Science

2 AUGUST 1991 VOLUME 253 NUMBER 5019

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 F. Koshland, Jr. Deputy Editor: Ellis Rubinsteir Managing Editor: Monica M. Bradford International Editor: Alun Anderson Deputy Editors: Philip H. Abelson (Engineering and Applied es); John I. Brauman (Physical Sciences); Thomas R. Cech (Biological Sciences)

EDITORIAL STAFF

Assistant Managing Editor: Dawn Bennett Senior Editors: Eleanore Butz, Martha Coleman, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelner, Phillip D. Szuromi, David F. Voss ociate 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 Gray, Beverly Shields Production Director: James Landry Production Manager: Wendy K. Shank Assitant 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 Carte NEWS STAFF

Managing News Editor: Colin Norman Deputy News Editors: Tim Appenzeller, John M. Benditt,

Jean Mary News and Comment/Research News: Ivan Amato, Fave

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. Burklund 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): Sa Jose CA 95112 Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16th St. +108-998 4690: Dorse: VT 05251: 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(0647)52918; 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

492 EDITORIAL

The Foreign Policy of U.S. Universities

A 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



The Foreign Policy of U.S. Universities Author(s): John Deutch Source: *Science*, New Series, Vol. 253, No. 5019 (Aug. 2, 1991), p. 492 Published by: American Association for the Advancement of Science Stable URL: <u>http://www.jstor.org/stable/2878958</u> Accessed: 04/10/2008 08:28

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aaas.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Association for the Advancement of Science is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Science.