

F. A. S. NEWSLETTER

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS
October 24, 1950

1749 L Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.
50 - 9

MOBILIZATION PAINS

Scientists and the Draft. The subject of the utilization of scientific manpower in the current emergency and its full mobilization in time of war has been headline news these past few weeks. Maj. Gen. Lewis Hershey, Selective Service Director, started the fireworks by stating in a speech that the American people have been sold a "lot of baloney" about the necessity of deferring scientists and professional men from military service because there aren't enough of them around.

Although Gen. Hershey did not specifically say so, the impression left by the press stories was that scientists and technical people are seeking blanket deferments for all members of their profession. Press statements by the American Chemical Society, the FAS, and the National Society of Professional Engineers criticized his stand and pointed out the importance of proper utilization of scientific manpower as an element of national strength. The following day, W. Stuart Symington, National Security Resources Board Chairman, came out in favor of deferment of scientific personnel and announced his intention of discussing the matter with the Secretary of Defense.

Several days later, the Trytten Report, recommending a procedure for deferring college students, was issued. This report, prepared and endorsed by six advisory committees to the Director of Selective Service, was grudgingly accepted by Hershey. Thus on the surface, things were quiet again, but there is every indication that this will not be for long. The simple fact is that if we are going to adhere to our announced purpose of maintaining a 3,000,000-man army, and the current re-enlistment and rejection rates for the armed services are maintained, then the percentage of students deferred will probably have to be reduced from that contemplated in the Trytten Report.

Of longer term interest are the current discussions being held on the desirability of a National Service Act. Although this proposal seems attractive from the military point of view, many people feel that there are elements of weakness in such a scheme. It is suggested that if everybody in the country is going to be told what to do, then the natural tendency will be to do nothing until given specific orders to do something. The net effect will be to sap the initiative inherent in the democratic system. Opponents of a National Service Act feel that it is important to retain the present Selective Service system with its local boards, since local determination is essential to the democratic process. However, the inability of these boards to judge the war effort must be corrected. One way of achieving this is through the preparation of a Roster, by some competent agency such as the NSRB, which will enable the local board to judge whether a particular individual is really engaged in a critical occupation and is not just claiming to be important to the war effort. This is somewhat similar to the Reserved Occupations which the British used in the last war. As the scale of our military preparations increases, some decisions will have to be made on these matters. At the moment it appears that the opponents of the National Service Act are in the ascendancy.

Basic Research and Mobilization. The impact of expansion of the military establishment on higher education, including research, was the subject of concern in the Conference on Higher Education in the National Service convened in Washington Oct. 6-7, under the auspices of the American Council on Education.

Among the conclusions embodied in their preliminary report were several of particular interest to scientists. The Conference judged it "imperative that any program of priorities and allocations which may be established by the government include educational institutions at a sufficiently high priority level so that they may further effectively render essential services for national defense and public welfare." Recent National Production Authority

(Continued in column 2)

ATOMIC CONTROL

New U.S. Attitude? In a possibly significant statement about atomic control, President Truman proposed in his UN Day speech at Lake Success October 24 that the disarmament discussions in the UN deal jointly with atomic and conventional weapons. The President praised the work of each of the two present commissions, the UNAEC and the UN Commission on Conventional Armaments, even though they have not been successful in obtaining agreement among all the major powers. He suggested that their work might be "revitalized" if continued through a "new and consolidated Disarmament Commission." At the same time, the President insisted that any disarmament plan must (1) include all kinds of weapons, (2) be based on unanimous agreement, and (3) have safeguards which will insure the compliance of all nations and be adequate to give immediate warning of any threatened violation. The plan, he said, "must be founded on free and open interchange of information across national boundaries."

This policy appears to represent a partial change from that of the last 4 years, during which the US, hoping for speedy agreement, wanted atomic control discussed separately. The President's present proposal may be the first important change in the official American attitude towards atomic control since the Baruch proposals. If a Combined Disarmament Commission were established in the UN, the resumption of discussions in a slightly different setting would give hope that the participating nations might break away from the rigid attitudes which have resulted in deadlock.

Compromise Control Plan. The Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Federation of UN Associations last month in Geneva adopted a resolution favoring a compromise agreement to break the UN deadlock in atomic energy and general disarmament. The compromise would involve the concession from the majority of the principle of supra-national ownership of atomic resources; on the other hand, it would insist on the acceptance by the Russian-led bloc of "effective provision for continuous international supervision" to help insure against illicit activities. In regard to the time-table problem in atomic disarmament, the Assembly urged that the majority agree to a prohibition of atomic weapons to come into force concurrently with the establishment of the inspection-control system.

