ments unless it is protected, its executives are not above contemplating the prospect aloud.

RCA's case could be buttressed by publicly demonstrating how the removal of tariff has affected its sales, but so far the company has declined to expose what it calls its competitive position. This refusal is puzzling, both because it is hard to see why competition in a domestic market, which consisted in the most educated guess (there are no authoritative figures available) of only 220 units last year, should be secretive and because RCA's role in the market seems assured. It is estimated that RCA commanded about 37 percent of the domestic market last year—about 80 instruments—leaving the eight other manufacturers to divide the remaining market of 140 instruments among them. RCA itself estimates that it has produced only slightly less than half the electron microscopes in use anywhere today. In any case, electron microscopes are just a small portion of RCA's enterprises: last week the corporation announced new records of $1.75 billion sales and $51.5 million operating profits for 1962.

Most foreign producers of the microscopes do not share the anxieties of Hitachi, and remain unconcerned about the tariff, both because they are confident that the unique qualities of each will continue to be in demand, and because their companies are able to produce such a very small number of these complex instruments (in the case of one instrument widely regarded as superior the number is as low as two per month) that selling them is no problem whatever. These firms anticipate that the market will remain approximately constant, tariff or no tariff.

One final aspect of the whole maneuver is that although in all probability the tariff would not significantly affect the market, it would affect the cost of research in the U.S. by raising equipment costs for researchers who will continue to purchase the foreign microscopes that best suit their needs. Since it is estimated that between 65 and 80 percent of the electron microscopes sold here each year are purchased by nonprofit institutions, and since it is in many cases the federal government which contributes substantially to such institutions, the end result—if the measure goes through—will be the government taxing itself for a benefit to RCA that is more apparent than real.

—ELINOR LANGER

The Manhunters: British Minister Blames American Recruiters for Emigration of Scientists

Although no one likes to talk about it very much, it is no secret that manhunts against foreign scientific establishments have beefed up many a research staff in this affluent country. The losing countries do not like to advertise the fact that they cannot provide the salaries, professional opportunities, and facilities to hold some of their best people; the hunters tend to be discreet about their successes. As a result, the subject has largely remained outside public discussion.

Last week, however, Viscount Hailsham, Britain's Minister of Science, said his country had endured the depredations long enough. In an address to the House of Lords he let loose at the raiders, and, in turn, the Labor opposition let loose at him, charging that it was the government's niggardliness, rather than the wiles of manhunters, that has created the westward flow of British scientists.

Hailsham said: "We are in the presence of a recruiting drive systematically and deliberately undertaken by American business, by American universities, and to a lesser extent, American government, often initiated by talent scouts specially sent over here to buy British brains and preempt them for service of the U.S.A."

He conceded that conditions in Britain had something to do with the departures, but he seemed to find some consolation in the theory that the quest for British scientists mainly reflected the inadequacies in American education.

"I look forward earnestly," he said, "to the day when some reform of the American system of school education enables them to produce their own scientists so that, in an amiable free trade of talent, there may be an adequate interchange between our country and theirs, and not a one-way traffic."

The opposition was not long in coming back at Hailsham, offering the view that it's worse than you think and you're partly responsible for it. In an address the next day at the Imperial College of Science and Technology, in London, Harold Wilson, leader of the Labor party, charged that the government was being "appallingly complacent" when it estimated that by the middle 1960's British supply and demand would be in balance. It will, he said, "if we don't give science its proper place in national life. We shall no doubt be training all the bullfighters we need, because we don't use many."

The occasion for the debate was the release of a Royal Society study, "Emigration of Scientists from the United Kingdom," which disclosed that emigration now claims about 17 percent of all Ph.D.'s awarded in Britain each year. Last year, 58, or 5.6 percent of these, came to the U.S., bringing the 10-year total to 518. Figures were not available on how many of these moves were self-motivated and how many were the result of recruiting. But, in any case, the report noted that "the emigration of scientists has created some serious gaps in the scientific effort of this country. Instances were noted of scientists leaving university and other research institutions after establishing thriving research groups."

Since the cross-Atlantic flow of scientists cannot be controlled by fiat, it would seem that if Britain is to stop the exodus, it is going to have to give science the recognition and support that makes scientists happy to stay where they are. Some persons have pointed out that a good starting place would be Hailsham's office itself, which is structurally outside the mainstream of policy formation on scientific matters. Its title suggests that it is a counterpart of this country's White House Office of Science and Technology, but in fact it has little to say about the government's relationship with science, and Laborites charge that it was established, after the last election, to take the bite out of the Laborite contention that the Conservatives were not paying enough attention to British science. Hailsham himself is not a scientist, and, while he is Minister of Science, he is without a ministry.—D.S.G.

Announcements

The first **science high school** to be established in Turkey is scheduled to open in the fall of 1964, in Ankara. It is supported by a $1.1 million Ford Foundation grant. The new school will specialize in training in biology, chemistry, physics, and mathematics. A student body of 300 will be selected through nationwide entrance examinations. Turkey's ministry of education