self and Schnapper or between himself and the Fund.

The press coverage, like the decision to republish, by no means depended solely on the use of the Fund's name. An Associated Press editor points out that the general interest in reporting on right wing extremists was an important factor. Both *Time* and *Newsweek* had run long attacks on the extremists the previous week. But the apparent sponsorship of the Fund, of course, was also a factor in the decision to cover the story at all and in deciding how much space to give it.

The effect of the use of the name might reasonably seem to have been likely to give the impression that the Fund had sponsored the report, with the implication that its officials had looked into Ellsworth's qualifications as a political analyst, had found him well qualified, and had financed his report. Since, as a practical matter, a foundation normally has a good idea of what sort of conclusions its grantee is likely to reach, particularly on such a widely discussed subject as Ellsworth's, there was the further implication that the Fund found his views to be sound, or at least sufficiently sound to deserve serious consideration.

At least until the report was printed, all of these assumptions were wholly unwarranted, since, as noted, the Fund had in fact neither sponsored nor financed the report. In these circumstances, the Fund's responsibility for the report would appear to have been really no more than if it had been sent in by a complete stranger. But once the report had been published, and republished, using the Fund's name, with at least its tacit approval, it might seem that the Fund had chosen to take, or accept, responsibility for the report.

But the Fund's officials have not taken this view, and do not feel the use of the Fund's name carries the implications suggested above.

Robert Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago and head of the Fund, says the report is solely what its title says, a report to the Fund, with no implication of Fund approval or sponsorship. So unless the Fund changes its mind, it seeems that all anyone has to do who wishes to use the name of the Fund in this way, with whatever implications it may carry, is to subtitle his view "A Report to the Fund for the Republic," and remember to mail a copy before publication to the Fund for the Republic, Santa Barbara, Calif.—H.M.

Space Cooperation: Agreement at U.N. Leaves Out Some Key Points

From New York. The destructiveness of modern arms, and the long-standing antagonism of East and West, give special urgency to the exclusion of conflict in outer space. At the same time, the high cost of exploiting the peaceful uses of space, especially in communications and weather forecasting, makes cooperation economically desirable.

Of the two potentialities, military and peaceful, the former has little immediate significance, but in the long run it portends the greatest hazards. At present, space technology, despite its startling achievements, is rudimentary, and the United States and the Soviet Union are technologically incapable of clashing above the earth's atmosphere. But in not too many years, if present goals are achieved, the means will be developed to carry the present earthly tensions into the outer regions. Growing skills will make questions of celestial sovereignty a reality; orbiting launching platforms will be in existence, and these may be countered by missiles capable of destroying a target in space.

Against this background, considerable significance inevitably was attached to the Soviet Union's decision last week to end its 2-year boycott of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. It did this when it abandoned its insistence on a troika —East-West-neutral—division of the committee and endorsed a resolution calling for the committee to meet by 31 March. The resolution, like a glimpse of blue sky in a rainy spell, was happily regarded as a propitious sign, and the tenor of most news accounts was that it portended the start of East-West space cooperation. This view was generally based on the resolution's exclusion of space from claims of national sovereignty. A closer examination, however, reveals that by its omissions and cautious phrasings, the resolution reflects vast impediments to keeping the cold war out of space.

The resolution generally follows the space proposals offered by President Kennedy in his U.N. address last September, but significantly makes no reference to his proposal for "prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies." According to sources at the U.N., the United States did not raise this particular item during the week-long negotiations that produced the resolution, nor did the Soviet Union seek its inclusion. Japan and Egypt made an attempt to bring it up for discussion, but neither the U.S. nor the Soviet Union—which are the only nations that count in space matters—showed any interest in it.

The closest the resolution came to requiring cooperation that has significance for military space efforts is in its provision calling for "states launching objects into orbit or beyond to furnish information promptly . . . for purposes of registration of launchings . . ." and "to provide for the exchange of such information relating to outer space activities as Governments may supply on a voluntary basis. . . ."

The provision, of course, leaves open the question of what information is to be included in the registration. If it is simply that a vehicle has been launched into space, the registry would tell no more than can now be determined by radar surveillance. If it is to go beyond that, and provide information about thrust and mission, there is no reason to believe that, in the present state of cold war tensions, the U.S. would find disclosure any more welcome than the Soviets would. As this nation's Midas and Samos reconnaissance systems approach operational use, the Air Force has become noticeably reticent about their performance. The Soviets, for their part, have never owned up to a major space failure. The energy that they put into exploiting space for prestige purposes does not suggest that they will come forward and provide unflattering information about themselves. The registration provision also raises the question of inspection, which has been the stumbling block throughout East-West disarmament negotiations. If the registry is to provide more than the announcement that a vehicle went aloft, who is to verify whether the additional information is indeed truthful?

In terms of readily attainable goals, the most significant part of the resolution deals with the establishment of cooperative space efforts in communications and weather forecasting. Since the United States has already invited other nations to partake of its achievements in these areas, the foundation for cooperation has already been laid. If the Soviet Union chooses to remain aloof, as it has from past U.S. efforts to foster East-West space cooperation, it will find the United States far outdistancing it in the good will and propaganda benefits to be derived from providing the world with some peaceful dividends of the space race.