The basis for the resolution, which was sent on to the UNAEC, is a report presented at the Plenary Assembly by the Association group from Great Britain and Northern Ireland. According to the report, such a compromise would cover the maximum possible area of agreement with Russia, which has emphatically refused to consider international ownership of facilities inside the USSR. Though not furnishing maximal security, the arrangement, it was pointed out, would at least provide warnings of evasions, and it could be a first step toward agreements in wider areas and expanded development of peaceful applications of atomic energy.

Research & Mobilization (cont. from column 1).

regulations giving priority to military and AEC activities in obtaining scientific equipment have already started a squeeze on civilian and governmental non-defense scientific programs.

The Conference asserted that "Basic research in all fields of knowledge should continue unabated and if possible be increased in scale." It foresaw, however, that "Universities must, in all probability, undertake an increasing amount of applied research of military interest." It warned, nevertheless, that "every effort should be made to minimize the dangers of an excessive diversion of activity from basic to applied research." It urgently recommended "a declaration of policy affirming the importance of continued basic research in the national interest." In connection with this, it believed that "the National Science Foundation should be placed into effective operation as rapidly as possible."

OATHS and ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Loyalty in California. In "The Year of the Oath" (Doubleday & Co., New York, 1950; 156 pp., \$2.00), George R. Stewart and a group of unnamed collaborators tell the story of the battle over loyalty oaths between the Regents and the faculty of the University of California. In many ways it is a sad and bitter tale. It is the shocking story of fear infecting a great University. The authors note that they organized "for the writing of this book as the French organized their Resistance during the years of the Nazis, with radiating lines of responsibility and with no one knowing all the others who were involved." They remark that if they "are sought out and disciplined, or if retaliation is visited upon them in subtler ways, that in itself will be proof that Academic Freedom no longer exists in the University of California."

It is the tragic story of the academic mind seeking to adjust to a very unacademic world. Case histories are offered of individual professors groping their way between the comfortable and the right, troubled by doubts and guilt-ridden consciences, grinding down their principles against hard personal, professional, and social pressures.

It is the continued turbulent story of the state of California where the "lawyer-executive-banker complex," which so frequently dominates Boards of Regents, is linked with some of the most ruthless elements in the population. Regent L. M. Giannini, president of the Bank of America and scion of the long-dominant financial family of California, remarked during a climactic session of the Board on April 21: "I want to organize 20th-century vigilantes, who will unearth Communists and Communism in all their sordid aspects, and I will, if necessary."

It is the story of cold-war America and the corrosive effect on academic freedom of an atmosphere thick with suspicion and distrust, and loud with charges and countercharges. Above all, it is an instructive story, one which no American and particularly no professional can afford to ignore.

Reviewing the chronology of the struggle to April 21, 1950, the authors recognize four phases. During the first (Jan. to May, 1949) President Sproul, acting on the advice of the University's legislative representative, developed and proposed an oath for the faculty to the Regents and gained their unanimous agreement. During the second (June 1949 to Jan. 1950), the faculty (and non-faculty employees whose activities are regrettably omitted from consideration) reacted strongly but failed in its effort to find a formula which would combine a demonstration of the anti-Communist sentiment generally held by the faculty with a strong defense of academic freedom. This was a period of considerable marching and counter-marching, on which the opposition Regents capitalized, but on the whole it was a period of faculty strength since, during it, the faculty remained largely united against any form of oath.

During the third period, the application of stern economic pressure succeeded in fragmenting the faculty front as weaker segments took refuge in various degrees of compromise. On Feb. 24, after fruitless negotiations between faculty and Regents had been broken off by action of the latter, the "sign-or-get-out ultimatum" was issued after a 12 - 6 vote of the Regents. During March, by mail poll, the faculty voted heavily in favor of the Regents' anti-Communist employment policy and in favor of having it included and attested to in their annual contracts. Despite this faculty retreat on principle, on March 31 the Regents refused by a 10 - 10 tie vote to rescind their previous ultimatum, thus pressing for a complete rout of the faltering faculty.

