nual, San Francisco, Calif. (J. J. Harford, ARS, 500 Fifth Ave., New York 36.)

9–13. American Soc. of Mechanical Engineers, semiannual, San Francisco, Calif. (C. E. Davies, ASME, 29 W. 39 St., New York 18.)

10–12. American Nuclear Soc., 3rd annual, Pittsburgh, Pa. (W. W. Grigorieff, ANS, P.O. Box 963, Oak Ridge, Tenn.)

10–12. Canadian Soc. of Microbiologists, annual, London, Ont., Canada. (J. A. Carpenter, Dept. of Bacteriology, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.)

10–14. Molecular Structure and Spectroscopy Symp., Columbus, Ohio. H. H. Nielsen, Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Ohio State Univ., Columbus 10.)

10–14. Technical Writers' Institute, 5th annual, Troy, N. Y. (J. R. Gould, TWI, Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst., Troy.)

11–13. American Meteorological Soc., Monterey, Calif. (K. C. Spengler, AMS, 3 Joy St., Boston 8, Mass.)

11–15. Ionization Phenomena in Gases, 3rd internatl. conf., Venice, Italy. (U. Facchini, Laboratori CISE, Via Procaccini 1, Milan, Italy.)

12–15. Colloquium of College Physicists, 19th annual, Iowa City, Iowa. (J. A. Van Allen, Dept. of Physics, State Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City.)

16–20. American Soc. of Mammalogists, annual, Lawrence, Kansas. (B. P. Glass, Dept. of Zoology, Oklahoma A.&M. College, Stillwater.)

16–21. American Soc. for Testing Materials, Atlantic City, N.J. (R. J. Painter, ASTM, 1916 Race St., Philadelphia 3.)

17–19. American Neurological Assoc., Atlantic City, N.J. (C. Rupp 133 S. 36 St., Philadelphia 4, Pa.)

17–19. Astronomical Soc. of the Pacific, annual, Flagstaff, Ariz. (S. Einarsson, Univ. of California, Berkeley 4.)

17–19. Health Physics Soc., 3rd annual, Pittsburgh, Pa. (H. W. Patterson, Radiation Lab., Univ. of California, Berkeley.)

17–19. Military Electronics, national convention, Washington, D.C. (G. Rappaport, Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp., 701 Lamont St., NW, Washington 10.)

17–20. Carbon Conf., 3rd, Buffalo, N.Y. (Carbon Conf., Univ. of Buffalo, Buffalo.)

17–20. Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, natl. summer, Los Angeles, Calif. (S. P. Johnston, IAS, 2 E. 64 St., New York 21.)

17–21. American Soc. for Engineering Education, annual, Ithaca, N.Y. (W. L. Collins, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana.)

17–21. Association of Official Seed Analysts, annual, Baton Rouge, La. (L. C. Shenberger, Seed Lab., Dept. of Agricultural Chemistry, Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Ind.)

17–21. Canadian Medical Assoc., 90th annual, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. (CMA, 244 George St., Toronto, Ont., Canada.)

17–22. Coordination of Galactic Research, internatl. symp., Stockholm, Sweden. (P. T. Oosterhoff, University Observatory, Leiden, Netherlands.)

17–22. Internal Combustion Engine Cong., 4th internatl., Zurich, Switzerland. (C. C. M. Logan, British National Committee, 6 Grafton St., London, W.1.)

(See issue of 19 April for comprehensive list)

LETTERS

The editors take no responsibility for the content of the letters published in this section. Anonymous letters will not be considered. Letters intended for publication should be typewritten double-spaced and submitted in duplicate. A letter writer should indicate clearly whether or not his letter is submitted for publication. For additional information, see Science **124**, *249 (1956) and* **125**, *16 (4 Jan. 1957).*

Political Means

Since I am only on a leave of absence from the United States, I feel free to comment on the article concerning the resolutions of the AAAS [*Science* **125**, 280 (1957)]. I was particularly struck by the statements concerning the lack of attention which greeted the recommendations of the Radiation Committee of the National Academy of Sciences. I should think the answer would be obvious. Any group that wants to enter the political arena to obtain politically what it desires must use political means. If most AAAS members and most other scientists back the findings of the Radiation Committee, as I think they do, it does no good simply to issue reports and hope for the best.

