

Health Service for supporting traffic safety research on the same terms on which it supports basic medical research—terms which include more attention to the worthiness of the research than to the use made of the results. He also urged that joint government-industry support of research on controversial topics, together with a policy which en-

couraged researchers to submit data to their industrial, rather than their governmental, sponsors, was cheating the public of valuable information for which it was footing a share of the bill. The PHS is now reevaluating its policy, and there are signs that it may soon shift its auto safety research projects onto a contract basis.

Nader is not single-handedly responsible for either the changes in mood or the changes in policy. But his well-reasoned book and his private campaign have gone a long way toward bringing them about. The answer to the perennial question "What can one man do?" seems to be that he can do quite a lot.
—ELINOR LANGER

Speaker Ban: Controversy Is Revived at U.N.C.

When one strikes at a king, one strikes to kill. By the same token, those who strike at bad laws often are well-advised to strike hard and stand over their victims until the last breath of life is gone. Outright repeal of North Carolina's controversial "speaker-ban" law might have spared the state and its university and publicly owned colleges a new round of turmoil. Last fall's amending of that law seems not to have brought such respite. The speaker-ban controversy, supposedly settled, has been revived—in a form potentially more virulent than ever.

Originally, the controversy involved these principal disputants: on one side, the state's superpatriots and a minority of the legislature; on the other side, North Carolina's political leaders, all of the state's major newspapers, and virtually everyone associated with the University of North Carolina. The university's trustees, administration, faculty, and students and many of its most influential alumni were speaking as one against the speaker ban. Now, however, the controversy threatens to divide the university against itself, just as Ohio State University was divided until its speaker-ban controversy was resolved last year.

The state General Assembly, acting in haste at the close of its 1963 session, enacted a law prohibiting "known communists" and persons who have pleaded the 5th Amendment in loyalty investigations from speaking on state campuses (*Science*, 29 October and 5 November 1965). By last fall it had become clear that the speaker-ban statute was doing harm to the university—

undermining faculty morale and posing a threat to the university's accreditation. In November the General Assembly amended the law, abolishing the statutory ban and making the university trustees ultimately responsible for the choice of visiting speakers.

However, the amendment was part of a compromise prepared by a special commission Governor Dan Moore had named in an effort to find a way out of the speaker-ban crisis. The compromise was regarded by many, at the time, as simply a political device permitting speaker-ban proponents to save face and enabling the legislature to rescind the speaker ban without seeming to be soft on communism. But it seems to have exacted a greater concession from the anti-ban forces than they then realized.

The compromise called for trustees of state-owned institutions to adopt a speaker policy declaring that, while students should be free to hear Communists and 5th-Amendment pleaders, the appearance of such speakers should be "infrequent," and on those rare occasions when permitted, should serve the interests of education and not exploit the campuses as "convenient outlets for discord and strife."

The university would have preferred outright repeal of the speaker-ban law but felt that, under the circumstances, it was best to accept the compromise. Moreover, while it had been recognized all along that the speaker ban infringed on academic freedom, this argument against the ban often was raised only indirectly. The principal argument used was that the ban amounted to legisla-

tive interference with the prerogatives of the university trustees, whose independence was seen as one of the principal safeguards of academic freedom. The compromise appeared to have the virtue of ending that interference, which the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) had cited as the reason for its pending review of U.N.C.'s accreditation.

The sanguine attitude of the university and its friends was reflected in the *Raleigh News and Observer's* grandiloquent comment on the compromise. "The state of North Carolina regains its image as the free, creative capital of the Southern mind," the newspaper said. A few doubts were expressed, but they tended to be lost in the general optimism. In early December at a meeting in Richmond, Virginia, of its commission on colleges, SACS removed the threat of disaccreditation. The association did indicate that continued watchfulness for infringements on academic freedom in North Carolina and other Southern states was in order. One participant at the Richmond meeting observed anonymously that the terms of the speaker-ban compromise would "intimidate all but the boldest [university] officials."

The remark was prophetic. U.N.C.'s trustees and administrators have been afraid to permit invitation of two speakers whose appearance on campus might be interpreted as a flouting of the speaker-ban compromise. Though disposed to administer their speaker policy liberally, they are caught in a dilemma. If the speakers are permitted to appear, the university officials fear that the speaker-ban question will again become a heated political issue, just when May's Democratic primary election for legislative seats is approaching. On the other hand, if approval of student plans to invite domestic speakers of the ultra-left continues to be withheld, the administration could find itself in deep trouble with the student body and faculty, particularly the younger faculty.

Although up to now the administrators and trustees appear to have the sympathy and respect of most students and faculty, signs that relations may become strained are appearing. An awkward series of events has unfolded since the first of the year. It began with an announcement by the Students for a Democratic Society, a group whose U.N.C. chapter is small but conspicuously active.

The SDS said it planned to have two ultra-leftists speak on campus in early March—Herbert Aptheker, the Marxist theoretician, and Frank Wilkinson, who once pleaded the 5th Amendment before a California legislative committee and who has been chairman of the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. The invitations were subject, of course, to the university's approval. However, the Board of Trustees had not yet adopted rules governing the appearance of speakers of the kind formerly proscribed by law, although it had agreed to the basic policy set forth in the speaker-ban compromise.

