

addressed by his highest title. For example, the president of a university who once was a professor and who also had been granted a Ph.D. degree would be addressed in Germany as "Herr President," and if it was needful to repeat all of his titles, they would appear as "Herr President Professor Doctor." Discerning persons notice the impropriety of addressing a given individual as "Doctor" instead of "Professor" if he is entitled to both titles—provided, of course, there is intent to follow the German system.

The English title of Mister depends on matters nonacademic.

In summary, the problems that you pose might be answered in one way if the German system were followed and in another way if the British system were followed. It seems to me that there is no American system. If there is an American system, perhaps someone like you who has given thought to the matter ought to outline it. Those of us who are teachers might find it useful to have a recommended system in order to teach students in American universities how to avoid unintentional discourtesies.

E. RAYMOND HALL

*Museum of Natural History,  
University of Kansas, Lawrence*

## Loyalty Oath

Jack P. Hailman's letter regarding the loyalty oath [*Science* 133, 251 (27 Jan. 1961)] reawakens a grave concern regarding the growing tendency of Americans (not only scientists) to shrink from an opportunity to reaffirm love for, belief in, and loyalty to their country. This tendency is approaching a stage of neurosis, or negative thinking, in which a loyalty oath is regarded as being as surely preliminary to adoption of the cloak of the Fifth Amendment as a Bach toccata is indicative of an impending fugue. Such concern was in no way allayed by the eloquent appeal of Bentley Glass on behalf of the resolution, adopted by the AAAS Council at the Chicago meeting in 1959, recommending elimination of this requirement for the grant of National Science Foundation fellowships.

I would suggest to Hailman that he might ponder whether a President-elect of the United States should feel, concerning the not dissimilar oath he is required to take at his inauguration, "How unnecessary!" It seems to me that, if one is loyal to his country, taking such an oath is the least undertaking he can make, and rather than regard it as an insult, he might better be willing to take the oath at every available opportunity.

On moral grounds it can be ques-





# Presenting

## The WORLD'S FIRST and ONLY DISPOSABLE PLASTIC MOUSE \* CAGES

**Will comfortably hold  
up to 6 mice**  
... each cage approximately  
11" L. x 8 3/4" W. x 5" H.

**Tested and proved in  
extensive laboratory tests**

A new disposable mouse cage that does away with disagreeable sterilizing! Combines a nickel-plated steel top with a plastic, escape-proof disposable cage bottom. Constructed of a tough, new plastic which is inert and non-allergic. Now, priced so low that you use the cage bottom just once—then destroy! In fact, priced less than it costs to clean and maintain standard type cages. Cages are transparent for continuous observation and suspended on cardboard supports for stability and free air circulation. Top is fully ventilated to maintain ambient temperatures . . . entire cage structure is assured gnaw-proof. Bottoms are designed to nest for compact stacking in minimum space . . . permit storage close to experiment area.

**Order your SPECIAL TEST PACKAGE TODAY!  
Only \$19.75 each**

Sold only through these authorized distributors:

**ALOE SCIENTIFIC**  
**CANADIAN LABORATORY SUPPLIES, Ltd.**  
**CHICAGO APPARATUS CO.**  
**HARSHAW SCIENTIFIC**  
Division of The Harshaw Chemical Co.  
**SCIENTIFIC PRODUCTS**  
Division of American Hospital Supply Corp.  
**SCIENTIFIC SUPPLY CO.**  
Mail your order today!

**Components of the  
S.I.U. DISPOSABLE MOUSE CAGES**



Aluminum Food Hopper

Holds sufficient food for 5 to 6 adult mice for one week



Water Bottle



Rubber Stopper



Stainless Steel Tube



Nickel-plated Steel Top



Disposable Plastic Cage Bottom



Folding Support

Finger Grips

Observation Flap and Record Holder

tioned whether falsely subscribing to an oath can be regarded as an "insignificant offense," even in a comparative sense. And it matters little whether the oath is made in reference to the Bible, the Koran, or the Talmud. If one is a believer in the sanctity of oaths, as one would expect a believer in American ideals to be, there can be no crossing of the fingers, no seeking of special immunity for the field of science. Not to acknowledge the sanctity of oaths is to flirt with the moral dangers of agnosticism and with social beliefs inimical to the Western world.

Let us remember that disbursements of funds by the National Science Foun-

dation are largely disbursements of funds of all American citizens, who have an essential interest—too often disregarded, one might add—in the manner in which such funds are used. But the most publicized defections from the Western world are those of people with access to scientific knowledge which could be useful to unfriendly powers. Every citizen should reasonably require that his funds be disbursed in such a manner as to bring maximum benefit to his country. The loyalty oath is certainly a means of *trying* to ensure this. The average citizen might well feel that it should be required of the scientist above all, in

view of past happenings and of the scientific revolution which he is told he is witnessing.

If one were to require every person in the country who is to benefit from federally financed programs of any kind to take a loyalty oath—a course suggested by Hailman as being less objectionable—we would require it of every citizen from womb to tomb. That might indeed be desirable, but would it be practicable? In naturalization proceedings, for example, the courts normally absolve those of tender years from taking the loyalty oath. Perhaps it should be regarded as acknowledgment of maturity that graduate students are required to take the oath. They are, naturally, free to decide whether national funds available to them are worth a moral commitment.

One might echo President Kennedy's rhetoric, "Ask *not* what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country!" The need for good scientists is freely acknowledged, but "good" has many connotations. All of them are implied in this context.

I should not like to think that the requirement of a loyalty oath for National Science Foundation fellowships is, through individual decision or the counsel of others, depriving us of sound scientists. I cannot feel that the requirement is depriving us of *good* sound scientists.

I hope that, if time permits, Hailman will reconsider his decision and take the oath, which would not deprive him of any rights but which would, in some eyes at least, enhance his stature as a *good* sound American scientist.

A. J. HAWORTH

30 Glendale Drive,  
Glenbrook, Connecticut



## Gives reproducible results, bottle after bottle

Take one set of results you got with Du Pont Nitric Acid Reagent. You can change bottles, shipments or locality, and you'll reproduce the same results—time after time! That's because each bottle gets 113 separate analytical tests to keep it uniform for your use.

It's of uniformly high purity, too, exceeding American Chemical Society requirements. And you get the convenience of single-trip cartons, dripless sleeves, safety grips on 5-pint bottles and color-coded caps and labels.

Du Pont's family of reagents includes Nitric, Sulfuric, Hydrochloric and Glacial Acetic acids, and Ammonium Hydroxide. They're readily available all over the country. Ask your local laboratory supply house or write for list of suppliers. Industrial and Biochemicals Dept. N-2545S, Wilmington 98, Delaware.

BETTER THINGS FOR BETTER LIVING . . . THROUGH CHEMISTRY



## UNESCO Statements on Race

If there is anything less profitable than replying to a hostile reviewer [see *Science* 133, 873 (24 Mar. 1961)], it is to consume the valuable space of a journal devoted to more edifying matters. On one matter of fact, however, since it concerns others in addition to myself, may I beg the courtesy of a few words.

The first UNESCO Statement on Race was not, as your reviewer states, written largely by myself. It was written by the committee appointed to draft it. As *rapporteur* of the committee it fell to me to act as secretary. At the request of the committee I wrote the first draft, and after this was hammered into shape by the committee, I can by no stretch of the imagination conceive how I could be said to have been largely responsible for writing it. As for your re-