

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **SEABORG RENOMINATED TO AEC:** Glenn T. Seaborg was renominated last week as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) by President Nixon. Seaborg has been chairman of the AEC since 1961; his term will run 5 years.

● **SAFE CAR:** The National Highway Safety Bureau has asked General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler to develop an Experimental Safety Vehicle. The cars will be five-passenger family sedans with many new and unproven modifications, all designed to enable the occupant to avoid accidents or to survive them in much better shape than is currently possible. The cars should be ready in 28 months.

● **FIXED COMBINATION DRUGS:** The Food and Drug Administration has ordered off the market 48 drugs containing fixed combinations of penicillin and sulfa and penicillin and streptomycin. The FDA first published an order to halt marketing of these drugs in June 1969, but appeals by the drug companies delayed action on the order for a year.

● **FAS REVIVES:** The Federation of American Scientists (FAS), an organization which played a significant role in science policy issues immediately after World War II but has since faded into obscurity, has launched a drive to attain greater influence. The organization has appointed a new director, Jeremy J. Stone, an arms control analyst; has expanded its secretarial staff; and has moved its offices from a remote location to 203 C St., NE, close to the Capitol complex, in Washington, D.C. The FAS also plans a drive to boost membership above the 2000 scientists and engineers currently enrolled. Stone hopes to make FAS a "significant force" by setting up some 50 or so "issue committees" and by lobbying at the state and national levels on issues ranging from atomic power to drug abuse to stock market excesses.

● **WHITE HOUSE FOOD CONFERENCE:** The report of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health (*Science*, 12 December) is available now. Copies may be obtained for \$3 from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

already enrolled were permitted to finish their courses, and, in line with government regulations that permit nonwhites to attend white universities if facilities or programs are lacking at their "own," several hundred nonwhites continue to this day to be enrolled at UCT and Witwatersrand. This is done under case-by-case government dispensations. (These students share educational and dining facilities with whites, I was told, but are barred from campus residential halls and athletic teams.) At the same time, in violation of the spirit but not the letter of the *apartheid* laws, several nonwhites remained on the UCT teaching staff. In this and other ways, UCT officials explained to me, the university signified its opposition to *apartheid*, and sought to maximize its freedom within the law, though, as is befitting an educational institution, they explained, open violations and clashes were avoided. Two years ago, however, a direct confrontation did occur, and it is instructive to examine it as a case study in the form and effectiveness of academic dissent in South Africa.

A young black received a degree in the Department of African studies at UCT, and went on to receive a doctorate in England. He then applied for a teaching post at UCT, and was approved by the various academic groups within UCT that must pass on all staff appointments. However, when the impending appointment came to the attention of the government Department of Education, which is the principal source of financial support for white higher education, it was made clear that the appointment was unacceptable—purely on racial grounds. Two senior administrators at the university gave me the following account of what ensued.

The government warned that if UCT insisted on the appointment, it would enact legislation to remove the few nonwhites who still remained on the faculty. There were also hints of financial reprisal. The administration of the university then withdrew the appointment. This touched off a student sit-in that lasted about a week. The protest, by all accounts, was peaceful, but came close to possible violence when several hundred students from the nearby jewel of Afrikaner higher education, Stellenbosch University, alma mater of most South African prime ministers, marched on UCT with the stated intent of attacking the protesters. (None of the Afrikaner universities ac-

cept nonwhites under any circumstances, and, with a few minor quibbles, they back *apartheid* down the line.) The marchers were thwarted by police with dogs, and not long afterward UCT returned to normal.

One of the UCT senior administrators went on as follows:

"We are violently opposed to *apartheid*, but we have to bow to reality. The students tend to operate on ethical principles, but the council and senate are responsible for running this university and we are threatened with the loss of our government grant. We had to withdraw the appointment. Abstract principle is one thing, reality is another."

He continued, "However much I disagree with the government, I feel that a majority of the Afrikaners are decent people. We are not dealing with Nazis."

Then he proceeded to an analysis that I frequently encountered in South Africa, one that put aside the issue of the morality or justice of "separate development" and instead delved into the question of whether it was proceeding at adequate speed, with proper financial support, and tactical matters of that sort. He said, "When the government ordered nonwhites out of the universities, they *did* permit those who were already there to complete their work. And they *did* establish separate universities for the nonwhites. I know that separate is unequal, but they have tried to be decent about this and we can hope that these nonwhite universities will improve."

"Look at the English Newspapers"

A long evening with a scientist from another English university produced the following conversation, considerably condensed here, but substantively intact:

"You don't understand," he said—a remark I frequently encountered—"we *do* have free speech here. Look at the English newspapers. They're full of antigovernment stuff. I've given speeches against government policies."

I pointed out that the leading English newspaper, the *Rand Daily Mail*, had been severely penalized for reporting on torture of political prisoners, and that all political articles were required to carry not only the name, but also the address of the reporter.

"That's true," he said, "but they still do criticize, you have to admit that. I haven't encountered any difficulties when I attack the government. Now, one does have to be somewhat careful. If I'm going to speak out on some issue, I always send a copy beforehand to the