I would recommend that, if we desire action based on the recommendations, we should lobby for it. The AAAS should bring into being a political arm, should set up a lobbying group in Washington, should see to it that its members constantly relay to the public, through meetings, talks, and propaganda, its views, and should badger the scientifically interested public to write their Congressmen and express their views.

We should not be ashamed of this activity; we scientists have as much right to try to impose our views on the public as do other interest-groups. Only in this way can we make sure that not only our own interests but what we think are the interests of the country can be forcefully brought to the attention of the legislators.

PHILIP SIEKEVITZ
Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, New York

Feedback

Referring to your editorial of 15 March, "Feedback," there is proposed the problem of applying the brakes to the inflationary competition for scientists and engineers without discriminating against the governmental employee. It is questionable whether this competition will contribute enough to inflation to counterbalance the effect the lack of competition will have on the problem of the shortage of engineers. Many young students are not entering

engineering or science because of the salary level, which does not yet compare favorably with that of other professions and trades attained after a comparable number of years of experience. It is also widely felt that the engineering shortage is a temporary one created by large federal armament spending. It would be wisest and in the best interests of the country to increase the salary level of all research and development engineers and scientists, including biological and medical scientists, to a level which is at least commensurate with the training required and which will at least offer a sufficient return on the investment to induce those promising students of a practical nature to enter research.

NORMAN RABBINER
116½ Twelfth Avenue,
Belmar, New Jersey

I enjoyed your editorial "Feedback" in the recent issue of *Science* until I ran against the last sentence in which you wish to "find some way to apply the brakes without discriminating against the governmental employee," with regard to increases in salaries for scientists in government and industry. Obviously, there should be some limit to the ceiling on salaries, but I do not see why we need any brakes applied yet. If we are to attract young men into science in our present society, the only feasible method is to make science financially attractive to them. This, in my opinion, has not yet happened. They can do better in medicine and far better in business administration. Until the scientist receives a salary comparable to what he might get in these two and other fields, we have not solved the problem. Hence, I feel that no effort should be made to "apply brakes" yet.

FRED L. WHIPPLE
Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D. C.

Scientists on Politicians, and the Obverse

J. Bronowski said: ". . . the decisions of state cannot be taken out of the context of science. . . .

"The fate of a nation may hang on an error of judgment here. Let me give you a slightly mischievous example. In 1945, the British Government published . . . a White Paper on the wartime development of atomic energy. Among the documents in this White Paper is the directive by which Mr. Winston Churchill . . . set up the project to make an atomic bomb. This directive begins with the words: 'Although personally I am quite content with the existing explosives. . . .'

"This bland phrase is a monument to a nonscientific education. . . . I do not much care for atomic bombs myself, but still less do I care to have them judged in phrases like Mr. Churchill's. In 1941, they might have weighed life and death between this country and Germany; and what brought down the scales was not the wisdom of statesmen, but the democratic tradition which caused Mr. Churchill to waive his own unwisdom.

"This example shows us succinctly what voters and statesmen do not know. I have called Mr. Churchill's astonishing phrase a monument to a nonscientific education. For it could have been written only by a man, an intelligent man, who simply does not understand how big a million is."

This remarkable series of statements was published once in Great Britain [*Advancement of Sci.* **12**, 301 (1955)] and once in *Science*, [**123**, 70 1956)] and was recently quoted in *Science* [**125**, 179 (1957)] by Dael Wolfle, who apparently takes them at face value

It is astonishing, and it is a prime example, but not of what the authors intended. Churchill's statement was obviously a bitter jest and nothing more. Doubtless, his knowledge of the devilish uses to which explosives can be put and his good judgment, rather than merely the "democratic tradition," "brought