The Soviet decision to end its 2-year

boycott of the space committee was, of course, unaccompanied by any explanation and goes into the bulging file of mysterious Soviet policy changes; as usual, however, there is an abundance of plausible speculations. These include the theory that Soviet space scientists feel handicapped by enforced isolation from their Western counterparts and have prevailed upon their political leaders to open the way to some measure of cooperation; that the Soviet Union is now seeking to counteract the revulsion it elicited by breaking the nuclear test moratorium and defying U.N. pleas to call off its test series, especially the preannounced 50-megaton blast; that American reconnaissance satellites are reaching the stage of refinement where they are seriously eroding Soviet secrecy, and therefore the Soviets will soon have nothing to lose in letting the West in on some of their space activities; and finally, that in view of the overwhelming sentiment at the U.N. for reviving the committee, there was nothing to be lost in an appearance of cooperation. Whatever the reason, support of the resolution committed neither the Soviet Union nor the United States to anything they may regard as incompatible with their national interests. The U.N., it should be recalled, has repeatedly gone on record against nuclear testing.

Under U.N. procedure, the resolution goes from the 103-member political committee which adopted it to the General Assembly, where its approval is virtually assured. Once approved, it stands as a U.N. goal to be implemented under the space committee's guidance.

The protracted bargaining that preceded adoption of the resolution centered largely on a number of lesser powers which are still a good way from the space age. In reviving the committee, both the U.S. and the Soviet Union agreed that it should be enlarged from 24 to 28 members to reflect the growth of U.N. membership. Which nations to add then became the hard issue. The Soviets selected Ghana and Outer Mongolia, and the United States selected Sierra Leone and Chad. After the deal had been closed, however, Ghana expressed pleasure at the thoughtfulness of the Soviet Union, but said that it had no interest whatsoever in serving on the committee. The Soviets then named Morocco, which accepted.

South Africa, which has long cooperated with the United States in satellite tracking operations, protested that it was offended by the failure of the United States to put it up for membership. The United States privately replied it was offended by South Africa's racial policies.—D.S.G.

Is Soviet Society Classless? Classroom Poll Casts Doubt

What role does social class play in the assignment of educational opportunities in the Soviet Union's supposedly classless society?

The stock answer from Soviet officials is that it plays no role. Most Western observers, while not deprecating the Soviet Union's educational achievements, consider this answer to be something less than the whole truth. A bit of support for this doubt is to be found in an incident related by Congressman John Brademas (D.–Ind.), who recently returned from a brief visit to the Soviet Union. Brademas, a 34-year-old Rhodes Scholar, is a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. He made the trip to study several Soviet educational institutions.

In an article he wrote for the South Bend *Tribune,* Brademas described his visit to an experimental language school in Leningrad:

"The pupils in the English school we visited were obviously intelligent and eager to learn and I was curious as to how they were selected for admission. I asked the principal if the parents of most had enjoyed the advantages of higher education.

" 'Oh no!' she replied, 'most of the students' parents are workers—construction workers, workers on the subway, all kinds of workers.'

"An hour later, while asking and answering questions in the 10th grade class, I requested the teacher to allow me to poll her pupils. When she said yes, I asked them each to write in English on a piece of paper their names, the occupations of both their parents and what career they hoped to follow.

"Of tweny-two pupils, only one said 'My father is a worker.' The parents of three others appeared to be highly skilled workers or technicians—a dispatcher at an airport, a master in one of the largest plants of Leningrad and a designer.

"The other eighteen children came from families where fathers, and in a majority of cases, mothers, followed professions."—D.S.G.

Announcements

A project for the establishment of a French **National Center for the Study of Space**, coordinating civil and military activities, has been approved by the French Council of Ministers. The objectives of the center, which will succeed the Committee on Space Research set up in January 1959, will be to plan and supervise a space program, and to represent France in international space activities. Among the projects proposed for the next 5 years are a joint British-French program for construction of the Blue Streak missile, and a joint program with the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the launching of satellites, particularly those designed to study the ionosphere. The center, like the committee, will report directly to the Prime Minister.

The results of long-term studies on **industrial hearing loss** have been released by the U.S. Public Health Service. The report (PHS publication No. 850) contains information obtained from hearing tests given 2000 employees of the Federal Prison Industries, and correlates these tests with factory noise measurements. (PHS, Washington 25, D.C.)

An **International Conference on Dermatoglyphics** (the study of fingerprints, palms, and soles) has been founded to standardize methods and promote activity and research in the field. The conference, headed by Harold Cummins of Tulane Medical School, invites inquiries from interested workers. (H. Cummins, Tulane Univ., 1430 Tulane Ave., New Orleans 12, La.)

The Department of the Interior has initiated a nationwide training and research program in **sport fishery**, with the establishment of a Cooperative Fishery Unit at Utah State University. Under the new program, state agencies will provide and maintain technical gear and equipment; arrange limited funds for graduate studies; provide assistantships, fellowships, or research grants in fisheries or for graduate theses projects on fishery management techniques, fish-pesticide relationships, aquatic ecology, and fish population dynamics; and, with federal agencies, will give seasonal employment to fishery students wherever possible. (Fish and Wildlife Service, USDI, Washington 25, D.C.)