP) in Palo Alto. This means CPP takes over all the daily operations and distribution of the test, as well as contracts for scoring it and for conducting further research. CPP now gets the royalties, of which \$300,000 a year must go to Stanford.

Stanford lawyer Iris Brest says that nothing in the agreement with Campbell has been violated since Stanford continues to own the test and still has final say on scientific decisions. She says Stanford is merely reverting to a prior arrangement and that CPP has charge of all the university's psychological tests.

Campbell says the "prior arrangement" was a contract terminated in 1964, and that of all the tests, Strong-

Campbell is the only one that remains "viable." He claims CPP has already demonstrated an "inability to properly handle" the test.

One of the demands in Campbell's suit is that the provision in his contract that prevents him from developing a competing instrument be declared void. He is in fact devising an elaborate test of "work style" but never intended to compete with Strong-Campbell. Now, however, "I'm so irritated that I don't want them to say what I can and cannot do." He says the situation has become excessively polarized because he can't get anyone at Stanford to talk to him except lawyers.

Campbell anticipates that at the trial, tentatively scheduled for 15 October, Stanford will impugn his motives by pointing to his membership on the board of National Computer Systems, a Minneapolis optical scanning company that has made a lot of money from scoring the inventory. CPP has not been using it.

But he insists his main interest is the integrity of the test, which he would like to become the property of the University of Minnesota. He is hoping to avoid a trial, and instead use the threat of embarrassment to persuade Stanford to adopt a set of proposals. These include establishment of a scientific oversight committee that includes himself; allocation of 5 percent of the test revenue for research; release from the "non-compete" clause of his contract, and a restoration of his (twice halved) royalties to 2.5 percent of revenues.

—CONSTANCE HOLDEN

Comings and Goings

Ruth Adams has resigned the editorship of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* to move to Washington with her husband, Robert McCormick Adams, the new director of the Smithsonian Institution. **Len Ackland**, a technology and business reporter with the Chicago Tribune, succeeds Adams as editor.

The National Institute for Mental Health finally has a new director: he is **Shervert H. Frazier**, professor of psychiatry at Harvard Medical School and psychiatrist-in-chief at McLean Hospital in Belmont, Massachusetts.

DOD Buys Secure Telephones

In the first phase of an ambitious new defense program, the Reagan Administration has decided to commit \$33.4 million to protect sensitive telephone communications from electronic eavesdropping by foreign governments. The funds will be used to buy several thousand telephones developed by the National Security Agency, each attached to a computer capable of encoding and decoding voice transmissions as a conversation occurs.

The initial goal is to allow senior U.S. Army officials and key defense contractors, in both the United States and Europe, to discuss sensitive or classified information freely, without fear of interception. According to testimony last spring before the House Appropriations Committee, the Army now possesses only 426 secure telephones, which one official described as "an old, antiquated system, out of production, and consequently difficult to maintain." Each new phone will cost roughly \$15,550, and the funds for their purchase will be transferred from other Army programs.

Next year, the Army intends to buy roughly 1350 more and eventually, it hopes to have 30,000 of the telephones in place. According to a recent article in the *New York Times*, the National Security Agency believes that the government should purchase more than 500,000 of the telephones, modified so as to permit integration with a variety of communications networks used by government and weapons industry officials. The total cost will probably be billions of dollars.

The high priority attached to the program indicates that electronic eavesdropping by the Soviet Union and its allies has recently become much more sophisticated and aggressive. As part of its formal budget request, the Army stated that "urgent action is necessary due to the increased emphasis by hostile nations on intercepting U.S. government and corporate telephone conversations." More specifically, Richard Day, an official at the National Security Agency, has testified that "the threat is tremendous . . . [we] are giving away a great deal to the Soviets in [this] area."

—R. JEFFREY SMITH