

At the beginning of World War I and at the request of President Wilson the National Research Council was established to act as an advisory body in scientific matters pertaining to the national emergency.

It is to be emphasized that in the executive order this Research Council was "to survey the larger possibilities of science, to formulate comprehensive projects of research and to develop effective means of utilizing the scientific and technical resources of the country for dealing with these projects. To promote cooperation in research at home and abroad in order to secure concentration of effort, minimize duplication and stimulate progress; but in all cooperative undertakings to give encouragement to individual initiative as fundamentally important to the advancement of science."

With the inauguration of the New Deal administration under President Roosevelt a new kind of national emergency existed and a Science Advisory Board was called into being to implement the functions of the National Research Council and to advise the government relative to the administration of its scientific bureaus. It was noteworthy that most of the recommendations made by this advisory board as to specific questions raised by the government were acted upon favorably. However, additional recommendations initiated by this Science Advisory Board, though of far-reaching significance especially as concerning government bureaus of science, were not acted upon.

With the imminence of threatened hostilities the Science Advisory Board was rendered obsolete by the creation of a new organization, the National Defense Research Committee, for the complete organization and coordination of all scientific interests in the country in the interests of total war. This was done by executive order of President Roosevelt. This organization later became subordinated to a newly created Office of Scientific Research and Development directly responsible to the Chief Executive. What assurance is there that another newly created Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization may be anticipated to be more successful than the collection of scientific advisory boards that they have supplanted.

It is certainly to be hoped that Senate Bill 702 will be given serious consideration by the scientists and scientific societies of the country not alone for its national but for its international implications. Unless those most concerned in maintaining conditions for the future progress of science give heed, it is not unthinkable that such a bill could be passed through the ignorance or lack of action on the part of those supposedly most intelligent in evaluating it. One may be tolerant of centralization of science during a war emergency, but when projected into a peacetime economy such centralized power may not only be inefficient

but extravagant of public funds and may seriously jeopardize our international cooperation in science.

One is concerned in the preamble of this bill that so little recognition is given for the many well-known and effective scientific agencies that already foster and promote the welfare of science not only nationally but internationally, and that have deliberately made for the free exchange of ideas and the dissemination of information to the public. Every taxpayer should be made to understand the full implications of this bill before increasing the load of government expenditures by \$200,000,000 plus for the beginning of an organization that in the end could well defeat the very purpose for which the mobilization of science act was proposed.

Unfortunately, apparently, it is not possible with present methods of bookkeeping to evaluate the cooperative scientific research of individuals, institutions and private capital which has been placed unstintingly at the disposal of the National Defense Research Committee in the interests of the war; but it is obvious that the total dollar value of salaried research men and laboratory equipment which has been freely placed at the government's disposal would render the \$200,000,000 appropriation asked for in the Kilgore Bill, for the complete centralization of the science of the nation, wholly inadequate for the accomplishment of an equivalent effort.

The most significant new proposal of the Kilgore Bill not included in the executive order creating the National Research Council is "to make, amend, and rescind appropriate rules and regulations . . . which shall have the force and effect of law."

Moreover, it is to be observed that the proponents of this bill request Congress to pass a law that shall transfer their law-making power so far as it concerns the future of science to an unknown administrator without offering the benefit of knowledge of the kind of laws that such an administrator proposes to set up.

HARLAN T. STETSON

NEEDHAM, MASS.

THE OPPOSITION TO THE KILGORE BILL

THE two articles opposing the Kilgore Science Mobilization Bill which appear in *SCIENCE* for May 14, 1943, are certain to arouse widespread criticism. In particular, the article by the director of research of the Universal Oil Products Corporation, Dr. Gustav Egloff, who is also president of the American Institute of Chemists, contains statements so misleading as to require immediate correction. It is certainly not true that "over 95 per cent. of our scientific and technical manpower and facilities are now highly organized and coordinated to the single end of advancing the war effort." The statement that "practically every laboratory in the nation is in the service of the government"

is patently false. One has only to point to the thousands of biologists of all kinds, of geologists, mathematicians and other scientists whose work has no immediate relation to the war;¹ and to the many laboratories which are operating as usual without reference to either the war or the government. And is it true that "there are no secrets in the oil industry for the duration"?