The fourth period, Mar. 31 - Apr. 21, 1950, is labelled by the authors "The Climax." This is the period of development of the "compromise," involving rescission of requirement of the oath, but transfer of its essentials to the annual contract. Those who refused to accept this change of form were to have a hearing before the Faculty Committee on Privilege and Tenure. In light of events occurring later than the coverage of the book, this might better be labelled "Baiting the Trap." For at its August meeting the Regents, by a 12 - 10 reversal of a 10 - 9 vote in July, dismissed all those who failed to accept the contract provision whether or not they had been cleared by the Privilege and Tenure Committee. Not one of those dismissed was charged with being a Communist, or being in any way disloyal. As a matter of fact, at no point in the long controversy has a single member of the regular UC faculty been charged by the Regents with anything remotely resembling disloyalty.

Recent events suggest that the conflict now has entered a

fifth phase. Faced with clear proof that compromise doesn't pay (Stewart quotes the editor of the East Bay Labor Journal, April 7, 1950 as advising "you academic boys and girls of the faculty" to "hang tough" and "compromise when hell freezes over when you're dealing with [Regent] Neylan's kind"), the faculty appears to be once again moving toward a firmer course. On Sept. 26 the Northern Section of the Senate, sparked by its younger members and following the leadership of one of its oldest -- Ex-Provost and Prof.-emeritus Deutsch -- roundly condemned the action of a "bare majority" of the Regents, saying that it had "grossly violated its own resolution of April 21," "arbitrarily dismissed members of the faculty despite the fact that not one of them is being charged with being a Communist," "broken faith with the Senate," "revoked appointments lawfully made by the Board," and violated the principle of tenure, an absolute essential condition in a free university." In further expression of its displeasure and defiance, the Senate approved a plan for faculty financing of support for the dismissed colleagues, and instructed its Committee on Privilege and Tenure to review the 5 cases on which they had earlier made no findings because of refusal of the persons involved to testify. These 5 were subsequently dismissed by recommendation of the President to the Board of Regents. The Senate now, however, expresses the hope that "these persons may be fully cleared of all imputation of disloyalty and honorably restored to the enjoyment of their respective positions."

Support for the California faculty meanwhile has been crystallizing in the academic community at large. Nearly 100 favorable communications, some carrying as many as 400 signatures, have been received by the faculty action committees. Included are messages from faculties of Swarthmore, Princeton, Harvard, Oberlin, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, NYU, Rutgers, and the Institute for Advanced Study. The American Psychological Association has blacklisted the University, the American Mathematical Association has urged the President and the Regents to reverse their actions. The entire situation is being investigated by the American Association of University Professors. It is broadly recognized that the situation at California is a focal struggle in which the verdict to date cannot be allowed to stand if academic freedom is not to be weakened beneath every ivy-covered tower.

Very recently the already complicated situation has been further complicated by passage of a general loyalty oath for all California state employees. It has been ruled by the California Attorney-General that this new oath also is applicable to the University faculty. As this is written it is not clear how this development will influence faculty and the Regents' attitudes. In any event, this tragic story is not yet at an end. "The Year of the Oath" provides welcome insight into what may have been only the early stages of a crucial fight to keep the effects of the cold war from chilling the heart of academic liberty.

Spitzer Loses Passport. Dr. Ralph Spitzer, the chemist who lost his position at Oregon State College two years ago in a dispute over his attitude toward Lysenkoism, found himself in new difficulties last month. According to the very brief press reports; Spitzer's passport was revoked in Holland after he had attended an international student meeting in Prague. He was described as referring in a speech to loss of scientific freedom in the U.S. In a letter to the N.Y. Times (Oct. 5) after his return to this country, Spitzer charged that upon instruction from State Department representatives he "was seized by the Dutch police and placed in solitary confinement in the Rotterdam jail." After 7 days of incarceration without access to legal counsel, he says that he was placed forcibly on a U.S.-bound ship by Dutch police. Had no point was he given explanation for his treatment. Since he had been abroad in connection with studies in the history of science -- he had read a paper on Newton at the 6th International History of Science Congress at Amsterdam and had planned to proceed to England to continue work on this subject -- Spitzer is protesting his treatment to the American and Dutch governments "both as an individual whose right to travel and study has been infringed, and as a scientist concerned at a serious attack on international cultural interchange."

