

quest was denied, he complained to the FCC. The commission agreed that the fairness doctrine should apply to cigarette advertising, though it rejected the claim for equal time, saying that the effect of an equal-time requirement would be to drive cigarette commercials off the air. Congress, it noted, had required a health warning on cigarette packages but had kept the Federal Trade Commission from requiring such a warning in advertising.

Banzhaf, an M.I.T. graduate who forsook a career as an electrical engineer a few years ago to study for a law degree, is not, it must be said, above using shock tactics on his elders. He was at his most abrasive last September at a world conference in New York sponsored by the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health, which is made up primarily of representatives of voluntary and professional health groups and several federal agencies. He accused the voluntary health agencies of putting their desire for the broadcasters' goodwill and cooperation in fund raising ahead of what he felt was their obligation to take part in defending and enforcing the FCC ruling. The ruling was reaffirmed by the commission on 8 September, but it now faces a court test.

Despite a substantial increase (often from nearly zero) in the showing of antismoking materials by broadcasters, much more will have to be done to counter the barrage of cigarette commercials and remind the radio listener or television viewer that the "smooth"-tasting cigarettes, with the "tobacco-rich flavor," which he is urged to smoke may kill him.

Moreover, no clear standards for compliance with the FCC ruling have been developed, although the commission has said that ordinarily a significant amount of time should be devoted each week to presenting viewpoints opposed to smoking. The idea has gotten abroad that the FCC, through an off-hand remark by its general counsel, has suggested as an informal guideline a ratio of one antismoking message to every three commercials. In fact, the commission has said explicitly that it has no specific ratio in mind, and that it will tailor its demands for compliance "so as not to preclude or curtail [emphasis supplied] presentation by stations of cigarette advertising that they may choose to carry." The ruling thus contains a built-in contradiction and may produce only marginal results unless the FCC can be persuaded to interpret

## NEWS IN BRIEF

### ● FACULTY VIEWS ON VIETNAM:

Although the academic community is usually depicted as dovish on Vietnam, a random survey of 300 faculty members at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor revealed that the faculty there is far from solid in its position. The survey was conducted by Howard Schuman, associate professor of sociology, and Edward O. Laumann, assistant professor of sociology, both at the University of Michigan. The survey was made after one-fifth of the faculty signed a letter calling for an unconditional halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. Results were reported in the November issue of *Trans-action*, a publication of Washington University, St. Louis. After analyzing the returns, Schuman and Laumann concluded that "... by the most generous estimate, 38 percent of the faculty oppose the bombing and 50 percent ... support the bombing." They also noted, "Signers and supporters of a letter calling on the President to stop the bombing made up 35 percent of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, as opposed to only 29 percent of the university as a whole. Supporters of the bombing made up only 25 percent of the liberal-arts faculty, compared with 28 percent of the whole faculty." Seventeen percent of those sampled in the medical school and 22 percent in the engineering college supported the stop-the-bombing letter. Three out of four social scientists wanted the bombing stopped, humanists tended to oppose the bombing, but by a closer ratio, and the natural scientists were the only group in which those favoring the bombing outnumbered those who wanted it stopped.

● **ON STUDENT FREEDOM:** In the wake of widespread student disorders when numerous Dow Chemical Company, CIA, and military recruiters were heckled or trapped by students in cars and buildings, the Council of the American Association of University Professors endorsed a statement deploring such actions.

The statement said, in part, "action by individuals or groups to prevent speakers invited to the campus from speaking, to disrupt the operations of the institutions in the course of demonstrations, or to obstruct and restrain other members of the academic

community and campus visitors by physical force is destructive of the pursuit of learning and of a free society. The resolution was passed 28 October during a meeting in which Council members approved the *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students* (*Science*, 4 August, p. 524) which notes that students should "be free to support causes by any orderly means which do not disrupt the regular and essential operation of the institution." The Council also reaffirmed the fundamental principle that was set forth in the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* that "the common good depends upon free search for truth and its free exposition."

● **PASS-FAIL AT YALE:** Beginning in January, Yale undergraduate students will be graded on a pass-fail basis. Under the plan, which was approved by Yale's undergraduate faculty, students will receive one of four designations for course work: fail, pass, high pass, and honors. The system will be tried experimentally for a period of 5 years.

● **BIRTH CONTROL:** The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was criticized by outside consultants for failing to provide "prompt and vigorous" implementation of birth control policy statements issued more than 21 months ago by Secretary Gardner. HEW officials, who had commissioned the study, released the findings at congressional hearings 2 November. They called the report "critical" but "excellent," "honest," and "fair." The consultants, headed by Oscar Harkavy, of the Ford Foundation's Population Office, found that "none of the DHEW regional offices or operating agencies presently places high priority on family planning, or is certain what precise functions it is expected to carry out in this field." Estimating that some 5 million women need publicly assisted family planning services, while only 700,000 are currently receiving such aid, the consultants urged "a manifold expansion of funds for family planning." Congressional critics of HEW's birth control efforts welcomed the report with glee, saying it proved their contention that HEW is "fainthearted," "pusillanimous," "lackadaisical," "weak," and "confused."