after subversives; and during the first Eisenhower years, pressure on the agencies by the Administration to find a reasonable number of security risks to fulfill the campaign promises to clean out the government. One of the results of this pressure was the famous "numbers racket" in which some extremely odd techniques were used to swell the totals of the cleanup; for example, the security files of people leaving the government perfectly voluntarily were checked, after they had left, and if adverse information turned up they were counted as among the security risks the Eisenhower administration had gotten rid of. This apparently left quite a few people leery of taking a new job outside of the government for fear they might then be classified as security cases on the basis of adverse information that could easily have been answered had they ever known it existed. With this sort of attitude at the top levels of the Administration, it is not surprising that the screening boards were sometimes over-quick to decide that the raw files contained enough adverse information to warrant bringing charges against a man. In recent years, the screening boards have simply been doing a better job in making the "commonsense judgment" required by the regulations for evaluating the raw files. There is undoubtedly a certain amount of unavoidable unfairness left, particularly in the treatment of applicants for routine jobs, who may be passed over (without being labeled security risks) simply because they are dubious cases and their jobs are not important enough to be able to go to great lengths to definitely decide whether they are clearable. But the serious problems of the early '50's seem to no longer exist.—HOWARD MARGOLIS

Cigarettes and Cancer: Pressure Grows for the Government To Respond to Health Hazard

"If tobacco were spinach," said a longtime cancer researcher, "the government would have outlawed it years ago, and no one would give a damn."

Tobacco, however, bears only a superficial botanical resemblance to spinach; it thereafter soars to a unique place in mass affection and economic significance to become politically and socially immune to legal banishment. As a consumer product that is neither food nor drug, it qualifies for federal scrutiny only under regulations affecting deceptive advertising, and these regulations have been invoked only to exclude health claims. The consumption of tobacco, in short, is not a matter that comes under any existing federal authority.

In 1957, Americans paid $5.3 billion to buy 442 billion cigarettes; last year, they paid $6.9 billion for 528 billion cigarettes. But while they have been puffing, the conclusion—valid or not—has been growing that cigarettes are detrimental to health and that they contributed heavily to some 37,000 deaths from lung cancer last year. The tobacco industry vigorously disputes this conclusion, but the "position" of the American government on the relationship between smoking and lung cancer is a 1959 report of the surgeon general, which states:

"The weight of evidence at present implicates smoking as the principal etiological factor in the increased incidence of lung cancer." (The American Cancer Society stated the case more strongly 2 years ago when it concluded that a variety of studies had established "beyond reasonable doubt that cigarette smoking is the major cause of the unprecedented increase in lung cancer.")

The surgeon general's expression was not followed by any government action outside of stricter policing of advertising, nor, as the sales figures would seem to indicate, has cigarette consumption been adversely affected. Recently, however, at a number of points in the federal government, the conviction has grown that the health hazards of cigarette smoking have been sufficiently well established to warrant more potent federal action, that the government should move from its role of cautioning bystander to a more positive role.

Action Abroad

The economic importance of the tobacco industry and the power of the tobacco-producing states in Congress preclude, for the present at least, anything resembling the vigorous anti-smoking campaign recently undertaken by the British government. The British action followed a report by the Royal College of Physicians which concluded "that cigarette smoking is the most likely cause of the recent world-wide increase in deaths from lung cancer."

The Royal College report was promptly endorsed by the government, and the Ministry of Health subsequently distributed more than 400,000 posters, which, if they do not discourage smoking, will most certainly undermine the mental well-being of cigarette advertising copywriters. One of the posters states: "Danger! Heavy cigarette smokers are thirty times more likely to die of lung cancer than non-smokers. You have been warned."

The British cigarette industry responded by scheduling its television advertising for after 9 P.M., a concession of questionable realism to the Royal College's concern over the effect of cigarette advertising on youth. One British firm has also removed its product from vending machines to help prevent circumvention of the law which forbids cigarette sales to persons under 16. In Italy, meanwhile, Parliament vigorously assaulted the problem by slapping an outright prohibition on cigarette advertising.

Prohibition Not Feasible Here

In this country, there is no easy political path to direct action of the British and Italian variety. In addition, the experience with prohibition has left behind deep suspicion of any effort to promote government regulation of individual tastes. At the same time, however, the accumulation of evidence on the hazards of smoking is providing support for the view that it is the responsibility of the government to do something. The White House is steering clear of the issue, for it can only further arouse congressional elements that are already generally hostile to the Administration. But Kennedy's broad view of the role of government in American life has created a background that favors government concern about tobacco consumption.

Against this background, the following developments have taken place:

The Federal Trade Commission is becoming increasingly dissatisfied with its ability to regulate cigarette advertising. It has succeeded in banning health claims, but sales have not been affected, and, of particular concern to the FTC, the manufacturers are putting considerable effort into wooing younger smokers. This is reflected, in part, by the heavy promotional campaigns conducted on college campuses, with prizes ranging from small amounts of cash to sports cars. There is growing sentiment at the FTC for further restricting advertising by requiring "affirmative disclosure" of health hazards,

rather than simply the absence of health claims. In their more optimistic moments, some FTC officials visualize this as taking the form of a warning, on each cigarette pack and advertisement, to the effect that excessive use of the product may be detrimental to health. The FTC requires an affirmative disclosure of hazards in a number of products, such as inflammable cleaning fluids. But it is not fully confident about its ability to translate the available medical conclusions into a court victory. "If we are going to try for affirmative disclosure, we know we are going into one hell of a court fight," an FTC official said in an interview, "and we want to make sure that we are in a position to win, because it would be a disaster if we tried and lost. The position of the Public Health Service is of crucial importance for us if we go to court, but we feel that the 1959 statement of the Health Service just isn't strong enough for us to make our case."

