

worried about the reality of it," says Graff, for he says the organization will not compromise its standards. "But I am a little worried about the perception that others might have."

That is a short list of questions. A longer and sharper list might be posed by a review committee<sup>†</sup> of the National Academy of Sciences recruited to guide the San Joaquin Valley research. The committee has not examined the EDF-Westlands proposal. However, it has

<sup>†</sup>The Committee on Irrigation-Induced Water Quality Problems of the National Research Council is chaired by William Allaway, a visiting fellow in agronomy at Cornell and former soil research director for the Department of Agriculture.

just finished a review of the bigger program centered at the Bureau of Reclamation.

On 10 October, the committee issued a quietly scathing commentary. It begins with the tart observation that, "Failure to assess the problem explicitly in advance wastes time and multiplies effort. This appears to be happening to a degree in the San Joaquin Valley drainage studies." The group reported that it found overlapping research proposals, inadequate control by the oversight committee, and little substance in the Bureau of Reclamation's research agenda. The list did not end there. Some of the other

items cited were: an inadequate staff, insufficient public communication, poor planning for data analysis, no guidelines for quality control of samples, a lack of clarity in the wildlife research plan, inattention to public health dangers, "woefully inadequate" provisions for studying social and economic impacts, no discussion of waste disposal options and "no substance" in plans to study on-farm management of wastewater.

The entire critique is only 11 pages long, making it a model of efficient communication. The EDF-Westlands program might benefit from the same kind of constructive review.—ELIOT MARSHALL

## Archeology Congress Threatened

*American and European scholars have resigned from next year's World Archeology Congress as a result of a ban on South African participation*

The 11th World Archeological Congress, due to be held in Great Britain next fall, is facing a major crisis as a result of a recent decision to deny attendance to anyone working in South African institutions, irrespective of nationality. News of the national committee's decision, which was taken belatedly and without consultation with the appropriate international body or session organizers, has provoked many prominent scholars in the United States and Europe to resign from the Congress in protest. A campaign, initiated in this country, is now being mounted to inform all participants of these developments and to encourage further protests.

If the national committee were to reverse its decision, which seems unlikely, it is now clear that the issue has become sufficiently politicized that some participants, mostly in Britain, would resign to protest South African inclusion. This is ironic, because the original invitation to researchers from South Africa had inspired no adverse comment from the archeological community. Pressure to prevent South African representation came exclusively from outside organizations, including the Association of University Teachers (AUT), the Anti-Apartheid Movement, and the City Council of Southampton, whose university is to host the gathering.

Those who are protesting the national committee's decision describe it as a violation of the principle of the free circulation of scientists and scientific

ideas, which, for instance, is embodied in the guidelines of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). Desmond Clark, of the University of California, Berkeley, wrote the following in his letter of resignation to Peter Ucko, national secretary of the Congress, which reflects what many other participants are saying: "The Executive Committee's decision amounts to a slur on the hitherto enviable reputation of Britain which has always stood out for full and free exchange of ideas between scientists, irrespective of the policies of their governments."

By contrast, those who support the decision as a matter of principle argue that political developments in South Africa have now reached a stage where a strong stand is important. "Academia is not apolitical," says Ian Hodder of Cambridge University, England. "It is a political statement to have South African participation at an international meeting. And to have a ban of this sort is the best way to force people in South Africa to change the system from inside."

The national committee appears to align itself with this sentiment, by stating that it is following Unesco guidelines "to refrain from cultural or academic interaction with South Africa." The committee also noted that, while it supported the principle of academic freedom, "South Africa, and its apartheid regime, placed it outside all normal principles and regulations."

In fact, the committee's decision was

one of pragmatism, not principle, made in a situation that was forced upon it in part because of meager financial resources. By contrast with the most recent congresses, in Mexico City in 1981, and in Nice in 1976, which each received generous government financing, the British gathering is to be funded principally by private sponsorship and an ambitious publications program that will derive from the scientific sessions. Ucko and his committee have received enormous praise from all sides for their obviously very successful entrepreneurial effort in what are clearly difficult circumstances.

In addition, the scope of the scientific programs and involvement of a large number of Third World and Fourth World (indigenous peoples) participants has been heralded as a great achievement, which would be of enormous benefit to the scholarship and integration of the archeological community. Indeed, ironically enough, the First and Second Announcements of the Congress, penned in 12 languages, proclaimed that "This meeting . . . is to be a truly international one." Many prospective participants failed to notice that, when the Third, and final, Announcement arrived just a few weeks ago, the international flavor had been somewhat diluted by the omission of scholars from South Africa who previously had been billed as session organizers and participants.

The shift had occurred during the late summer, when the national committee was approached first by the local chapter

of the Anti-Apartheid Movement, then in short order by the local community relations board, the AUT, representatives of the Southampton student body, and finally by the City Council. In each case the message was the same: if scholars from South Africa were allowed to attend the Congress, there would be trouble. Protests, in the form of "non-violent direct action," were promised by the students, the AUT, and the Anti-Apartheid Movement. In addition, the Anti-Apartheid Movement would contact sympathetic governments and encourage them to boycott the meeting.