Scientists should consider what the motives are which impel a representative of one of the great oil corporations to such gross exaggeration. Is it concern for the public good or for corporation profit? Dr. Egloff on other occasions has expressed his vigorous opposition to the Kilgore Bill in still less measured language² and it is evident that his fears are aroused by section 7—"Protection of the public interest in discoveries and developments financed by the United States"—which declares that property rights in discoveries made with public funds are to be vested in the public, and providing for just compensation to the discoverer. This seems to strike at the basis of private monopoly control based on exclusive private patent rights. If there are to be no secrets in the oil industry for the duration, it ought for the duration to withdraw its opposition to the legal recognition of such a lesser degree of pooling as is provided in the Kilgore Bill.

As for the opinion of the directors of the American Chemical Society that the bill would "confer totalitarian powers," one can only urge unbiased scientists to read the bill for themselves and to reach their own conclusions on this question.

L. C. DUNN

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

CLASS DISTINCTION AMONG AMERICAN MEN OF SCIENCE

IN a recent issue of *SCIENCE*, Professor S. O. Mast¹ objects to the designation of some one thousand "leading men of science" by a star in the forthcoming edition of the Biographical Directory of American Men of Science.

I object first to the manner of his objection, which seems more suited to a political squib than to a scientific periodical.

¹ Nicholas, J. S., 1942, "The War Problem of Manpower in Biology and Agriculture," *American Scientists*, Vol. 30, pp. 297-298, estimates that in the biological sciences alone exclusive of medicine, there are available about 67,000 scientists. The National Roster of Scientific and Professional Personnel contains the names of thousands more not involved in war work.

² Egloff, Gustav, 1943, "Scientific, Technical, Inventive and Industrial Mobilization for War," address at the meeting of American Institute of Chemists, Washington, D. C., March 13, 1943. Scientists should also consult the evidence concerning Dr. Egloff's statements and opinions which were attacked by Judge Arnold and published in "Hearing on S 702 United States Senate," part 1, March 30, 1943, especially pages 9 and 17.

³ S. O. Mast, *SCIENCE*, 97: 465, 1943.

entific periodical. He introduces the phrase "class distinction" with its logical denotation, but uses it to draw conclusions prejudiced by its political connotation.

I object secondly to the general principle which he puts forward in the name of "democracy," viz., "There should be no fixed differentiation into classes in any group of individuals without the sanction of that group." I set up against this the principle of jurisprudence, "No one should be judged in his own case." I therefore suggest that Professor Mast's suggestion that "the continuation of 'starring' of scientists in the directory be put to a vote of those involved" should not be followed—unless among those "involved" be included all who use the directory or have an interest in its use as well as those whose names are included in it.

I maintain that democracy implies a vote of the whole people, and that Professor Mast's thesis leads to a negation of democracy, namely, syndicalism (against which I am prejudiced).

L. H. THOMAS

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

IS CORRECT LABELLING UNDEMOCRATIC?¹

Mast, S. O., Ph.D. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. Professor of Zoology. In Charge General Physiology, Johns Hopkins University. (1).

SUCH is the description to be found in the Federation Year Book, and to those searching for simple data, it is an admirably succinct label. That such statements quite clearly put The Doctor Professor Chairman Mast of Johns Hopkins University into a most exclusive class, not only amidst some half-million of his local fellow beings, but also in the entire world, is true. In spite of much levity, Ph.D.'s are not yet as common as blackberries and men capable of holding such positions as the above are very scarce. Moreover, to say there is but one Johns Hopkins is a statement of fact.

Consequently, the recent attempt of Dr. Mast to view a matter of simple grading through the curiously wrought lens of a political belief seems rather needless. Indeed, as seen through other glasses in common use in a nearby city, this attempt to remove useful data from a label might be considered false and misleading!

Technical labels have nothing to do with democracy nor any other political pattern, as I feel sure that Professor Mast experimentally rediscovers each time he corrects his examination papers. Nor would it seem really in the interest of science to decrease in any way our efforts quantitatively to estimate everything

¹ "Class Distinction among American Men of Science," *SCIENCE*, 97: 2525, May 21, 1943.