

## Comments and Communications

### Two Aspects of the Loyalty Problem

The integrity of science and scientific education in this country is seriously jeopardized, and can be maintained only if scientists generally and the National Research Council in particular are alerted to the dangers inherent in the requirement of clearance and "loyalty" oaths for research fellowships and nonsecret work. Actually the dangers are not confined to science, although they are most acute there. The principle stated by the Congressional interrogators of Dr. Smyth and others is that no one should be educated at public expense who may not be acceptable for government work by the terms of the Federal Loyalty Order—"who would not in the future be eligible to work for the Government in classified fields." This would apply to National Science Foundation fellowships and any other publicly supported grants. In view of the clearance difficulties of some of our most outstanding scientists, and the irresponsible interpretations recently given to routine FBI reports, this condition is manifestly generating fear and insecurity.

An oath unaccompanied by an FBI investigation may sound harmless—an oath of allegiance, as a safeguard against treason, is surely unexceptionable. But an oath covering "past and present membership in various organizations," *under penalty of perjury*, to determine the "subversive and reasonably potentially subversive," is quite another matter, and it is on this that some scientists have compromised. Our Atomic Energy Commission fellows have already been asked to take general and inclusive oaths, subject to interpretations which can only become clear as time goes on. An oath involving the beliefs of both the individual signer and the organizations (whatever "belief" may mean in this case) to which he may belong or which he supports (whatever *that* means), has been written into the National Science Foundation bill now before the House of Representatives. It would be folly to expect that these oaths would not be followed by some sort of investigation, and any attempted guarantee to the contrary would be ridiculous. Oaths of this kind open the possibilities of irresponsible accusations, and of legal procedures based not on acts but on opinions which for one reason or another may not be popular at the moment. The chain of associations is endless. Will the professor be deterred from making recommendations without investigating his student's views, since any difficulties will also involve him? Dare a student study with any nonconformist professor, however brilliant, since he may need simon-pure recommendations?

The words "subversive" and especially "potentially subversive" are variable terms; on the whole they are expanding, becoming more comprehensive, at the present period. According to Senator Hickenlooper, subversive

"probably means generally someone who believes in doing substantial harm to our form of government and to our institutions." One could agree unthinkingly, yet only a few years ago a National Science Foundation itself was regarded as an idea considerably to the left of center, and it took a brave scientist to stand up and defend publicly the public support of science. How about national health insurance, and public housing? According to many they will do substantial harm to our institutions, and even to our form of government. And one has only to *believe* in them.

It is a wholesome exercise to remind ourselves that there have been definitions of loyalty quite different from that in current vogue. According to the Connecticut Yankee (*italics* Mark Twain's):

You see my kind of loyalty was loyalty to one's country, not to its institutions or its office-holders. The country is the real thing, the substantial thing, the eternal thing; it is the thing to watch over, and care for, and be loyal to; institutions are extraneous, they are its mere clothing, and clothing can wear out, become ragged, cease to be comfortable, cease to protect the body from winter, disease and death. To be loyal to rags, to shout for rags, to worship rags, to die for rags—that is a loyalty of unreason, it is pure animal; it belongs to monarchy, was invented by monarchy; let monarchy keep it. I was from Connecticut, whose Constitution declares "that all political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their benefit; and that they have *at all times* an undeniable and indefeasible right to *alter their form of government* in such a manner as they may think expedient."

Under that gospel, the citizen who thinks he sees that the commonwealth's political clothes are worn out, and yet holds his peace and does not agitate for a new suit, is disloyal; he is a traitor. That he may be the only one who thinks he sees this decay, does not excuse him; it is his duty to agitate anyway, and it is the duty of the others to vote him down if they do not see the matter as he does.

Of course this is a very radical statement; one would not have to go nearly so far as to act in accord with it to be refused clearance for secret work. We are perhaps not in immediate danger of having Mark Twain barred from school libraries, but we are already afraid of having people take him, or the constitution of Connecticut, too seriously. And unless we resist completely this latest invasion of the personal beliefs of students and their teachers, we are inviting the kind of atmosphere which pervaded Germany in the thirties, stifling academic achievement generally and science in particular.

THEODOR ROSEBURY and MELBA PHILLIPS  
*American Association of Scientific Workers*  
*New York Branch*

The Scientists' Committee on Loyalty Problems has been studying the loyalty and security clearance procedures of different government agencies for some time.

While these procedures could be improved in many ways, the committee wishes to point out to scientists that they themselves, even under present procedures, can better the situation.

