

**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.

**Publisher:** Richard S. Nicholson  
**Editor:** Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.  
**Deputy Editor:** Ellis Rubinstein  
**Managing Editor:** Monica M. Bradford  
**International Editor:** Alun Anderson  
**Deputy Editors:** Philip H. Abelson (*Engineering and Applied Sciences*); John I. Brauman (*Physical Sciences*); Thomas R. Cech (*Biological Sciences*)

## EDITORIAL STAFF

**Assistant Managing Editor:** Dawn Bennett  
**Senior Editors:** Eleanor Butz, Martha Coleman, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelner, Phillip D. Szurmi, David F. Voss  
**Associate Editors:** R. Brooks Hanson, Pamela J. Hines, Kelly LaMarco, Linda J. Miller, L. Bryan Ray  
**Letters:** Christine Gilbert, *editor*; Steven S. Lapham  
**Book Reviews:** Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Teresa Fryberger  
**Contributing Editor:** Lawrence I. Grossman  
**Chief Production Editor:** Ellen E. Murphy  
**Editing Department:** Lois Schmitt, *head*; Denise Gipson, Julianne Hunt, Steven Powell  
**Copy Desk:** MaryBeth Branigan, Joi S. Granger, Margaret E. Gray, Beverly Shields  
**Production Director:** James Landry  
**Production Manager:** Wendy K. Shank  
**Assistant Production Manager:** Catherine S. Siskos  
**Production Associate:** Scherraine Mack  
**Art Director:** Amy Decker Henry  
**Assistant Art Director:** Julie Cherry  
**Art Associate:** Diana DeFrancesco  
**Graphics and Production:** Holly Bishop, Linda C. Owens  
**Systems Analyst:** William Carter

## NEWS STAFF

**Managing News Editor:** Colin Norman  
**Deputy News Editors:** Tim Appenzeller, John M. Benditt, Jean Marx  
**News and Comment/Research News:** Ivan Amato, Faye Flam, Troy Gately (copy), Ann Gibbons, David P. Hamilton, Constance Holden, Richard A. Kerr, Eliot Marshall, Joseph Palca, Leslie Roberts, Richard Stone  
**Bureaus:** Marcia Barinaga (West Coast), Michelle Hoffman (Northeast), Anne Simon Moffat (Midwest)  
**Contributing Correspondents:** Joseph Alper, Jeremy Cherfas, Barry A. Cipra, Robert Crease, Elizabeth Culotta, M. Mitchell Waldrop, Karen Wright

## BUSINESS STAFF

**Marketing Director:** Beth Rosner  
**Circulation Director:** Michael Spinella  
**Fulfillment Manager:** Marlene Zendell  
**Financial Analyst:** Deborah Rivera-Wienhold  
**Classified Advertising Supervisor:** Michele Pearl

## ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

**Director:** Earl J. Scherago  
**Traffic Manager:** Donna Rivera  
**Traffic Manager (Recruitment):** Gwen Canter  
**Advertising Sales Manager:** Richard L. Charles  
**Marketing Manager:** Herbert L. Burkland  
**Employment Sales Manager:** Edward C. Keller  
**Sales:** New York, NY 10036: J. Kevin Henebry, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); Scotch Plains, NJ 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Hoffman Estates, IL 60195: Jack Ryan, 525 W. Higgins Rd. (708-885-8675); San Jose, CA 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16th St. (408-888-4890); Des Moines, IA 50319: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581); Damascus, MD 20872: Rick Sommer, 11318 Kings Valley Dr. (301-972-9270); U.K., Europe: Nick Jones, +44(0)64752918; Telex 42513; FAX (0647) 52053.

**Information for contributors** appears on pages 35–37 of the 4 January 1991 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Telephone: 202-326-6500. **Advertising correspondence** should be sent to Tenth Floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050 or WU Telex 968082 SCHERAGO, or FAX 212-382-3725. **Subscription/Member Benefits Questions:** 202-326-6417. **Science:** 202-326-6500. **Other AAAS Programs:** 202-326-6400.

## The Foreign Policy of U.S. Universities

**T**he accelerating globalization of technology, industrial practice, and economic markets should stimulate universities to reflect on the international dimensions of education and research. However, universities are busy defending current practices against growing criticism rather than devoting attention to formulating a coherent justification for foreign involvement.

The criticism arises from the tension between the long-term view that the university's purpose is to produce knowledge and educate people and the newer short-term view that U.S. research universities, largely supported by taxes, can and should be managed to improve U.S. economic competitiveness. It would be convenient if the criticisms could be rejected, but unfortunately, they have some merit.

A number of federal agencies increasingly use competitiveness to justify their research budgets to Congress. If university research programs have potential commercial value, it is natural for a concern to arise about technology transfer to foreign competitors. Therefore, some research sponsors seek formal or informal restrictions—for example, contract funds may not be used to support foreign graduate students or postdoctoral fellows for specific projects. The same research universities that encourage the budget justifications indignantly resist the restrictions that the public budget justification implies.

However, it is not unreasonable to expect that when a university accepts research that is justified by its value for commercial technology, that university must be prepared to agree to certain (but not all) restrictions that the sponsor proposes to specific contracts. The call for restrictions will continue until public claims about the short-run domestic economic value of university-based research become more realistic.

In addition, U.S. research universities are expanding university-industry programs in order to better learn about the process of innovation. Again, the question of foreign participation arises but should be simply resolved. Because the purpose of these cooperative efforts is clear—to improve the performance of U.S. industry—the appropriate test for such participation is whether the foreign firm contributes to the success of the technical program.

It is more difficult to defend university-industry liaison programs that sell access to and patents on taxpayer-supported research to foreign corporations. The typical congressman does not understand why universities should profit from transferring technology created on government grants to U.S. economic competitors.

However, the large number of foreign graduate students and postdoctoral fellows on U.S. campuses presents the most difficult problem. Although both U.S. universities and industry have become dependent on this source of talent, there is growing criticism about this proportion, both from those who believe that the United States is exploiting the intellectual capital of other nations and from those who believe that the United States is being exploited by nations that send their scientists here to learn about basic technology for use at home.

It would be comfortable to reject these two contradictory criticisms and argue that academic freedom demands the admission to U.S. research universities of the best minds, without regard to national origin or future employment location. But the number of foreign students and postdoctoral fellows in many departments is determined more by the demand created by available research funding than by an academic judgment about the desirable level of foreign student presence.

This issue would likely disappear if the proportion of foreigners fell from about 40 to 20 percent (excluding neighboring Canada and Mexico). Such a reduction could have the welcome effect of encouraging the recruitment of U.S. young people, especially minorities and women, into scientific careers.

It is neither necessary nor likely that the tension between the national and international purposes of the U.S. university will be entirely resolved. The welcome current emphasis on improving the nation's economic competitiveness has been accompanied by an unhealthy shift toward short-term nationalistic orientation. If the accompanying protectionism is to be avoided, universities must make a coherent case for the long-term benefits of international relationships and alter their policies to respond to legitimate concerns about benefits the U.S. public receives from its support of research universities.—**JOHN DEUTCH**, *Institute Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139*