Most telling of all, however, was the threat to withdraw financial support and accommodation by the City Council and the student body, respectively. The financial loss, some \$145,000, would have represented one quarter of the Congress's budget.

Ucko tried, but failed, to persuade these various bodies of the virtues of academic exchanges with individuals in South Africa who were not in any way representative of the government. A meeting of the executive of the national committee early in September decided that there was no serious alternative but to disinvite South African participants and announce a ban. John Evans of the Institute of Archeology, London, and president of the committee, says that "... it was clear that nothing short of a complete ban would satisfy them."

Ucko explored the possibility of locating the congress outside Southampton, but was told that the protesters would follow wherever he went. In any case, the logistics of such a move would have been horrendous. The drastic alternative of canceling the Congress as a matter of principle was unanimously rejected.

Letters of "disinvitation" were sent to scholars in South Africa on 9 September. Congress co-organizers were informed of the decision 10 days later, again by letter, as was Jacques Nenquin, secretary general of the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences (IUPPS), which is the governing body of the congress.

Evans and his colleagues knew that their action would be criticized, not least because many of its victims have for years fought publicly and vigorously against apartheid, both within universities and outside. Most notable among these is Phillip Tobias of the University of the Witwatersrand Medical School, Johannesburg. It so happens that Tobias has been a member of the Permanent Council of IUPPS for almost 10 years.

The executive's action is also attacked because it was taken without wide con-

sultation, and particularly without reference to its governing body.

But central to the current argument is the contention that the national committee was charged by its parent body to accept "all bona fide scientists to its venue, irrespective of nationality, philosophical conviction or religious faith." This statement is not part of the International Union's statutes, which instead state that the Congress must accept participation of scholars from all countries, but was part of a letter from Nenquin to Evans, of 15 May 1982. That letter, Nenquin explains, was a formal instrument in finalizing the conditions under which Britain, as the host country to the 11th Congress, must operate.

---

### The drastic alternative of canceling the congress as a matter of principle was unanimously rejected.

---

Ucko implies that the statement has little force, because it is not part of the statutes. In addition, Ucko and his colleagues cite Unesco's strictures on South Africa as support for the committee's decision. But this is treacherous ground on which to wander, as Evans admits. "No, the committee has no plans to take action against other nations that are in disfavor with Unesco, such as Israel," he says.

The rationale finally used for overriding Nenquin's statement, however, was that the actions of the South African government put it outside normal considerations of principle. But, Carmel Shrire, of Rutgers University, argues, "In an ideal world you don't have to make explicit statements about protecting principles of freedom of ideas and people. It's when those principles are threatened, as with South Africa, that you do."

North American sentiment appears to be strongly, but not unanimously, in favor of upholding the principle of the free circulation of ideas and people, and as a result most session organizers from this continent have resigned, including Clark, Shrire, A. L. Bryan of the University of Alberta, and Meg Conkey of the State University of New York, Binghamton. Other leading scholars who have withdrawn are Lewis Binford, of the University of New Mexico, and Edwin Wilmsen of Boston University.

The ban on South African participation may have other effects in this country too. For instance, the Wenner-Grenn Foundation for Anthropological Research, which has already given a grant to the Congress for organizational resources, is now holding up a second grant, which was to have been for travel expenses, while the recent events are reviewed. "The Foundation has a general policy of not encouraging or supporting conferences that are not open to international scholars without restriction," says Lita Osmundsen, secretary of the Foundation.

The issue is to be discussed by the board of the Society for American Archeology (SAA) when it meets in Washington, D.C., in early December. Donald Fowler of the University of Nevada and president of the SAA has been preparing to sponsor a proposal to the National Science Foundation (NSF) for travel funds for postgraduate researchers and young faculty to go to the Congress. A final decision on this will have to await the outcome of discussions in December, he says, but he notes the sentiment gathering against the Congress.

But even if a proposal is submitted, it might fail because of the political restrictions on the Congress. Although the NSF has no firmly articulated policy that covers this kind of situation, decisions might be influenced by principles of the free circulation of scientists. "The ICSU guidelines have got to be the basic position from which we start," says Robert Hardy, deputy director of the Division of International Programs.

Meanwhile, in Britain several important session organizers have recently declined to participate. At least three vice presidents of the congress, Glyn Daniel, Grahame Clark, and Stuart Piggot seriously considered resigning their positions, but for the present decided against it on the grounds that they could be more influential in helping to rescue the principles of the Congress in the future, if not this current event. As a protest, each has withdrawn from participation in the scientific sessions, including delivering several keynote speeches.

The vice presidents will have an opportunity to make their feelings known to the national committee, when it meets at the end of this month. Clark says that an unsatisfactory outcome from this meeting would cause him to resign, together with Daniel and Piggot. Evans told *Science* that if he faced overwhelming sentiment that the congress should be canceled, he and his committee would have to consider the option very seriously.—ROGER LEWIN