

and the possible perils of offending their grant-giving American friends, the dons manifested their displeasure by blocking an honorary degree for Hailsham.

After their victory they issued a statement, explaining, "We believe Lord Hailsham's view is incorrect and impolite to the Americans who pay for so much research in Britain. It evades tackling the main issue of the need for adequate finance from the government for education and research in the interests of the community as a whole."

The controversy has been marked by a mixture of good and bad marksmanship, as far as the real issues are concerned. Whether lured or self-propelled, the British are coming in fairly large numbers, and Hailsham did not hurt anything but precious sensibilities when he brought this courteously disregarded fact out into the open. But he would be hard put to defend his theory that the westward flow reflects nothing so much as the inadequacy of American scientific education. Scientists, like other people, tend to flock to money and opportunity, both of which are abundant here and in relatively short supply there.

Moreover, it is extremely unlikely that the flow of American support for British research will be responsive to Hailsham's petulant remarks. The federal agencies and foundations that finance science abroad do so for a variety of reasons, but principally because they feel there is good work to be had in foreign laboratories. The main countervailing force to the eastward flow of funds—at least as far as the federal government is concerned—is the American balance of payments problem. The administration is deeply worried about this matter, and it has asked federal agencies—including those that finance foreign research—to look into cost-cutting possibilities. The outcome may be a reduction of American support for foreign scientists, but that has nothing to do with Hailsham's rocking the boat.—D.S.G.

Moscow Embassy: Officer Named To Fill Science Liaison Post

The State Department has tentatively assigned a Foreign Service Officer to serve as a scientific representative at the American Embassy in Moscow. At other major American embassies, the function is usually assigned to a science attaché, who is generally a senior sci-

entist. But the Soviets, for reasons that are not clear, have not been receptive to the presence of a full-fledged science attaché at our Moscow Embassy.

The Russians have a "scientific counselor" at their Washington Embassy, but his role appears to be very much along the lines of most science attachés in Washington, and differs from the American concept of the job. While other nations regard the science attaché as a collecting point for scientific publications and general information about scientific activities, the State Department is seeking to use our science attachés as a means for bringing scientific advice into the mainstream of foreign policy formulation. It has not always worked out too well but that is the goal.

Present plans call for assigning the Moscow post to Glenn Schweitzer, a 1953 West Point graduate who joined the Foreign Service in 1956 after resigning from the Army. Schweitzer, who is currently assigned to the science and technology office of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, served at the American embassy in Belgrade in 1957. He subsequently studied nuclear engineering at the California Institute of Technology and the Argonne National Laboratories.

His function in Moscow, according to the State Department, will include assisting American scientists in exchange arrangements with their Soviet colleagues. It is expected that he will take up the post late in the summer.

—D.S.G.

Civil Defense: Congress Refuses Funds To Complete Shelter Survey and Stocking Program This Year

Congress generally does not give civil defense the openhanded treatment it accords other aspects of defense, and last week civil defense suffered another rebuff on Capitol Hill when the House rejected an administration request for \$61.9 million to complete a program of stocking fallout shelters.

The action attracted little notice in the press, since the money for civil defense was part of a mixed bag of measures in a \$1 billion supplemental appropriations bill and attention was diverted by a floor battle over a \$450 million item for the so-called emergency public works bill, which was approved by the Appropriations Committee's deficiencies subcommittee, knocked out by the full committee, and restored

by a 228 to 184 House roll-call vote.

The \$61.9 million asked by the administration was to be used to pay the cost of the last 25 percent of the work of marking and stocking shelter space already existing in buildings and in caves, mines, and other underground structures around the country. In federal bookkeeping terms, the money was to be a supplement to the \$111 million appropriated in the last session of Congress for civil defense for the current fiscal year, which ends 30 June.

In rejecting the civil defense item the House followed the recommendations of the Appropriations deficiencies subcommittee, whose chairman is Representative Albert Thomas (D.-Tex.), a very influential member of the House, who has been a resolute skeptic in regard to civil defense.

Thomas's stand on civil defense is of strategic importance to the program because the Texan is also chairman of the Appropriations independent offices subcommittee which oversees regular appropriations for civil defense.

It was the Thomas subcommittee which in March of 1962, in the ebb of the Berlin crisis of the previous summer, killed proposals for a "shelter incentive" program and thus effectively set Congressional policy against a major program of new shelter construction.

Thomas and his colleagues have generally gone along with a federal-state-local cooperative program to identify, mark, and stock shelters in existing structures, and Congress, in fiscal years 1962 and 1963, appropriated a total of \$175 million for the effort. The program, according to official estimates, would result finally in the stocking of some 70 million shelter spaces with austere rations for about 2 weeks and basic medical, sanitation, and radiological kits.

In testimony at hearings on the supplemental appropriation before the Thomas subcommittee last month, Stuart L. Pittman, the assistant secretary of defense who directs the civil defense program, argued that failure to provide the funds would not only interrupt completion of the shelter survey, disrupt the flow of supplies to shelters at a critical time, and cut back delivery and production schedules, but would also prejudice the whole civil defense effort, since building owners and local governments would be left uncertain about the federal government's intentions and a hard-won spirit of cooperation would be undermined.