learned that leftist filmmaker Saul Landau was teaching two classes and showing films on campus. Csorba was particularly offended by the public showing of "Fidel," an uncritical profile of the Cuban dictator produced by Landau. "My group did some research on him in Washington, and we did an exposé of Mr. Landau based on some of his statements on socialism," Csorba says. They published a six-page pamphlet, wrote a letter to the editor, and staged a protest outside the film hall. Landau and Csorba traded charges and threatened to sue one another but later backed off.

The furor exploded when California State Senator H. L. Richardson, a Republican from Los Angeles, decided to mount an investigation of the state university's hiring policies. This triggered another demonstration by students who charged that the state was interfering in academic affairs. Csorba says: "It was never the case that we wanted Landau removed. We didn't. . . . We just wanted someone as noted as he to represent the conservative side." In the end, the investigation and protest were dropped, overshadowed by other protests on South Africa. Landau retreated to his home at the University of California at Santa Cruz. He is on leave and could not be reached for comment.

It is not clear how the volunteer monitoring system will work. Many students have telephoned Lawrence, and he says, "we recognize that we have to be careful doing this," particularly to weed out grudges. The intelligence from student monitors will be seasoned with information from older people, whom Lawrence expects to recruit as well. He points out that in many cases, older citizens may take courses free of charge at state schools. When AIA finds a problem, it will first ask the professor to add balance to the course or bring in someone to present another point of view. If this fails, AIA may write up its findings in a newsletter, hoping to arouse the interest of alumni, influential taxpayers, and school trustees.

A few professors and several university organizations have denounced this campaign already, inchoate as it is. However, Kurland of the American Association of University Professors says: "It's hard to say in advance what this will turn out to be. We expect some vigilante action." But he adds, "You can be assured that Harvard, Yale, and Princeton are not quaking." The impact is likely to be felt most by "some obscure guy at a university you haven't heard of before." And for that person, it may be hard.—**ELIOT MARSHALL**

Vacuum Ultraviolet Synchrotron Confusion

Despite at least three major studies in the last 2 years aimed at sorting out what new synchrotron light sources are needed and when they should be built, federal officials remain uncertain about what to do. So, yet one more panel has been assembled, this one to counsel Alvin Trivelpiece, the director of energy research at the Department of Energy (DOE), and Erich Bloch, the director of the National Science Foundation (NSF). The six-man group, headed by Dean Eastman of the IBM Yorktown Heights Laboratory, is to deliver an oral briefing giving its recommendations next month.

Previous studies dealing with synchrotron light sources generally agreed on priorities: first is to complete the commissioning of existing facilities, second is to build an advanced ultrahigh-brightness x-ray source, and third is to construct a vacuum ultraviolet source of comparable capability. One sticky point is the Aladdin facility at the University of Wisconsin's Synchrotron Research Center in Stoughton, for which the sponsoring agency, NSF, decided to discontinue funding in fiscal year 1986 after 4 years of delays in getting online (*Science*, 21 June, p. 1410).

Without Aladdin, which could potentially serve about half of American vacuum ultraviolet users, there would not be enough facilities available to fill all the demand for synchrotron light in this wavelength region. Last May, DOE's Energy Research Advisory Board said that the need for an advanced vacuum ultraviolet synchrotron source would become more urgent, if Aladdin were not completed. It did not, however, recommend reversing the priorities set earlier.

In the meantime, Aladdin's performance has progressed to the point where, if it remains considerably below the design specifications, it is already a brighter source than the old Tantalus facility that currently serves vacuum ultraviolet users at Wisconsin. At a Synchrotron Radiation Center users' meeting held on 22 July, a majority of those present signed a statement urging NSF to restore funding to operate Aladdin in its current configuration without the $25-million upgrade that had once been planned. Aladdin would then replace Tantalus, with the potential of serving five times the number of researchers for about twice the operating expense.

—**ARTHUR L. ROBINSON**

Administration Divided Over OECD Biotech Plan

A proposal to set up an international set of guidelines to regulate biotechnology has hit some snags because several U.S. federal agencies are deeply divided over the details about how to achieve the goals. The State Department has now taken the lead to try to bring them into harmony. A State Department source says, "It's important to us that the U.S. doesn't appear to be dragging its feet. This project is important to a lot of countries."

For the past 2 years, members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which includes the United States, most of its European allies, and Japan, have been discussing how to set up guidelines to regulate the emerging industry. One of the underlying reasons is to develop a uniform approach so that no one country in the group will become a haven to biotechnology businesses.

In May, after experts from a few of the member countries, including the United States, had helped to compose the document, the first draft of the regulatory guidelines was circulated at a meeting in Paris. It immediately got off to a shaky start. According to a State Department source, many countries felt that the definition of biotechnology was inconsistent and confusing. Members of the American delegation disagreed among themselves about the draft's contents. After 3 days of discussion, the document was revised and sent home with representatives for additional consideration.

