

At the next day's symposium on 27 December 1969, devoted to the future of the American Space Program, worse was to follow and a veritable uproar ensued, when students and scientists shouted angrily at each other during the normally so sedate and conservative proceedings. Such scenes had never before been seen, and as they were being televised, serious consequences for the AAAS were forecast in my report "Uproar over Space Costs at US Science Meeting"; 30 CC. The meeting degenerated into pandemonium with placards paraded, a man brandishing a knife and another reciting an obscene poem of an anti-white character. With both the chairman and the questioner having independent microphone circuits, shouting at an incredibly loud level, such phrases as "Rockets on the Moon, slums on Earth" echoed round the hall. These scenes produced deep anger in the audience, not about the dissent urged, but by the sound-level and the crudity in which it was presented.

It was by no means a unisex protest that must have been deeply felt by all, as two women presented papier-maché Moon rocks to a distinguished speaker shouting "USA first in space, sixteenth in infant deaths—What means more to you?"

The symposium organised by NASA to gain public support for its schedule of Moon flights during the coming years must have given the organisers a grim foretaste of the cuts in its budget by Congress and the cuts in the number of Apollo flights which indeed had to follow. Only the presentation of the Apollo 11 and 12 films by Colonel 'Buzz' Aldrin, the second man on the Moon, restored some order and were in contrast to the earlier rowdy scenes.

On 28 December, the following day, the opposition to the scientific establishment was more structured and detailed. "The sorry State of Science" was presented by a group of young scientists as serving only industry for profit. Four specific examples were quoted: 'Computers with built-in obsolescence'; 'Molecular manipulation of drugs without achieving greater efficiency'; 'The use of social science to persuade underprivileged people to fit into existing society, instead of bettering it'; and finally 'NASA as a governmental technique to subsidise the aero-space industry'.

In answer, an astronomer from Harvard urged scientists to 'de-mystify' science, so that ordinary people could help in changing it. Another one of my reports "Scientists oppose manned Mars Landing" was published; 38 CC. But a counter-blast "Do not ridicule Science" by Dr J. Myer, a consultant to the White House, was not favoured by the 'copy tasting' editor in London.