YOU AND THE ATOMIC BOMB is the title of the New York State Civil Defense Commission's Public Pamphlet #1. A small pocket-size pamphlet prepared jointly by the Commission and LIFE magazine, it gives a set of instructions on what to do in case of an atomic attack. It is shown that effective measures taken immediately should possibly cut deaths and casualties resulting from an attack in half. Single copies can be obtained from LIFE, 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N.Y., for 10¢.

ATOMIC BULL SESSION

FAS Chairman Reports on American-British Meeting. Several members of the FAS had the privilege of participating last month in an informal discussion with representatives of the British Atomic Scientists Association in Oxford, England. The Atomic Scientists Association, like the FAS, was formed by alumni of the Manhattan Project at the end of the war and has carried on a program similar to ours in the United Kingdom. This spring their president, Prof. R. E. Peierls, proposed a joint meeting. Fortunately, it turned out that a number of members of the FAS were to be in England this fall and the meeting was arranged.

It was not anticipated that anything spectacular would be accomplished by this meeting and it was felt that a free exchange of ideas could best be achieved if the discussions were informal and off-the-record. So no formal notes were taken and only a sketchy report can be made. Yet, in spite of the pre-conference caution, I believe that all participants came away convinced that this was a good introduction to closer cooperation in the future. In a discouraging period of history, it is encouraging to know that there are others who share your hopes and will keep on doing their part. Although two full days were taken up in discussion while sitting on hard seats in cold, very old Brasenose College, there was much more we would have liked to say.

Since world control of atomic energy has been of primary concern to both our groups, the first subject considered was the status of control negotiations in the UN. It was felt that political considerations stood in the way of agreement at present and that it was not worthwhile to discuss the technical aspects or to try to stimulate further discussions in the UNAEC. While it once seemed hopeful to try to reach agreement on atomic control first, it now seems unrealistic to consider this problem except in relation to others such as general disarmament. This led naturally into discussion of the political problems. It was felt that contact between East and West only on the diplomatic level was not very promising. If only the "iron curtain" could be penetrated, then perhaps it would be possible to build an area of understanding among the people themselves. It was tentatively suggested, by an American, that the U.S. should try to encourage exchange of students by offering scholarships to students from behind the iron curtain. If such a thing were possible, it seemed that it would be a useful step. On rare occasions Russian scientists have visited England and a better understanding on both sides appeared to be gained. Although the Oxford meeting occurred before the McCarran bill was passed, American policy in excluding visitors suspected of Communist sympathy came in for considerable criticism. Such exclusion, it was felt, amounts to building an iron curtain on our side which is just as dangerous to us as is the Russian one. In the great middle area between the U.S. and the USSR, our curtain is a great discouragement to those who have struggled for freedom. The iron curtain can certainly not be removed by erecting another in series with it. As scientists, we have to continue to stress the need for international cooperation and a more rational approach to this problem. There was some discussion of the military significance of technical and scientific secrets, but no one felt that these would be seriously threatened by a policy of greater openness.

Prof. Niels Bohr's open letter to the UN (see FAS Newsletter A-822, July 19, 1950), which was circulated by both organizations, lays great stress on the importance of "openness" as a necessary condition for stable peace. All concurred in the philosophy expressed in the letter and felt it should receive continued study by our members. It was felt, however, that a policy of "openness," if adopted by the West solely for propaganda purposes, would do more harm than good. If adopted as a goal, toward which policy is continually directed (especially if real steps could be taken, such as that mentioned above, as evidence of our belief in this goal), this concept holds great promise.

In a recent issue of the Atomic Scientists News, Professor Peierls discussed the moral problems involved in the use of atomic weapons: if one grants that fighting may be necessary, then the object of war is to win -- but without unnecessary destruction of life or property. Atomic weapons are so destructive and so relatively easy to use that the possibility of excessive (and so, immoral) destruction must be a matter of primary concern. This led to a discussion of the military importance of atomic weapons and agreement that the experience of the last war had shown area bombing to be brutally destructive but not militarily useful. However repulsive it may be to contemplate another war, it was felt

that it is necessary to do so. Military preparations are being made. How they are made not only will determine their effectiveness if used, but also may affect the possibility that war can be avoided. Although no solutions to these problems were found at the meeting, it was felt that because many scientists are in a position to advise the defense agencies, the need for responsible thinking on their part is doubly important.