The following proposal aims at raising the level of the confidential reports on which clearance decisions are based. In most investigations, agents of the FBI obtain information from friends, neighbors, and colleagues of the person to be cleared, as well as from less direct sources. The results are collected in a confidential dossier in which the sources of information are often anonymous, or revealed only to a very limited number of officials. It is obvious that these unacknowledgeable statements can cause serious misunderstanding which cannot easily be clarified, especially in cases where the clearance status meets with difficulties.

It is, therefore, strongly recommended that all scientists adhere to the following rules whenever possible:

- (1) When giving information to loyalty and security investigators, state willingness to testify if necessary.
- (2) Prepare a signed, written statement of the information for the investigating agency.

SCIENTISTS' COMMITTEE ON LOYALTY PROBLEMS: *Lyman Spitzer, Jr.*, Chairman; *William A. Higinbotham*, Associate Chairman; *Arthur S. Wightman*, Secretary; *Donald E. Hamilton*, Treasurer; *David Bohm*, *Roy Britten*, *Robert R. Bush*, *Elmer G. Butler*, *Albert Einstein*, *Luther P. Eisenhart*, *Samuel A. Goudsmit*, *M. Stanley Livingston*, *Stuart Mudd*, *David Pines*, *Oswald Veblen*, *Irving Wolff*.

Princeton, New Jersey

### The Northern Limit of the Fauna of the African Equatorial Forest

While in the southern Sudan in 1948 with the U. S. Navy Medical Science Group (University of California African Expedition) I gathered material and information concerning the fauna of the forested mountain ranges of the Latuka country in the eastern part of Equatoria Province.

The Imatong Mountains (10,376 feet = 3163 meters) and Didinga Mountains (8935 feet = 2724 meters) are the highest elevations between the mountains of Kenya and Uganda and the highland of Ethiopia. Four species of mammals belonging to the forest fauna have been previously recorded from this area and can now be correctly identified, thus serving as index species for an appraisal of this fauna. They are (1) Black and White Colobus Monkey, *Colobus polykomos occidentalis* Rochebrune (syn. *dodingae* Matschie), (2) Blue Monkey, *Cercopithecus mitis stuhlmanni* Matschie (*otoleucus* Selater), (3) Bushbuck, *Tragelaphus scriptus delamerei* Pocock (*dodingae* Matschie, *locorinae* Matschie, *barkeri* (Millais)), (4) Blue Duiker (*Philantomba monticola aequatorialis* Matschie), (5) From descriptions received locally, although no specimens were obtained, it appears probable that the Black Mangabey (*Cercocebus albigena johnstoni* Lydekker) also occurs.

These forms are subspecifically identical with those occurring in the forests of Uganda and in the Ituri

forest. They indicate that the reduction of the continuous forest and the development of the forest islands in the East Nile area are of fairly recent origin. On the other hand the separation of the mountain forests of southern Ethiopia is more remote. The species of this forest fauna are subspecifically distinct from those in the mountains of the Latuka country.

ERNST SCHWARZ

U. S. Naval Medical School, Bethesda, Maryland

### A Statement of the Governing Board of the A.I.B.S.

For more than a decade, biological scientists and particularly geneticists and cytologists in the USSR have been attacked by so-called "Michurinists," led by T. D. Lysenko, now a high government official and a public figure. Lysenko and his followers have declared the principal attainments of genetics and cytology, including Mendel's laws, to be invalid. This has been done in a manner which shows clearly that Lysenko is either unfamiliar with, or else is willfully ignoring, the basic facts and the methods of investigation of the sciences which he presumes to negate. On the other hand, Lysenko and his adherents have claimed successful experiments with higher organisms demonstrating directed hereditary changes of a useful kind, by means of adaptive responses that later were inherited. Such phenomena would have been of great theoretical and practical value if confirmable. However, outside Lysenko's group in the USSR, such confirmation has proved impossible.

The necessity for clarifying the situation becomes all the greater because Russian spokesmen, such as I. I. Prezent and S. Kaftanov, quote from the works of Western geneticists in support of their views. This Communist party line has even penetrated in subtle ways into reputable weekly and daily journals in France, England, and the United States. The opinion is consequently spreading that modern genetic researches in the West support the official Communist views on heredity. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Authors quoted by the Russians have strongly denied the validity of drawing such conclusions from their studies. In no case has their work discredited or contradicted the firmly established validity of the gene. They resent having their papers cited as leading to such a discrediting, for this is a manifest reversal of their data and of the intent of their statements.

The opinions and claims of Lysenko and his followers have become a matter of especially serious concern to scientists everywhere because the government of the USSR has not only approved and supported the Lysenko group, but has also condemned and suppressed those biologists in the USSR who have disagreed with Lysenko and who have tried to continue their research in the fields of genetics, cytology, and related sciences. As reported in recent months by the world press, and published in the official newspapers of the USSR, the views of Lysenko have been endorsed by the government organs directing scientific research in that country—among them the