nomic growth at a time when their research and development expenditures are still relatively low. Consequently, they may be able to make better use of future expenditures.

ARNOLD KRAMISH
Rand Corporation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington 6, D.C.

Tribute to F. R. Moulton

I often wonder whether the present officers of the AAAS, to say nothing of its members, realize the extent of their indebtedness to Forest Ray Moulton, with whom I had the privilege of working in the Association from 1943, when he was 71, until 1948, when he retired. He died in 1952.

It is not my intention here to write a biographical sketch of Moulton. I merely want to point out that Moulton in his 70's was still an enormously strong and able man, and was absolutely devoted to the advancement of the AAAS. Perhaps if I called him the de Gaulle of American science, I would convey briefly a fairly accurate impression of his characteristics. Moulton was admirable, but to most people not lovable, and he could be almost ruthless in his drive to build up the AAAS. Unfortunately, I think, he scorned the art of social diplomacy and lived a rather lonely life. However, such a man was needed to conduct negotiations for the purchase of *Science* and the *Scientific Monthly* from the Cattell estate.

Today *Science* belongs to the Association through Moulton's efforts; the headquarters building of the Association has its present fine location at Scott Circle because Moulton selected and procured the site; the excellence of the AAAS symposium series stems from his personal editorial work; and the solvency of the Association during his period was assured by his careful, some would say penurious, fiscal management. Remember that his were the days before government support of science became prevalent, that he had been born in a log cabin in Michigan, and that his distinguished career in celestial mechanics at the University of Chicago was the result of his native ability and tireless personal efforts.

I think of Moulton as the most rugged individualist I have known—the builder of the AAAS during a critical decade of its history. As such, it would seem fitting to remember and honor his

name. Therefore, I propose that, at an appropriate time and with suitable ceremony, the headquarters building at 1515 Massachusetts Avenue be named Moulton Hall, and be so indicated on a plaque at the entrance.

FRANK L. CAMPBELL
National Academy of Sciences–National Research Council, Washington, D.C.

Scientist Reviewers Beware

A recent episode in professional reviewing, which has occurred in the present fever-heat atmosphere in which all discussions of race are being conducted, has highlighted a hazard about which I suspect many scientists, accustomed to reviewing for scientific journals, are not aware.

The episode in question, which stirred up a mare's nest of moral indignation, mutual recrimination, and accusation, resulted from the fact that Theodosius Dobzhansky followed a scientific reviewing ethic rather than a literary reviewing ethic when he wrote a critical review of Carleton Coon's book, *The Origin of Races*, at the request of the *Saturday Review*. In accordance with a practice of scientific courtesy, he sent a copy of his review manuscript to Coon. Coon responded by asking for the right to reply—again a correct response in the case of a review appearing in a scientific journal.

But in the case of a journal like the *Saturday Review*, it is incorrect to send a copy of the manuscript of a review anywhere else before the review has actually been published. Literary review journals have to guard against premature quotation by other publishers, and last-minute changes in makeup may mean that a review is not run at all.

The *Saturday Review*, in response to Coon's request, tried to arrange an interview with him, but by the time this was planned for, he had left for Europe. Meanwhile, another section of the *Saturday Review* had run some excerpts from the book.

Friends of Dobzhansky joined him in the belief that his review was being held up because of pressures against the review's content—an assumption that was not justified by the *Saturday Review's* record of liberalism. They began to write letters of protest, to which the *Saturday Review's* editors reacted with what they felt to be fully justified annoyance. As a result, the editors rejected