



Gladys M. Keener  
Executive Editor

**AAAS EDITORIAL BOARD**  
(Terms Expire June 30, 1951)

Howard A. Meyerhoff, **Chairman**  
William R. Amberson · Karl Lark-Horovitz  
Bentley Glass · Lorin J. Mullins  
Malcolm H. Soule  
F. A. Moulton, Advertising Representative

## Scientific Manpower

**T**HE debates, the formulation of plans, are about over. Now it is up to Congress what the nation will do about the training and utilization of scientific, technical, and engineering manpower.

M. H. Trytten's six advisory committees to Selective Service made two proposals designed to provide a continuing flow of trained men for either war or partial mobilization: (a) Those youths with the highest aptitude for college training, as determined by tests, should have their military service postponed until their training is over; (b) no effort should be made to direct what these young men should study, because no satisfactory determination can be made as to what will be essential to national defense five to ten years from now.

Directly opposed to those proposals was James B. Conant's idea that all eighteen-year-olds should be put into service for two years. That proposal is already dying of its own oversimplicity.

What is now emerging, and what Congress is likely to accept, is a compromise of the two plans. The final product will recognize both the cold hard facts on which the Trytten proposals were based and the political appeal of the Conant plan. That compromise has taken solid shape in the testimony of Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. This includes plans to continue some college deferments and to send some 50,000 draftees to college each year. Federal scholarships for qualified students needing them are also suggested. The National Securities Resources Board's Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee is coming out with a similar plan.

The essence of the compromise is that qualified men shall be sent back to college once they have been drafted. It is due to the work of Dr. Trytten and his committees that there is such a wide acceptance of the necessity for such a step. Most important, the unanimous report of the Thomas Committee dem-

onstrates that it has support from two proponents of all-out service who are members of the committee—Vannevar Bush and Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Carolina.

The second Trytten principle—that the student should be allowed to choose what he shall study—has also fallen by the wayside. But, once again, it is likely that, because of the Trytten report, the widest possible interpretation of what is "essential" will be made.

Pulling and hauling now will take place on two issues: (a) By what method shall these boys be returned to college? (b) Who shall decide what they will study? Former proponents of the Trytten plan will probably want qualified boys, furloughed immediately after induction, to go to colleges of their choice, and a civilian board to decide essential fields of training and see to it that they keep up in their marks. The other extreme is that the boys be members of military units established on college campuses, and that their lives and what they study be strictly regulated by the Defense Department.

It is expected that, either in the new draft law or in the hearings during which the law is written, the intent of Congress that provisions must be made for scientific, technical, and engineering training will be enunciated. Congress will also have to face the problem of utilization of scientific, technical, and engineering personnel already trained. Most plans—and there have been many—visualize compulsory registration of scientific manpower and machinery to place that manpower where it is needed, and to determine how far down in the educational scale such registration should go, and whether placement power should be restricted to the needs of the military or spread over our whole economy. There are few clues as to the thinking of Congress, but the Gurney Bill, under which some doctors can be drafted, may set the precedent.

WADSWORTH LIKELY

*Science Service*  
Washington, D. C.

SCIENCE, founded in 1880, is published each Friday by the American Association for the Advancement of Science at the Business Press, 10 McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., January 13, 1948, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, embodied in Paragraph (d-2) Section 34.40 P. L. & R. of 1948.

All correspondence should be sent to SCIENCE, 1515 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington 5, D. C. The AAAS assumes no responsibility for the safety of manuscripts or for the opinions expressed by contributors. Four weeks'

notice is required for change of address, and an address stencil label from a recent issue must be furnished. Claims for a missing number will be allowed only if received within 60 days from date of issue.

Annual subscriptions, \$7.50; single copies, \$.25; foreign postage, outside the Pan-American Union, \$1.00; Canadian postage, \$.50. Special rates to members of the AAAS.

The AAAS also publishes THE SCIENTIFIC MONTHLY. Subscription rates on request.