

Others, like Charles E. Kellogg, deputy director of the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, believe that the means are at hand—in the form of plants, fertilizer[†] and new machinery to apply it, herbicides to fight the overbearing tropical weeds, and management methods—to make sizable areas of the tropics arable and, with the addition of water for irrigation, some desert and semiarid areas as well.

The two classic ways to increase agricultural acreage, of course, are to put additional land under cultivation or to find ways of increasing the yield of land already in use. In the case of the tropics, however, putting new land to productive agricultural use would involve much the same sort of inputs

as are required to raise yields on land already being cultivated.

An Agriculture Department economist, Lester R. Brown, who has written a good deal on world food needs and prospects, has observed that “the ability to raise yields also seems to be closely related to the level of income. Increasing the food supply by expanding the area under cultivation requires relatively little capital. Increasing output per acre, however, requires a substantial increase in capital inputs in the form of fertilizers, pesticides, and improved implements.”

The implications of this statement are very broad when it is viewed in the context of the underdeveloped rather than the industrialized countries. At the NAS symposium, J. Burke Knapp

of the International Bank suggested the range when he said, “The Bank is fully aware of the fact that capital is only one of the essential elements required to bring about productivity increases. The factors limiting growth do not spring from any capital shortage but, in degrees varying from one country to another, from the need for extensive land reform, the lack of remunerative market opportunities, shortage of farm requisites, inadequate knowledge of soil and climatic conditions in many parts of the developing world, the limited knowledge of the farmer himself, and insufficiently strong agricultural administrations capable of planning and preparing agricultural projects suitable for financing. The provision of capital

HUAC: Stamler's Challenge Draws Academic Support

One manifestation of increasing political activity in the American academic community these days has been its support of the attempt of Chicago heart-research specialist Jeremiah E. Stamler to challenge the constitutionality of the House Committee on Un-American Activities (*Science*, 23 July 1965).

Subpoenaed to appear before HUAC in Chicago last May, Stamler and an associate, Yolanda Hall, decided, with the support of counsel, neither to go along with the committee in its investigation of an alleged resurgence of communist activity in the area nor to take the Fifth Amendment. Instead they initiated legal action against the committee. At the hearings, they submitted brief statements, then left the hearing room. As a result of their departure—and of the anti-HUAC demonstrations that also characterized the session—the committee later voted to cite them for contempt. The illness of committee chairman Edwin Willis (D-La.) has prevented the requested citations from reaching the floor of the House, whose approval is necessary to initiate formal action. But Willis is expected to return shortly, and, according to a spokesman for the committee, will take up the matter quickly when he does.

In the meantime, however, Stamler's legal battle against HUAC is

pending in the U.S. Court of Appeals and has attracted substantial support. The only formal organization in the picture is a Legal Aid Fund headed by Paul Dudley White, Robert W. Wissler, and John F. Perkins. White is the well-known Boston heart specialist; Wissler and Perkins are chairmen of the departments of pathology and physiology, respectively, at the University of Chicago. Their efforts have resulted in donations of about \$49,000 from more than 3000 people, mostly in the academic community. In addition several petitions are now being circulated to Congress urging it to vote against HUAC's effort to obtain citations.

One petition, signed by about 700 biomedical scientists and physicians, was the result of efforts by the three sponsors of the legal aid fund. The others, however, were initiated independently. They include a list of about 1000 political scientists, organized by Theodore Lowi, Hans Morgenthau, C. Herman Pritchett, and Quincy Wright, all of the University of Chicago; D. F. Fleming of Vanderbilt; and David Truman of Columbia. Another list of about 250 historians was organized by Walter Johnson and John Hope Franklin (Chicago), Henry Steele Commager (Amherst), John Caughey (U.C.L.A.), and William Willcox (Michigan). There is also a list of

about 400 professors of law, organized by Clark Byse, David Cavers, Vern Countryman, Mark De Wolfe Howe, Louis Jaffe, John Dawson, and Albert Sacks, all of Harvard; and Dean Robert Drinan, S.J., and William J. Kenealy, S.J., of Boston College Law School.

The petition, which was formulated by law professors, briefly traces the events leading up to the citations. Its concluding paragraph reads: “Because of the Committee's disregard of its own rules, because the entire matter may be rendered moot by pending litigation, and because this is merely one more instance of this Committee's continuing abuse of its powers to no apparent legitimate legislative purpose, we urge you to vote against all the contempt citations.”

Why the Stamler case has drawn so much interest at this time is a question to which nobody, not even Stamler, has the answer. It may be in part that he is prominent both locally and professionally; or that there is something in the particular style of his counteroffensive with which the academic community can readily identify. And it may not be too much to guess that at least one of the moving forces is that question intellectuals recurrently ask themselves: “When McCarthy was around, where were we?”—E.L.