The revised draft, which was obtained by *Science*, is called "Safety and Regulations in Biotechnology," and has several parts. It starts off with an upbeat description of biotechnology and its potential applications; discusses the potential risks of the technology, generally viewing the hazard as minimal, while saying it is impossi-

ble to rule out all risk; and describes a "general framework" to assess risk and to control microorganisms used in large-scale production and for agricultural and environmental purposes.

An EPA representative, who had a major role in shaping the original OECD draft, acknowledges that some changes are needed, but says that overall the document is a reasonable one and mendable. But the State Department, the Food and Drug Administration, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture all have significant objections to the tone and substance of the revised draft. Some participants complain that the document projects a pro-regulatory stance. What was intended to be a guide to regulation, they say, has turned out to be too prescriptive. They fear it will become an inflexible standard if adopted. Furthermore, the document appears to be inconsistent with the Administration's approach to the domestic industry, which was fleshed out in a lengthy *Federal Register* notice earlier this year. In this notice, the federal agencies, except for EPA, propose to take a business-as-usual approach to gene-spliced products; that is, products will be evaluated on their own merit and not according to the method by which they were produced.

Henry Miller, an FDA official, assailed the OECD revised draft in an internal memo as "seriously flawed" and "muddled," and said that it contained "an overall, inappropriate negative bias [against biotechnology]." The revised draft in some sections focuses on biotechnology in general and in other parts refers only to organisms made by recombinant DNA techniques, not other methods of genetic engineering. Miller criticizes the revised draft for singling out recombinant DNA techniques from other genetic engineering methods. This approach, he says in the memo, does not square with a statement in the document that says "potential hazards of industrial use of R-DNA organisms are expected to be of the same nature as for other biological agents."

The biggest bone of contention among the federal agencies appears to be the section that discusses controls on the commercial production of microbes. The revised draft includes a detailed chart that sets up three levels of containment and specifies, for example, the level in which staff should wear protective clothing, the laboratory air should be filtered, or laboratory waste treated. These details are "too specific," said the State Department participant. "This section is seriously flawed."

An EPA participant said that the containment categories were "never intended to be international standards, but are meant to illustrate the concept of containment." He concedes that the revised draft "is not a clear document. It needs help. [But] the issue is how to achieve consensus."

The State Department has agreed to let FDA commissioner Frank Young try to patch up the differences among the agencies. U.S. officials have postponed an August OECD meeting and hope to get the American act together so they can present a unified position when the next OECD meeting is held, perhaps in October.—**MARJORIE SUN**

Memo Sets Policy for "Star Wars" Publications

The head of the basic research end of the "Star Wars" program has sent a memo to other top Defense Department officials stating that no restrictions will be placed on the publication of research supported by his office on university campuses, unless agreed in advance by contract.

The memo, signed by James Ionson, head of the Innovative Science and Technology (IST) Office, comes at a time when scientists on several university campuses are refusing to participate in "Star Wars" research for political and technical reasons. Ionson's memo is an attempt to remove one area of potential conflict between his office and the universities.

The idea was to assure university scientists that if they accept funding from the "Star Wars" program, they would be able to publish the results freely. Unfortunately, however, the memo was "massaged" as it went through the Pentagon's review process, and it appears somewhat contradictory in its final form.

The second paragraph states unequivocally that "The conduct and reporting of research performed on university campuses when sponsored by the IST Office of the SDIO [Strategic Defense Initiative Office], although funded out of budget category 6.3, will be treated as 'fundamental research.' " In previous top-level memoranda, and in a draft national policy statement now under consideration by the White House National Security Council, Pentagon officials have said that no restrictions will be placed on the conduct and reporting of "fundamental research."

The next paragraph, however, states that "Decisions regarding publication of the results of unclassified IST research performed on university campuses will normally be the responsibility of the university author. However, when there is a likelihood of disclosing operational capabilities and performance characteristics of planned or developing military systems, or technologies unique and critical to defense programs, the contract will stipulate that the responsibility for the release of information resulting from IST research belongs to the sponsoring office."

According to Ionson, the intent of that paragraph is to enable universities to undertake restricted work if they wish to do so. "If there are no restrictions in the contract, none will be imposed—ever," says Ionson.

—**COLIN NORMAN**

Plan to Bar Funding to Pennsylvania Laboratory

Two House legislators want to block federal research funds to the University of Pennsylvania head trauma laboratory. Last month, the National Institutes of Health faulted the laboratory for its treatment of primates during head injury experiments and Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Margaret Heckler then suspended funding, pending a response from the school.

Representatives Charles Rose (D–N.C.) and Rod Chandler (R–Wash.) are seeking a tougher measure. They plan next month to introduce an amendment to the NIH appropriations bill that would suspend for 1 year agency funds used for animal research by the head injury lab. The measure already has bipartisan support from 30 other legislators.

—**MARJORIE SUN**