November 19, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Fujio Matsuda, RCUH

FROM: Vince Peterson, Professor of Physics

SUBJECT: Policies of Some Leading Research Universities on Classified Research.

Recently I have been stimulated to discover what is the policy of each of the following universities on classified research:

- Stanford (see below)
- UCBerkeley
- CalTech
- Cornell

in connection with the current discussion of the same subject at UHM.

On my recent (Nov. 15-17) trip to the Bay Area on another matter, I have had the opportunity to discuss consulting/classified research topics with key personnel at Stanford and UCBerkeley; i.e., Prof. W.K.H. Panofsky of Stanford, and Prof. William Frazer. Panofsky is well-known nationally and is the new chairman of the National Academy of Sciences committee on "Scientific Communication and National Security", as well as a past USA-negotiator on various technical parts of the ABM treaty and Salt II. Bill Frazer is the Senior Vice-President of the University of California system, with special responsibilities for relations with Los Alamos, Livermore, and other UC-run laboratories.

Attached is a copy of the Stanford "Policy Guidelines on Secrecy in Research", which is part IV-F of the Stanford Faculty Handbook. It is interesting to note that the Senate of the Faculty has primary responsibility for developing these guidelines: they are not rewritten by the administration based upon advice from the Senate. They include the policy that "the University should enter no contract and accept no grant to carry out research if the grant or contract restrains the freedom of the University to disclose ... research results... etc.". Panofsky made it clear that this meant "no classified research on campus", and no use of Stanford facilities for classified research; however, individual faculty members consulting off-campus were not asked to state the nature of their consultation. Note that use of confidential information (from outside sources) is discussed (section 4,d).

The Vice-President and Provost's office is sending me a complete copy of the Stanford Faculty Handbook, which also covers rules on outside consulting.

Bill Frazer is sending me the comparable material in effect at UC Berkeley. He stated that "no classified research on campus" is also the rule.
at Berkeley, although it was not always so. The UC System does not have an
uniform policy, since the Regents have yet to agree on one; each campus has
its own rules. The UC System manages the Livermore and Los Alamos laboratories
at the request of the Federal government, which has produced some faculty
unrest; this is done in an "arms-length" approach. (Presumably I will learn
more about this when Bill Frazer's material arrives.) Some students in Applied
Physics at UC Davis are able to use some of Livermore's facilities for
their thesis research (it's called "Teller Institute of Technology" by some!),
but special arrangements have to be made for equipment in classified areas.
Both the Berkeley and Davis physics departments rejected this proposed method
of utilizing specialized equipment in a classified area, as involving more
complications than they cared to handle.

At the meeting I attended (Symposium on the 30th Anniversary of
the Discovery of the Antiproton) I talked briefly with CalTech and Cornell
physicists, knowledgeable in their campus policies. The separation of the
Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory from Cornell, and the separate location of the
Jet Propulsion Laboratory—a classified area remote from the CalTech campus—are indications of how they have handled this matter of classified
research and higher education.

Applications to UHM's situation: As a purely personal view, I
see some general principles involved, as well as some important differences
between Hawaii and Stanford/Berkeley/CalTech. However, the evolution of
these strong research institutions, whose expertise in "high technology"
is far advanced beyond our own, is something to pay attention to, I think.

The general principle seems to be: don't mix classified research
with unclassified research, especially not in the same physical area. (It
not only violates the spirit of free inquiry fundamental to higher education,
but it entails all sorts of practical complications which are unnecessary.)
The "atmosphere" of excluding non-cleared students/faculty from certain
discussions or the use of university equipment is debilitating to the principle
of openness in research.

Furthermore, it appears that these first-rank universities have
found it entirely practical to fulfill their obligations to national
security—when requested and agreed upon—by maintaining entirely separate
("off-campus") facilities which can be made secure. This has the immense
advantage of limiting participation, or even exposure, to those faculty who
wish to become involved (during their consulting time allowed by University
policies.)

Differences between Mainland schools (above) and Hawaii seem to focus
on the more advanced technology surrounding the campuses at Stanford, Berkeley,
and CalTech/Cornell (?). Special equipment for research may be less available
in Hawaii than in Palo Alto and Berkeley. However, I predict that in a short
time it will appear "off-campus", if indeed it is essential to the (well-funded)
classified research. It is inadvisable to use hardware availability to
abrogate an otherwise-clearcut policy.

A related matter is consulting-for-personal gain, which is also
covered in detail in the Handbooks expected soon. From all I've heard,
the prohibition against use of University facilities in such consulting is
nearly universal, as a general rule. (I have been promised material on this
from Stanford and Berkeley, which lists grounds for exceptional circumstances.)