

# AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

*Science* serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

## Editorial Board

1982: WILLIAM ESTES, CLEMENT L. MARKERT, JOHN R. PIERCE, BRYANT W. ROSSITER, VERA C. RUBIN, MAXINE F. SINGER, PAUL E. WAGGONER, ALEXANDER ZUCKER

1983: FREDERICK R. BLATTNER, BERNARD F. BURKE, CHARLES L. DRAKE, ARTHUR F. FINDEIS, E. PETER GEIDUSCHEK, GLYNN ISAAC, MILTON RUSSELL, WILLIAM P. SLICHTER, JOHN WOOD

## Publisher

WILLIAM D. CAREY  
Associate Publisher: ROBERT V. ORMES

## Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

## Editorial Staff

Assistant Managing Editor: JOHN E. RINGLE

Production Editor: ELLEN E. MURPHY

Business Manager: HANS NUSSBAUM

News Editor: BARBARA J. CULLITON

News and Comment: COLIN NORMAN (deputy editor), WILLIAM J. BROAD, LUTHER J. CARTER, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, ELIOT MARSHALL, R. JEFFREY SMITH, MARJORIE SUN, JOHN WALSH

Research News: ROGER LEWIN (deputy editor), RICHARD A. KERR, GINA KOLATA, JEAN L. MARX, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, M. MITCHELL WALDROP

Administrative Assistant, News: SCHERRAINE MACK;  
Editorial Assistants, News: FANNIE GROOM, CASSANDRA WATTS

Senior Editors: ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, RUTH KULSTAD

Associate Editors: SYLVIA EBERHART, CAITILIN GORDON, LOIS SCHMITT

Assistant Editors: MARTHA COLLINS, STEPHEN KEPPLE, EDITH MEYERS

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, Editor; LINDA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG

Letters: CHRISTINE GILBERT

Copy Editor: ISABELLA BOULDIN

Production: NANCY HARTNAGEL, JOHN BAKER; ROSE LOWERY; HOLLY BISHOP, ELEANOR WARNER; JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, SHARON RYAN, ROBIN WHYTE

Covers, Reprints, and Permissions: GRAYCE FINGER, Editor; GERALDINE CRUMP, CORRINE HARRIS

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD G. SOMMER  
Assistants to the Editors: SUSAN ELLIOTT, DIANE HOLLAND

Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE

Member and Subscription Records: ANN RAGLAND  
EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Area code 202. General Editorial Office, 467-4350; Book Reviews, 467-4367; Guide to Scientific Instruments, 467-4480; News and Comment, 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. For "Information for Contributors," write to the editorial office or see page xi, *Science*, 18 December 1981.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

## Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager: GINA REILLY

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Marketing Manager: HERBERT L. BURKLUND

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Steve Hamburger, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581).

ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-730-1050.

# The Government, Secrecy, and University Research

Fundamental science in the United States is a successful venture, but a peculiar one. Its success is attested by the dramatic increase in scientific awards won by Americans and by the contributions it makes to our technological productivity. Its peculiarity lies in the organizational arrangements for its sustenance. It is an activity pursued in one culture, supported out of another: more than two-thirds of the nation's fundamental science is done in the research universities, with the government sponsoring nearly all of it. Given the contrast in style and values between the two cultures, it is hardly surprising that this patronage arrangement sometimes generates quarrels. The current one is a debate over the government's efforts to regulate scholarly activities related to critical technologies.

The problem is that the Communist bloc nations have obtained and then copied U.S. innovations in military technology. The solution proposed by the Administration—based on the hypothesis that these leaks partly involved academic exchanges—is that universities restrict the access of foreign students and visitors to, and dissemination of research results in, certain fields of study. These restrictions are sought by applying to fundamental research regulations originally intended for devices or industrial processes.

The universities have countered that if unpatrolled academic visits and the participation of foreign students in research programs contribute to technology leakage, they do so minimally, and that interdicting academic exchange would therefore yield trivial benefits to national security. We have also emphasized the potential damage to the scientific enterprise from government efforts to restrict its openness—especially when these coincide with efforts of private sponsors to expand secrecy for proprietary reasons. It surely will be difficult to resist the latter if we are forced to accept the former.

There is, fortunately, encouraging progress to report. The Department of Defense has created a forum with the universities to examine research restrictions, among other things. The National Academy of Sciences will be studying the matter as well. The Department of State and the Department of Commerce are responsible for the regulations under which the current restrictions have been mandated. The State Department has revised its instructions on the handling of Soviet visitors, so that their academic hosts will not be required to shield them from exposure to particular unclassified projects. That department, which is responsible for the International Traffic in Arms Regulations, has also adopted an appropriately narrow view of their scope. We are informed that the regulations will apply only to technical data significantly and directly related to specific items on the Munitions List—the limitation set out by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *U.S. v. Edler Industries*.

These are promising signs of change, and they should be encouraged; there are other ways to meet our national security objective. If a Soviet scientist is viewed with such alarm that universities must be asked to police his visit, then the Department of State can apply visa controls. And if a technology has such military value that exposure in an open environment presents clear risks to national security, the government can classify the technology—thereby permitting the universities to decide in advance whether they can accept the restrictions that come along with the work. But to apply a burdensome set of regulations to a venture that has gained such great strength through its openness will cost the nation more than it can be worth.—DONALD KENNEDY, *President, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305*