

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **CLASSIFIED RESEARCH:** Concern about the involvement of institutions of higher education in classified research projects has recently prompted a series of policy statements from various sectors of the academic community. The statements generally attempt to discourage classified research while still leaving a way open for its performance under certain circumstances. The American Association of University Professors, in a general session at its annual meeting in Cleveland last month, adopted a resolution urging "that institutions of higher learning inspect with great care the consequences of their research relationships in the area of defense with respect to the autonomy and freedom of academic societies."

The Board of Trustees of New York University adopted a policy statement which requires that all classified research have the prior approval of the president of the University. It further says that such research must be consistent with the university's concern "with the preservation and enrichment of human life rather than its destruction" and that "the university's involvement must demonstrably outweigh the disadvantages of having to subject the project to security requirements and possible publications restrictions."

A statement drafted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Academic Council and endorsed by the faculty, affirms "the merits of open research and free interchange of information among scholars," but it "recognizes that in a very few cases the pursuit of knowledge may require access to data or literature of a classified nature, or yields results whose immediate distribution would not be in the best interests of society." Future classified projects there must be approved by the president or provost.

At the University of Pennsylvania, the trustees adopted a resolution, recommended by University President Gaylord Harnwell, that two secret germ and chemical warfare research programs—Air Force Project Spice Rack and Army Project Summit—be terminated or transferred. The board supported Harnwell's recommendation that "it would be undesirable" to transfer the projects to the University City Science Center, because of the "misapprehension that the University exercises control of the Science Center."

● **MOHOLE REVIVAL MEETING:**

There is little hope at present for reviving Project Mohole. This was the conclusion that a group of earth scientists arrived at last month in an informal discussion held during the annual meeting of the National Academy of Sciences. The group, which met at the invitation of Harry Hess of Princeton, one of the founders of the original Mohole venture, generally agreed that federal research budgets are now too tight to accommodate the controversial project. The discussion took up the possibility of a reduced-scale deep drilling project to start sometime within the next three or four years, but arrived at no firm conclusions.

● **"SUICIDOLOGY" PROGRAM:** The National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) has granted \$110,515 to the Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic of the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine to support a program in "suicidology"—defined by NIMH as "the scientific and humane study of suicide and suicide prevention." The funds will be used to develop a curriculum, to recruit teaching personnel, and as support for students. NIMH plans four more years of support totaling \$852,338. The program will begin in September with the awarding of four 1-year fellowships, to be expanded to eight fellows in subsequent years. Seymour Perlin, professor of psychiatry at the school of medicine, will be project director.

● **WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH:**

The Office of Water Resources Research, Department of the Interior, has selected 31 projects, for a total funding of \$2 million, to initiate its water resources research program, authorized under Title II of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. More than half the projects selected were proposed by colleges and universities, with the remainder coming from private foundations, institutions, or firms, plus a state conservation department and a local watershed district. The projects, chosen from 244 proposals, include water resources planning and management, socioeconomic aspects of water resources problems, the hydrologic cycle, conservation of water quantity and quality, municipal and industrial water problems, estuarine problems, flood control, and water-based recreation.

time identified research centers where military work is being done. Saclay, a large CEA research center near Paris, which figured prominently in the discussions, was described as being devoted exclusively to nonmilitary research. An agreement provided that the French would get the computers if guarantees were given that they would not be installed at weapons development centers.

Other Europeans tend to take a skeptical view of this gentleman's agreement. *The Economist*, on 29 October, noted, "It is magnificently irrelevant, in getting calculations done, where the computers actually come to rest so long as they are physically in France." As for the effect of the embargo, it appears to have lent weight to French warnings to other European nations against dependence on the United States for critical materials, high-technology equipment, or technical information. It is suggested in France that disagreement with U.S. policy in Vietnam, for example, might have disagreeable consequences in this sphere, even for U.S. allies. For American policy makers the computer incident has been a painful reminder that consistency may be a virtue in foreign policy but is often difficult to achieve.

It now appears that the French will get about a dozen of the king-size computers from three or four companies, such customers as Electricité de France (EDF), the national electricity company, having put in their bids. This may mollify IBM and other American business interests, which put very strong pressure on the State Department to relent, not simply because of the sales involved but also because of unfavorable effects on other American interests in France. But it is going to divert the French from their national program.

Origins of this effort can perhaps be traced directly to the GE acquisition of a half interest in Machines Bull in 1964. Machines Bull is the largest independent producer of electronic calculators and business-machines in France. The chagrin of President de Gaulle was well known at the time, but the takeover was permitted, apparently because of Bull's operating deficit and internal difficulties. An agreement was reached under which, for example, GE promised to maintain Bull's research capacity, and it was hoped that a transfusion of American technology and managerial skill would put the company back on its feet.