The board's 12-member executive committee met twice in February, with Governor Moore, its chairman, presiding. On the first occasion, Moore had to leave early and nothing was decided. Shortly thereafter, the Governor stated publicly that the invitations to Aptheker and Wilkinson obviously were intended "to create controversy for the sake of controversy" rather than to serve a legitimate educational purpose. When the committee met again, Moore repeated these views and said, moreover, that it would be illegal to approve the invitations until the appropriate rules had been adopted by the full 100-member board of trustees. Accordingly, approval was withheld by a vote of eight to three. Moore's part in these events has caused some people to regret that by law the Governor is a trustee.

On 28 February, the board of trustees met, and, with only a few dissenting votes by die-hard speaker-ban proponents, delegated to the chancellors at the four U.N.C. campuses (Chapel Hill, Raleigh, Greensboro, and Charlotte) the authority to approve or disapprove speaking invitations to Communists and 5th-Amendment pleaders. The board also prescribed three conditions to be met any time such speakers appeared: a ranking faculty member would preside over the meeting; the floor would be open to questions; and opportunity for rebuttal would be provided either at that

meeting or at a subsequent meeting.

Immediately, a coalition of student leaders on the Chapel Hill campus renewed the invitation to Aptheker and Wilkinson. This was not another action by a tiny group of political activists, but an initiative by the most representative leaders on campus. They included the president of the student government, the editor of the *Daily Tar Heel*, and the presidents of the Carolina Forum, the Carolina Political Union, and the YMCA.

Acting Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson refused to permit the two speakers to appear, saying that he was guided in his decision by the position taken by the trustees' executive committee. Critics of the decision noted that some of the committee members had voted against Aptheker's and Wilkinson's speaking because the trustees had not prescribed the rules governing such appearances. However, a student-faculty advisory committee, whose six members included the chairman of the faculty and two elected student officers, had recommended the course which Sitterson decided to take.

Circus at the Stone Wall

The speakers controversy then entered its circus phase. On 2 March Wilkinson, on the student leaders' invitation, gave a midday speech just off campus, standing on one side of a stone wall marking the university boundary while several hundred students listened from the other side. On 9 March Aptheker gave a similar performance before a crowd estimated at 2000. Television crews were on hand and a holiday mood prevailed. Aptheker and Wilkinson devoted their speeches mainly to deploring what they alleged was the demise of freedom of speech at U.N.C.

Chancellor Sitterson has approved speaking invitations, by the political science and psychology departments, to two Communist scholars. Vladimir Alexandrov, an authority on Leninism from the University of Moscow, spoke at U.N.C. last week and engaged in a lively discussion with students. Hanus Papousek, a psychologist from Prague, will speak in May.

However, permitting foreign Communists to appear has not appeased the student leaders opposing the restrictive policy on campus speakers, nor is it likely to appease those faculty members who have joined the students in opposing the policy. Some 2 weeks ago the president of the student government

and two other student leaders called on Sitterson and urged him to permit Aptheker and Wilkinson to return and speak on campus. Their visit was followed by a letter formally requesting the Chancellor's approval of invitations to the two leftists.

If Sitterson denies the request, the student leaders may institute the law suit which the student government president has been saying is imminent. The suit would be against the university officials and trustees, with Aptheker and Wilkinson and perhaps a few faculty members joining the students as plaintiffs. Denial of rights guaranteed by the freedom of speech and "equal protection" provisions of the Constitution would be alleged. Also, the university's action in penalizing Wilkinson for having invoked his rights under the 5th Amendment would be attacked. The American Association of University Professors, whose Chapel Hill chapter is headed by Joseph W. Straley, professor of physics, may support the action, financially and with a friend-of-the-court brief.

University officials once felt that U.N.C. would suffer fewer recriminations from the public and the legislature if the speaker-ban controversy were settled politically—that is, by action of the General Assembly. This judgment might have proved correct had the Governor's commission and the legislature not adopted the Fabian strategy of amending the speaker-ban law instead of repealing it.

Now, a clear-cut court ruling sweeping away the amended statute and the trustees' policy based on it might bury the controversy—not merely in North Carolina, but also in other states where speaker-ban laws and policies have been debated. The North Carolina speaker-ban law was unique, but restrictive policies imposed by university administrations and trustees have not been uncommon.

There is some reason to think that a law suit—if its success could be assumed—would not make the U.N.C. officials unhappy. An unsuccessful suit would play into the hands of speaker-ban proponents, but attorneys whom the students have consulted appear confident that the suit would succeed. Such litigation tends to be long-drawn-out, however, and one could only hope that, pending the decision, the controversy would not grow worse.

In the event that the university's present speaker policy is abolished, Ohio State's solution to its speaker-ban controversy might serve U.N.C. as a useful

model. Before a trustee-imposed speaker ban was lifted early last fall, O.S.U. was torn by conflict. Student demonstrations and acrimonious faculty meetings at times had the administration in a state of siege.

