

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;<sup>1</sup> 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 language<sup>2</sup> 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. Mast<sup>1</sup> 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 sci-

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?<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> S. O. Mast, *SCIENCE*, 97: 465, 1943.

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