SCIENCE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Board of Directors

CHAUNCEY D. LEAKE, Retiring President, Chairman THOMAS PARK, President PAUL M. GROSS, President Elect

DON K. PRICE HARRISON BROWN HENRY EYRING ALFRED S. ROMER H. BENTLEY GLASS WILLIAM W. RUBEY MARGARET MEAD ALAN T. WATERMAN PAUL A. SCHERER, Treasurer DAEL WOLFLE, Executive Officer

Editorial Board

KONRAD B. KRAUSKOPF H. BURR STEINBACH WILLIAM L. STRAUS, JR. EDWARD L. TATUM EDWIN M. LERNER PHILIP M. MORSE

Editorial Staff

DAEL WOLFLE Publisher

HANS NUSSBAUM Business Manager

GRAHAM DUSHANE Editor

JOSEPH TURNER

ROBERT V. ORM Managing Editor

ELLEN E. MURPHY, Assistant Editor

NANCY TEIMOURIAN, Assistant to the Editor

News: Howard Margolis, Daniel S. Green-BERG, PATRICIA D. PADDOCK

Book Reviews: SARAH S. DEES

Editorial Assistants: NANCY S. HAMILTON, OLIVER W. HEATWOLE, EDGAR C. RICH, JOHN E. RINGLE, CONRAD YUNG-KWAI

Staff Assistants: GENEVIEVE M. KIRBY, JEAN P. D.

Advertising Staff

EARL J. SCHERAGO, Director

BERNICE SCHWARTZ, Production Manager Sales: RICHARD L. CHARLES (New York, N.Y., PE 6-1858); C. RICHARD CALLIS (Old Bridge, N.J., CL 4-3680); HERBERT BURKLUND (Chicago, Ill., DE 7-4973); DILLENBECK-GALAVAN (Los Angeles, Calif., DU 5-3991)

SCIENCE, now combined with THE SCIENTIFIC MONTHLY, is published each Friday by the American Association for the Advancement of Science at National Publishing Company, Washington, D.C. SCIENCE is indexed in the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature.

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to SCIENCE, 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington 5, D.C. Manuscripts should be typed with double spacing and submitted in duplicate. The AAAS assumes no responsibility for the safety of manuscripts. Opinions expressed by authors are their own and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated. For detailed suggestions on the preparation of manuscripts, see Science 125, 16 (4 Jan. 1957).

Advertising correspondence should be addressed to SCIENCE, Room 1740, 11 West 42 St., New York 36, N.Y.

Change of address notification should be sent to 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington 5. D.C., 4 weeks in advance. Furnish an address label from a recent issue. Give both old and new addresses, including zone numbers.

Annual subscriptions: \$8.50; foreign postage, \$1.50; Canadian postage, 75¢. Single copies, 35¢. Cable address: Advancesci, Washington.

Copyright © 1961 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Cheers for West Ford Two

At its recent assembly in Berkeley, California, attended by some 1000 astronomers from all over the world, the International Astronomical Union passed a resolution urging openness of procedure and great caution in the conduct of experiments that might affect the observations of optical and radio astronomers. This was quite right, but there was a second resolution opposing immediate carrying out by the United States of its project West Ford, a plan to place temporarily in orbit about 75 pounds of fine copper filaments to serve as a reflector of radio signals. The second resolution offers, in passing, one cheer for this country's behavior in the matter, but, so it seems to us, the United States deserves two cheers at least.

The International Astronomical Union was at pains to make clear just how any government should proceed when conducting an experiment that, in effect, uses the earth as a laboratory. It states that the government should make public its plans and the calculations justifying those plans, so that all interested scientists will be in a position to evaluate the program. The government should also invite interested scientists throughout the world to participate in making observations. But this is very much what the United States has done. Articles by American scientists published in the April issue of The Astronomical Journal describe the project and invite the cooperation of interested

The union is also concerned that no further launchings of reflecting belts be undertaken until the effects of the first experiment have been analyzed by project scientists in cooperation with other scientists. But again the United States had announced plans along the lines subsequently recommended by the union. In stating these requirements, the union acknowledges the actions of the United States, and this constitutes the one cheer offered.

There seem to be no difficulties about the effects of West Ford on the kinds of astronomical observations now possible. Opposition by the union arises out of fear that the belt might remain indefinitely in orbit, and so interfere, at some future date, with methods of astronomical observation yet to be developed. West Ford scientists intend, however, to orbit the belt in such a way that in a year or two solar radiation pressure will bring it into the atmosphere where it will be destroyed. The union wants more public discussion of this matter, and it is here that the United States could be in a better position. The calculations on which the contention of short life is based, although involving nothing particularly abstruse or secret, have not been published.

Failure to publish this material is an oversight that can easily be corrected, and there is reason to believe that this is soon to be done. In evaluating American conduct, however, the basic point to remember is that if our policy had been to run the entire experiment secretly, detection of the belt, according to informed sources, would have been unlikely in the extreme. Lacking advance notice of the project, no one would have been the wiser. The present American approach contrasts favorably with our handling of project Argus, in which, in 1958, without public notice, several atom bombs were exploded at low altitudes to create temporary radiation belts. It also contrasts favorably with the general Soviet practice of announcing launchings as accomplished facts.

For comments on another kind of experimentation that has worldwide effects, it will be interesting to see, at the forthcoming Pugwashtype conference in Colorado on nuclear weapons control, what Russian scientists have to say to their American colleagues.—J.T.