In removing the speaker ban, the O.S.U. trustees adopted a policy which included a provision applying to speakers whose appearance may generate "extreme emotional feeling." In the case of such speakers, who can be invited by any recognized student organization, the faculty advisory committee to O.S.U.'s president is to prescribe conditions to assure "an orderly and scholarly" meeting. Speakers are forbidden to advocate illegal acts, but otherwise are not restricted in what they may say. Opportunity for questions and rebuttal must be provided.

Aptheker, who is becoming a veteran of speaker-ban controversies, appeared at O.S.U. last October, and all went smoothly—so smoothly, in fact, that the "emotional feeling" clause wasn't invoked for the appearance four weeks later of Wilkinson, the speaker-ban proponents' other practiced tormentor.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

Announcements

The Agency for International Development and the Public Health Service have established an **international health education unit** in the PHS Office of International Health. The unit will help both agencies in programs such as nutrition, disease eradication, and family planning. It will be financed by AID. Mary Jo Kraft, health services director in the PHS Commissioned Corps, is in charge of the new unit.

A **rare-earth information center** has been established at the Atomic Energy Commission's Ames Laboratory. The center will prepare technical articles, answer requests for information, and publish a newsletter. It will keep a file of journal articles, reports, books, and translated foreign articles on the rare earths, and it will prepare bibliographies. Initially the center will emphasize the physical metallurgy and the solid-state physics of the metals and their metallic and semimetallic alloys.

Karl A. Gschneidner, Jr., will be in charge of the center. He is a metallurgist at the Ames Laboratory and associate professor of metallurgy at Iowa State University, which runs the labora-

tory for the AEC. The services of the center are available to government agencies, research and educational institutions, and industry. Additional information is available from Gschneidner, Rare-Earth Information Center, Ames Laboratory, Ames, Iowa 50010.

The **Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation** was established recently to "help close the gap between the needs of the medical profession and the technical capabilities of industry which are not yet fully realized in the medical field." The organization hopes to provide a medium of communication between the developers and users of medical instrumentation and the general medical and lay public. Its first meeting is scheduled for July in Boston. Additional information is available from AAMI, P.O. Box 314, Harvard Square, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

NASA last month announced the creation of a temporary committee to advise the agency on the **conduct of future space projects**. The agency's administrator James E. Webb said that the group was formed "because in the next generation of space projects, NASA will need new policies and procedures and possibly new organizational arrangements to enable scientists to participate."

The 13-member committee, chaired by Norman F. Ramsey of Harvard, will work directly with NASA's Space Science Board. The members include: G. W. Beadle, University of Chicago; L. Goldberg, Harvard; J. L. Greenstein, Caltech; H. H. Hess, Princeton; H. Johnson, MIT; G. J. F. MacDonald, UCLA; H. W. Magoun, UCLA; N. U. Mayall, Kitt Peak National Observatory; C. S. Pittendrigh, Princeton; M. Schwarzschild, Princeton; C. Townes, MIT; J. A. Van Allen, University of Iowa.

Meeting Notes

A conference on **energy conversion** by photosynthetic apparatus will take place at Brookhaven National Laboratory 6–9 June. Sessions have been scheduled on energy transfer and primary photochemistry; electron transport and phosphorylation; phosphorylation, ion flows, and conformational

changes; structural aspects; and oxygen evolution and chlorophyll fluorescence. Sponsor: Biology Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory. Deadline, notification of intent to attend the meeting: 6 May. (J. M. Olson, Biology Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, Long Island, New York.

The International Union of **Crystallography** plans to hold its seventh general assembly and congress 12–19 July in Moscow. The program will be divided into several divisions to cover the main problems of experimentation and the theory of crystal structure.

The congress will be followed by a symposium on **crystal growth**, 20–21 July. Topics will be external and internal morphology, effects of impurities, and epitaxy and autoepitaxial overgrowth. Details of the meetings may be obtained from the secretaries of the member nations' national committees for crystallography. The U.S. secretary is James Ibers, Chemistry Department, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

The preparation and properties of **electronic materials for the control of radiative processes** will be the subject of a conference in Boston 29–31 August. The meeting will emphasize the aspects of material science and technology that are related to spontaneous and simulated light emission, light detection and modulation, and microwave generation. Sponsor: electronic materials committee, Metallurgical Society of AIME. Abstracts: 200 to 300 words; deadline: 1 May. (E. P. Warekois, MIT Lincoln Laboratory, Lexington, Massachusetts 02173)

A symposium on **chemical engineering in medicine and biology** is scheduled for 20–21 October at the University of Cincinnati. Papers are invited on topics relating to research at the interface between chemical engineering and life sciences. Sponsor: industrial and engineering chemistry division, American Chemical Society. Abstracts: 150 words; deadline: 31 May. (Daniel Hershey, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221)

An international symposium on **atherosclerosis and the reticuloendothelial system (RES)** will be held in Como, Italy, 8–10 September. Papers are invited for the four sections: struc-