increase financial support for basic research in behavioral science; (iv) make available special facilities for behavioral science, including buildings and equipment; and (v) support centers devoted to foreign area studies."

Revised Apportionments on Fish and Game Restoration

Revised apportionments of federal aid funds to the states for restoration of fish and game have been announced by the Department of the Interior. The new apportionment is based on Treasury certifications of money available from excise taxes on certain sporting goods. Under the revisions the 48 States and Hawaii will receive $21,306,000 for fish and game restoration instead of the $25,130,000 previously announced. The revised figure for game restoration is $16,974,000 compared with the $19,130,000 allotted previously; the amount available for the restoration of fish is $4,332,000 instead of $6,000,000.

This money is distributed to the individual states and to Hawaii in accordance with formulas established by law and based upon license sales and land and water areas. Distribution is made on a reimbursable basis, with the states financing projects initially and being repaid $3 in federal aid money for each $4 expended, or a net expenditure of $1 state money and $3 from federal funds.

In addition to the afore-mentioned apportionments, Alaska is to receive $90,000 for game restoration and $75,000 for its sport fishery. Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands will each receive $12,000 for game restoration, and each will get $10,000 for fish restoration. These amounts are fixed by law rather than by formula.

Legislation also provides that no state can receive more than 5 percent of the total apportioned for game restoration, nor can it receive less than 0.5 percent of that amount. Limits for fish restoration apportionment are 5 percent maximum and 1 percent minimum.

Kolthoff Comments on Soviet Trip

I. M. Kolthoff, head of the analytical chemistry department of the University of Minnesota, has recently returned from the U.S.S.R., where he attended a symposium for scientists in his field and lectured at Moscow University. Some of his comments about the trip follow.

"When I arrived in Moscow December 1 it had been 12 years since my last visit to the Russian capital. The great official respect for scientists and the prestige of the Russian Academy of Sciences which were already quite evident in 1945 were made plain to me immediately again. At the airport, the reception committee expedited my passage through customs and immigration procedures with no fuss or red tape and no bother to me.

"I had been invited to Moscow to take part in a three-day symposium. . . . Other participants . . . included 18 scientists from the 'satellite' countries. . . . Harry Irving of Oxford University was the only other guest from a capitalist country.

"There were, in addition, three Chinese chemists present—two men and a woman. One of the men and the young lady had taken their Ph.D. degrees in the United States (University of Wisconsin, 1937, and University of Illinois, 1951). . . . The third Chinese chemist had won his Ph.D. at the University of Munich under the late Professor Hoenigschmidt, one of the world's experts on the determination of atomic weights.

"Although all three Chinese were avowed Communists and supporters of the Red Government in Peiping, the two American-educated chemists referred with affection to their stay in the United States. Indeed, throughout all the many talks and discussions which we had in Moscow, Irving and I never heard a disagreeable word about the United States and Britain.

"The Chinese trio spoke flawless English, and we conversed without inhibition. They admitted that their education system is not yet as advanced as Russia's; it is possible to get only a bachelor's degree in China. But they hope study for advanced degrees will become possible reasonably soon.

"I was impressed by the large number of Chinese studying for advanced degrees at Moscow University. This educational link between Russia and China is not without significance in world affairs, and I could not help regretting once again our government's policy which makes it impossible for us to play a part in training China's future scientific and educational leaders.

"The Chinese chemists invited me to visit them at home and proposed to have an official invitation extended to me on their return. I would have been happy to accept, but sadly had to admit that again in this respect State Department policy might stand in the way.

"This is too bad, for scientific visitors like myself are in a unique position to establish much-needed relations with countries like China. From scientific contacts frequently come exchanges of opinion on other matters.

"As to scientific research in the Soviet Union, we found that—as was true in 1945—most work is carried out in special institutes, which are under the auspices of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences and entirely separate from a university. Except for the fact that most of the advanced research workers also teach at a university (with extra pay), there is no direct relationship between a university and the institutes. . . . Emphasis is entirely on fundamental research, for which apparently unlimited funds are being made available.

"In 1945, I had noticed that practically none of the instruments and equipment was of Russian make. This time I was impressed, if not awed, by the fact that almost all the instruments for refined measurement are made in Russia. . . . .

"The number of research workers in chemistry is greater in Russia than in this country. The quality of their work varies from excellent and good to acceptable. Their papers and journals, in general, compare favorably with those in the Western World. . . . [But] the great advancements in pure and applied science are brought about by contributions of an original and fundamental nature. In this respect the Russians have not got the lead over the West as far as chemistry is concerned. But they definitely hold their own. . . .

"There is no reason for hysteria now. But we do need fully to recognize the fact that fundamental research is the source of applied research and that no nation can remain strong without leadership in basic research."

Grants, Fellowships, and Awards

Behavioral sciences. The most serious difficulty encountered by the Russell Sage Foundation in its work for more effective collaboration between the social sciences and the professional services is the scarcity of trained personnel. In order to help meet this shortage, the foundation offers postdoctoral residencies in operating agencies or professional schools for the purpose of providing qualified sociologists, social psychologists, and anthropologists with specialized training and experience relevant to professional practice. Award recipients must not be over 35 years of age and must definitely be interested in careers involving applications of behavioral science in a field of professional practice. For information, write to the Russell Sage Foundation, 505 Park Ave., New York 22, N.Y.

Biophysics. The Massachusetts General Hospital has established a biophysics training program designed to assist candidates holding doctorate degrees in mathematics, physics, or engineering to apply their knowledge to biological and medical problems. This program is supported by the National Institutes of Health and is presented with the co-