The Stockholm Peace Appeal was judged a very effective piece of propaganda abroad. We certainly favor effective control of atomic weapons but hardly see the object in signing the Appeal when all the UN is agreed on the importance of such control. The question is "how," and the Stockholm Appeal is no help on that. Each participant could think of logical objections to signing the appeal but these were no answer to an effect which is fundamentally psychological. Our position is difficult because Communists cannot see why we should refuse to sign if we are in general agreement, and the average non-American is both afraid of the bomb and convinced that it is the responsibility of the U.S. to avoid its use. There seems to be little that our groups can do in this regard.

The meeting closed with plans for closer cooperation in the future. It is hoped that an opportunity will arise to hold a similar meeting next year. It would be profitable to have a greater exchange of letters and literature. The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists is widely read in England and FAS members would enjoy reading the Atomic Scientists News (published by the British Atomic Scientists Association), which is something of a cross between our Newsletter and the Bulletin. (Associate Membership includes annual subscription to the Atomic Scientists News; £1, 1s; 7 Victoria Street, London, S.W. 1, England.)

The list of participants in the joint meeting follows (asterisk means one day, only): For the British ASA -- Prof. R. E. Peierls; Dr. J. L. Michiels, Dr. Kathleen Lonsdale; Prof. N. F. Mott*; Prof. H. W. B. Skinner*; Sir G. P. Thomson. For the FAS -- Mr. W. A. Higinbotham; Prof. A. Roberts; Prof. S. K. Allison*; Dr. D. L. Hill; Dr. Carson Mark; Dr. George Placzek; Dr. M. Shapiro. Dr. L. Kowarski of France also attended.

The informal character of these discussions should be emphasized again. No actions were taken and it is only possible to describe the direction of thinking as it appeared to one participant.

-- W. A. Higinbotham

Phoenix Project. In the most ambitious post-war study of the atom and its vast implications for peace, the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor is seeking \$6,500,000 from its alumni and friends to finance its Michigan Memorial-Phoenix Project. Not only will the project conduct new studies in atomic, molecular, and cellular processes, but it will investigate the social, economic, and cultural changes that will occur in the atomic age -- in fact all fourteen University schools, colleges, and related institutes will take part in the Project. By reason of this broad approach, the University hopes to serve as a central clearing house for information concerning all research developments in the atomic age and provide a common meeting ground for scholars in widely separated fields.

Membership in the Federation of American Scientists, a national society founded in 1946, is open to scientists and a limited number of interested laymen concerned with the impact of science on national and world affairs. Organization policy, determined by the annually elected Council, is carried out by the Executive Committee and a Secretariat in Washington. Non-member subscription to the FAS Newsletter is \$2.00 a year (about 10 issues). Applications for membership, or subscriptions to the Newsletter, may be sent to the Washington office.

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION or SUBSCRIPTION

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

Highest Degree Received _____ Institution _____ Major Field _____

Present Position _____

Annual Dues for Members-at-Large:

Regular Member* \$5 & \$3; Supporting \$10; Patron \$25
*Regular members with more than \$2500 annual income pay \$5.

SECURITY, LOYALTY, AND SCIENCE, by Walter Gellhorn; Cornell University Press, 1950; 300 pp., \$3.00.

This is a good book, tempered, rational, well-written. It is, furthermore, the sort of discussion which is much needed in this troubled year of our Lord, 1950. Mr. Gellhorn probes behind sentiment and hysteria toward a true evaluation of the results of government security and loyalty programs, particularly as they regard scientists and their work, although he also considers President Truman's Loyalty Order of 1947 affecting all government employees. Sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, Gellhorn, by documentation and ratiocination, arrives at his unprejudiced conclusions which are, in general, unflattering to the programs.

It will not come as a surprise to many scientists to discover that science and secrecy are poor mixers. "Classified" work leads to duplication of effort, to "a new class of scientists -- inbred and aloof," to poor teaching, mediocre work. Secrecy is often a happy shield for inaccurate or sloppy work, cosily protected from outside criticism. Loyalty checks tend to sift out the unorthodox thinker, who by challenging the complacently accepted, sometimes makes the best kind of scientist. And the loyalty investigations are often biased and even erroneous -- out of the first 7,667 field investigations conducted under the Loyalty Order, "494 were discontinued because the derogatory information appearing in the files proved to have related to someone else" -- an unhappy thought for the day for all Smiths, Whites, and Wilsons. The net result is mediocrity -- safe and sure and not subject to Congressional reproach -- at the expense of progress and vigor and even of liberty.

