

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

Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the Academy of Agricultural Sciences, and the Academy of Medicine. More serious still, geneticists, cytologists, and evolutionists as eminent in their fields and as well known to their colleagues all over the world as Dubinin, Schmalhausen, Zavadovsky, and others have been removed from their positions, deprived of their laboratories, or led to make shameful declarations of their supposed acceptance of Lysenko's view. Finally, the temper of this supposedly scientific controversy may be appreciated by the pronouncements of S. Kaftanov, Minister of Higher Education, to the effect that all anti-Lysenko doctrine must be systematically rooted out of the schools, universities, research institutes, and publishing houses.

It may be left to the judgment of scientists, friends of science, and all fair-minded people to arrive at their own conclusions regarding the propriety of governments and political parties not only deciding a supposedly scientific controversy in favor of one and against another theory, but also dismissing scientists and depriving them of the means of conducting their research, and too often of their lives, because of their adherence to a scientific theory accepted everywhere on this side of the iron curtain. As representatives of American scientific societies devoted to furtherance of research and study in genetics, we feel it our duty to state that the contention raised by Lysenko and his "Michurinists" against genetics does not represent a controversy of two opposing schools of scientific thought. It is in reality a conflict between politics and science. Today the condemned science happens to be genetics. Indeed, the conflict has already spread to other biological fields, and eminent physiologists, embryologists, microbiologists, and others are now being dismissed in the USSR. Tomorrow still other sciences may be proscribed.

The progress of science has always depended upon free inquiry. The inheritance of acquired characteristics, and other doctrines that the Russians now set forth as the official party line, have had their proponents in America; some nongeneticists still hold to these ancient opinions. Nevertheless, they are allowed to investigate or philosophize, and they have a hearing. In Russia, on the other hand, geneticists are being rooted out as dangerous, bourgeois, reactionary, idealist, fascist, regardless of their political views, simply because they, like geneticists everywhere else in the world, know and accept the facts of experimental breeding and microscopic observation which Russian politics has branded false. It is of the utmost importance for the preservation of free inquiry in that part of the world where it still exists that these facts be known and fully appreciated.

The Governing Board of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, an organization representing American societies in numerous fields of biology, is issuing the present statement after consultation with the executive committees of those societies in its organization which deal more particularly with the matters here at issue—namely, the Genetics Society of America and the American Society of Human Genetics. We would sum up our positions in the following propositions:

1. In our opinion the conclusions of Lysenko and his group regarding the inheritance of adaptive responses in higher organisms have no support in scientific fact.

2. Genetic researches definitely support the reality of the gene and the validity of Mendel's laws. They do not support the official Communist claim that Mendelian heredity is an illusion, and any attempts on the part of Russian proponents of the Lysenko doctrines to bolster their case by citations from the works or conclusions of Western scientists are gross distortions of the meaning and intent of these scientists.

3. We condemn the action of the Soviet government in presuming to banish a firmly established science from its schools, publishing houses, and research laboratories, and in persecuting scientists because their field of inquiry is distasteful to the government.

E. G. BUTLER

T. C. BYERLY

F. P. CULLINAN

W. O. FENN

R. E. CLELAND

*Executive Committee*

*Governing Board*

*American Institute of Biological Sciences*

### S. 1703 and the Antivivisectionists

Science will probably lose by default its present legislative battle against one of its most vocal and powerful enemies—the antivivisection cult.

Representatives from twenty-six national health and science groups, local hospitals, universities, lay groups, and governmental agencies met in Washington the second week of July to discuss the political future of Senate Bill 1703, medical science's first Congressional broadside against the antivivisectionists.

Specifically, the bill would enable District of Columbia scientific institutions to utilize a portion of the seven to ten thousand unclaimed and unwanted animals now annually destroyed in the District pound. The experimental use of these dogs which would otherwise be uselessly killed could speed research and teaching in the universities and government agencies of the nation's capital.

The bill applies to the District of Columbia only. Actually, however, because of its precedent-establishing nature, the legislation is of national importance.

A. C. Ivy, secretary-treasurer of the National Society for Medical Research, reported to the Washington meeting that a recent legislative conference revealed the bill would probably remain in committee because scientists and the friends of science have failed to express themselves on the matter. Dr. Ivy pointed out that members of the special Senate subcommittee to which the bill was referred are personally in favor of the bill, but that an organized flood of antivivisectionist mail has introduced political complications.

Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, the chairman of the subcommittee, has received the brunt of the antivivisectionist pressure. Although she recognizes the