Congressional Hearings

Officials of the Public Health Service say the FTC will probably have to wait a very long time if it insists on an airtight case, but the PHS is looking into the preparation of a new statement. Its officials are noncommital on the subject. Meanwhile, John E. Fogarty, the congressional benefactor of medical research, said in an interview that he would like to see the PHS play a more vigorous role on the issue of tobacco and lung cancer. The subject, Fogarty said, will be gone into "thoroughly" when his House Appropriations subcommittee takes up the PHS budget next year. (This will come as grim news to the cigarette industry, whose shares on the New York stock exchange dropped a few points earlier this year immediately after word leaked out from a closed hearing that Fogarty had heard some brief testimony on the health hazards of tobacco.)

If Fogarty does go through with his intentions, it will be only the second time that a congressional committee has gone at any length into the question of cigarettes and health. The first venture is now looked back upon as something of a disaster for all involved, the investigators as well as the industry. This took place in 1958 when the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, headed by Congressman John Blatnik of Minnesota, held hearings on the truthfulness of advertising of filter-tip cigarettes. The subcommittee's conclusion was that "The cigarette manufacturers have deceived the American public through their advertising of filter-tip cigarettes."

Further hearings were planned, but before they were held the subcommittee was dissolved by its parent committee. There is no hard and fast evidence that the subcommittee's disappearance was caused by its encounter with the cigarette industry—subcommittees come and go. But the incident has passed into the folklore of Congress as a warning that the cigarette industry has potent powers of self-defense. Since Blatnik's investigation, no congressional committee has gone near the subject, although numerous bills have been introduced aimed at studying or curbing public use of tobacco in one way or another.

The latest of these, a resolution (S. J. Res. 174) offered by Senator Neuberger of Oregon, calls for the President "to initiate and conduct a strenuous public health education program on the hazards of cigarette smoking . . ." Mrs. Neuberger also calls for the establishment of a Commission on Tobacco and Health to study the health hazards of tobacco and to seek solutions for the economic problems that might result from a sharp drop in cigarette consumption.

The resolution attracted six cosponsors and was then quietly interred in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. There is virtually no prospect that it will ever be given serious attention. The six major cigarette tobacco producing states are well represented in key positions in both houses, and they feel that any attempt to undermine tobacco is absolutely unnegotiable. The economic stakes involved are enormous. North Carolina farmers, for example, received $527 million for tobacco last year; Kentucky, $273 million; South Carolina, $99 million; Virginia, $96 million; Georgia, $84 million; and Tennessee, $81 million.

A direct assault through Congress would seem to be impossible at this time. But the publicity-generating powers of members who share a concern about the hazard of tobacco are considerable, and if they make enough noise, and if the medical reports become sufficiently damning, it is going to become increasingly difficult for the issue to remain dormant.

—D. S. GREENBERG

Announcements

An **international Red Sea expedition**, conducted by 20 Israeli, American, and Dutch scientists as a part of the International Indian Ocean Expedition, recently completed 6 weeks of field work in Dahlak Archipelago and Zula Bay off the coast of Ethiopia. Biological and oceanographic investigations included land and submarine geology, meteorological and hydrological conditions, ecology of coral areas and contrasting intertidal habitats of gradually sloping muddy bays and steep rocky shores, and the physiological relationship of calcification and photosynthesis in 18 species of invertebrates and algae.

The American delegation, headed by Eugenie Clark, director of the Cape Haze Marine Laboratory in Sarasota, Fla., was supported by the National Science Foundation and the Office of Naval Research. Overall planning was conducted by Israeli investigators under the direction of Heinz Steinitz, of the Hebrew University. Additional assistance was obtained from Israeli and Dutch agencies and the Ethiopian Navy.

Peace Corps volunteers in the **biological and paramedical fields** are needed for laboratory research or general science teaching in Malaya, Africa, India, East Pakistan, and the Philippines. Participants may select the country of their choice for service; knowledge of a foreign language is not necessary. Volunteers receive all expenses plus an $1800 termination payment rated at $75 per month for the 2-year period. (S. Babbitt, Office of Public Affairs, College and University Division, Peace Corps, 806 Connecticut Ave., NW, Washington 25, D.C.)

An **International Society of Craniofacial Biology** has been established with Allan G. Brodie, Sr. (University of Illinois), as president and W. M. Krogman (University of Pennsylvania) as president-elect. The society held its first formal meeting on 28 and 29 April in Los Angeles. (Samuel Pruzansky, Cleft Palate Clinic, University of Illinois Center for Handicapped Children, 840 South Wood St., Chicago 12)

A 5-member science advisory board has been appointed to assist the Interior Department in formulating **wildlife management programs and policies.** Under the direction of A. Starker Leo-