Mr. Gellhorn recognizes, of course, that controls are essential in those fields where security is a genuine issue. He would like to see the emphasis placed upon "security" rather than "loyalty." His program in this respect and his advice upon procedures as a legal authority seem very sound and very sane. It is to be hoped that "Security, Loyalty, and Science" falls into the hands of those legislators and politicians who, to combat the evils of authoritarianism abroad, are enthusiastic advocates of authoritarianism at home.

-- Jane Wilson

[Ed. Note: Our reviewer's hope was all too quickly realized, for Prof. Gellhorn's book was included in Sen. McCarthy's latest study (see next column) on the actions and habits of scientists. McCarthy regards the book as confirming all his previous fears about Communist infiltration of the scientific fraternity in the face of incredible naivete on the part of the leaders of American science. He dismisses Prof. Gellhorn as "a well-known enemy of the House Committee on Un-American Activities."]

AEC at Full Strength. With the swearing-in of Dr. Thomas Keith Glennan as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, a full team is now able to function for the first time since David Lilienthal's resignation in February of this year. The Commission now comprises Gordon Dean (lawyer), Henry DeWolf Smyth (physicist), Sumner Pike (businessman), Thomas Murray (engineer and financier), T. K. Glennan (businessman, engineer, and educator).

Federation of American Scientists
1749 L Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

50 - 9

McCarthy Researches on Science. Somewhat overshadowed by Korea during the past 3 months, Sen. Joe McCarthy apparently used his spare time to good advantage learning about science and scientists. His studies (Congressional Record, Oct. 20, 1950) led to the well-publicized conclusion that "the ranks of American scientists have been infiltrated to an alarming degree by the Communist enemies of the United States."

Savant McCarthy's methods of demonstration are by now well-known. They are old in the history of demagoguery, and here wielded by a master. The half-truth, guilt by association, the non-sequitur, asserting the plausible as proven, all are blended so skillfully that the most bizarre statements seem credible. Well-known scientific names take on a sinister sound; the AAAS emerges as an "unorganized, apathetic, and indifferent" group dominated by a "small clique" of Communist fellow-travelers. The FAS is casually characterized as "an organization heavily infiltrated with Communist fellow-travelers." A distinguished scientist is dismissed as an "utter fool" and "political ignoramus" who would do better to "stick to his heavy water and let heavy politics alone." Dark suspicion is cast on individuals because they have criticized the FBI, or the Un-American Activities Committee, or have favorably reviewed a book allegedly pro-Soviet in orientation. Thus the entire scientific community is portrayed as a cesspool of intrigue and espionage which would be "well-advised" to cleanse itself of Communist influence within its ranks.

This is a fantastic picture, difficult to take seriously. But it would be a mistake to minimize the potential danger of McCarthy's attack. Although aimed specifically at the AEC and its clearance procedures, thus supplementing Hickenlooper, it is also part of a general anti-intellectual offensive. On the scientific front, McCarthy appears to regard it as time to move the artillery barrage back from the outposts to the main fortifications -- from isolated individuals to scientific leaders and key organizations. The scientific community may be "well-advised" by McCarthy to gird itself for a major engagement.

AEC Fellowship Awards. The award of 148 predoctoral fellowships for the 1950-51 academic year under the AEC regional fellowship program was announced Sept. 30 by the AEC, after scrutiny by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, investigation by the FBI, and clearance by the AEC.

Of the 148, 37 are for work in the northeast, 10 in the southeast, 71 in the midwest, and 30 in the west. 121 are in the physical sciences, and 27 in the biological sciences. This may be compared with 121 and 56, respectively, for the 1949 awards.

The names of the participants in the post-doctoral fellowship program will be announced when the security investigations and clearances have been completed.

One fellowship holder, Barbara J. Bachmann, of the Hopkins Marine Station, Pacific Grove, Calif., resigned her fellowship (Science, Sept. 29, 1950), stating, "...I wish this resignation to be recorded as the protest of one student against a ruling that I believe to be directed against the freedom of the individual scientist and the interest of our society as a whole."

<p>Sec. 34.66, P. L. & R. U. S. POSTAGE PAID WASHINGTON, D.C. PERMIT NO. 9124</p>

Postmaster: If addressee has moved and new address is known, please forward and advise of new address on Form 3547. If new address unknown, return to sender. Postage for these services guaranteed.