

small, fragmented, and has little overall "visibility" to industry. A fuel technology directory would increase this "visibility" and would also be valuable to universities that are in the process of revising their curricula.

I would appreciate receiving the following information from those who teach or plan to teach courses in fuel technology: name of responder; title or position; department; institute, university, and address; fuel technology courses offered at present (course number, title, catalog description, and year); and fuel technology courses planned (title, brief description, and year). The directory will be circulated to all responders. I am also exploring means of distributing this information to relevant industries.

ROBERT H. ESSENHIGH

*Combustion Laboratory,  
Pennsylvania State University,  
University Park 16802*

## Optical Brighteners

Deborah Shapley's report on the achievements of Björn Gillberg in Sweden (News and Comment, 12 Oct. 1973, p. 145) deserves some comment. We have recently been collaborating in an attempt to repeat some of Gillberg's published experiments on the mutagenic effects of optical brighteners (1). In our experiments we used the same genetic system and the same compounds as those used by Gillberg. We were unable to confirm that the suspected agents acted positively when incorporated in the growing medium of the organism (2). None of the several trials carried out produced a positive result. At a meeting in Stockholm at which one of us reviewed the genetic activities of optical brighteners, Gillberg himself admitted that he is now unable to obtain positive results with these compounds. In the second part of our experiments, in which nongrowing yeast cells were exposed to visible light in the presence of the brighteners, we were able to duplicate his findings of an apparent increase in mutation frequency. However, on closer examination, we were able to show that the entire effect could be attributed to selection of preexisting mutants under the treatment conditions. Because the changes studied by Gillberg and by us were probably cytoplasmic changes, that is, nonnuclear, we repeated the experiments measuring nuclear changes by the occurrence of

gene conversion. In these experiments no positive results were obtained.

We do not think that our experiments indicate unequivocally that no danger exists from optical brighteners. The data are insufficient at present for this conclusion to be drawn. Several laboratories, our own included, are trying to obtain this information. We also do not wish to imply that public watchdogs, such as Gillberg, do not perform a useful function. However, we must be sure that a full-sized, hungry, four-footed wolf, with teeth, is coming before we start crying out about it. For environmental biologists, this means doing all in our power to be sure that the right experiments are done, positive results are reproducible, and any artifacts of method are excluded. It also means that data should not be taken out of context, but should be considered in the light of information from other sources. In the case of contaminating chemicals, this means that their distribution in the biosphere, their accumulation, their usage, and their persistence must be taken into account. If we startle the public too many times with sensational claims that are later retracted, we run a real risk of losing our most valuable ally if and when a real crisis comes.

B. J. KILBEY

*Institute of Animal Genetics,  
University of Edinburgh,  
Edinburgh EH9 3JN, Scotland*

G. ZETTERBERG

*Department of Genetics and Plant  
Breeding, University of Uppsala,  
Uppsala, Sweden 751 05*

## References

1. B. Gillberg and J. Aman, *Mutat. Res.* **13**, 149 (1971).
2. B. J. Kilbey and G. Zetterberg, *ibid.* **21**, 73 (1973).

## History of Life Sciences

The Division of Research Grants of the National Institutes of Health, citing insufficient workload, did not renew the charter of the History of Life Sciences Study Section for the 1973-74 fiscal year; therefore, the study section was terminated as of June 1973. This decision was made at a time when the peer review system was being critically examined throughout the federal establishment. A protest on the part of the members of the History of Life Sciences Study Section did not avert the

decision, although it elicited the indication that, should the number of applications in the field grow to a point at which the panel could again be justified, the Division of Research Grants would consider reconstituting the study section. Scholars of the history of the biomedical sciences need to be informed that the abolition of the History of Life Sciences Study Section does not mean the termination of research funds in this field of scholarship. The National Library of Medicine continues to award research grants in the history of life sciences, and applications continue to be evaluated by the peer review system through ad hoc meetings of a special study section of the Division of Research Grants. Scholars interested in securing information about the eligibility of biomedical history projects or application forms should write to Ileen E. Stewart, Executive Secretary, Division of Research Grants, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland 20014, or to Jeanne Brand, Extramural Programs, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

JAMES HARVEY YOUNG

*Department of History,  
Emory University,  
Atlanta, Georgia 30322*

## FDR's Science Policy

Some words of elaboration are in order about Milton Lomask's account (Letters, 12 Oct. 1973, p. 116) of the origins of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's letter to Vannevar Bush requesting the report which became the famed *Science, the Endless Frontier* (1). Lomask's version is based upon the recollections of Oscar M. Ruebhausen, the highly able General Counsel of Bush's wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD). A close examination of the contemporary documentary record yields an account which differs significantly in detail from Ruebhausen's and may also be instructive with regard to the considerations which go into the shaping of federal policy for research and development.

Ruebhausen may be right that the idea for a presidential letter came from Oscar S. Cox. In mid-October 1944, perhaps with an eye on the upcoming election, Cox and Harry Hopkins agreed that FDR should request a report from Bush. But it does not ap-