

to it. We have already named most of the individuals who have testified or submitted statements in favor of the bill and described some of their characteristics as seen by the National Patent Council. In addition, according to this Council, some or all of them are also "predatory politicians," "members of Government bureaus, commissions and agencies seeking constantly to increase the scope of governmental controls of industry and of the lives of all citizens," "rubber stamps," misguided members of Congress" and "people who are greatly impressed by preambles and grandiose statements of purpose but have not the disposition, and perhaps not the ability, to anticipate the legal and economic consequences of the legislation." We are not sure into which of these categories the National Patent Council fits Senators Thomas (Utah), Kilgore, Fulbright, Magnuson, Smith (New Jersey), Cordon, and Saltonstall, who sponsored the Senate bill (S. 247), or Representatives Priest, Mills, Van Zandt, Wolverton, Harris, and Celler, who introduced bills in the House.

The Council states that the bill is opposed by (1) "a vast majority of the many thousands of usually inarticulate smaller manufacturers. . . ." (2) "[the late] Dr. Frank B. Jewett. . . ." (3) "Various outstanding scientists more closely identified with the scientific realities of industry. . . ." (4) "members of Congress fearful of the power of the proposed Science Foundation to invade social, economic and political realms heretofore regarded as necessary to reserve to the citizen in perpetuation of the principles of incentive economy under constitutional government. . . ." (5) "Congressmen fearful of any centralized organization empowered . . . 'to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries.' . . ." (6) ". . . members of the House who understand that the establishment of such a Foundation would substantially destroy the high utility of the National Academy of Sciences—and may in fact have that destruction as one of its purposes. . . ." (7) ". . . members of the House who feel they have reason to fear that the establishment of the Foundation would result in a systematic breaking down . . . of public resistance to a disastrous repetition in America of the British capitulation . . . to such demoralizing and economically degenerating indulgences in political bribery and loot as is present in socialized medicine, socialized industry and other symptoms of economic cannibalism and social disintegration in such painful evidence in Britain." (8) "Congressmen who fear that . . . the Foundation could be made perhaps a decisive influence towards submission of voters to political bribery in the form of tax-supported handouts made in the name of social justice." (9) ". . . members of Congress who have become weary and frightened because of mounting pressures for bunghole type financing. . . ." (10) "Con-

gressmen who . . . understand that organizations and individuals seeking new handouts by Government have no fury like that of those seeking to retain, and increase the rate of, handouts once begun. . . ." (11) "Congressmen who fear that to place in the hands of one man, called Director of the Foundation, such power (Sec. 5, H. R. 4846) as could make committees and other agencies of the Foundation largely advisory window dressing, is not in the public interest." (12) ". . . members of Congress who fear that provisions for the pooling of patents by the foundation (Sec. 12, H. R. 4846) soon would enable the Foundation to build patent pools capable of bludgeoning American Industry into acquiescence in arbitrary and confiscatory activities of the Foundation. . . ."

We were electrified by the interpretation placed on H. R. 4846 and its predecessors by the National Patent Council and we cannot help but wonder whether the proprietor of the National Patent Council has read any of those bills through. In any event, we suggest that anyone interested might do well to read H. R. 4846 in the light of the National Patent Council pamphlet and communicate his opinion to his Congressman.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
INTER-SOCIETY COMMITTEE

Washington, D. C.

Nucleotide Content of Bacteriophage Genetic Units

Inactivation and recombination experiments (Luria, S. E. and Dulbecco, R. *Genetics*, 1949, 34, 93) with T2 bacteriophage indicate that there are approximately 25 essential genetic units analogous to genes in this virus. These are generally assumed to be nucleoprotein in nature, although it has been pointed out (Zahler, S. A. Essay submitted to the Department of Bacteriology and Parasitology, University of Chicago, 1949) that at least some of them may consist of nucleic acid only, without associated proteins. Since the bulk of the evidence indicates that almost all of the phosphorus in the bacteriophage is contained in the nucleic acid, we may readily calculate the number of nucleotides in the genetic units.

Various analyses of T2 have shown that approximately 4.5% of the 2.5×10^{-10} g mass of the bacteriophage is phosphorus. This is equivalent to some 200,000 phosphorus atoms, and, therefore, about this number of nucleotides is present. If we accept 25 as the number of genes, then some of the genes, at least, contain not more than 8,000 nucleotides. This corresponds to a molecular weight, for the nucleic acid portion of the genes, of less than three million.

STANLEY A. ZAHLER

1547 35th Avenue North
St. Petersburg, Florida