is used occasionally (but all too often) for the study of ants. I have not been able to find the word in any dictionary. The only word I can find is "myrmecology," which was apparently considered satisfactory by the old masters in this field, notably Mayr (as early as 1862), Emery, Forel, and W. M. Wheeler. That Dr. Wheeler did not feel the need of a new term is especially significant for two reasons: (1) he was addicted to the coinage of new terms; and (2) his thorough knowledge of classical languages would have enabled him to detect any flaws in the derivation of myrmecology.

But there is a more serious indictment of "formicology" than mere superfluity: It is incorrectly derived from the Latin formica and the Greek logia. In spite of precedents, such hybrid derivations are not excusable. I once heard W. M. Wheeler inveigh caustically against a well-known entomologist who had coined in the same manner a large number of new generic names. "Bastard derivatives," he called them.

What I can't understand is why anyone should have thought a new name was needed for the study of ants. Perhaps someone felt that "formicology" would be self-explanatory (since all ants are in the family Formicidae) to entomologists in general, whereas it might be necessary to consult a dictionary to learn the meaning of myrmecology. But in that case "formicidology" would have been more appropriate, though not better derived. By the same reasoning "entomology" would be "animalology." But if that unknown coiner had really wanted to make things easier for the layman, he would have gone all out and minted "antology," a term eminently appropriate for a subdivision of "bugology"!

GEORGE C. WHEELER

Department of Biology, University of North Dakota

1 Presumably meaning "hybrid" or "mongrel."

## National Conference of Science for Peace

AT THE first National Conference of "Science for Peace," which was held in London Jan. 19-20 and was attended by 180 scientists, two resolutions were passed unanimously. As provisional secretary of this organization I have been asked to send you the text of these resolutions in the hope that you will give them such publicity as you think fit.

I should point out that the resolution on biological warfare should not be taken to advocate unilateral abrogation of secrecy, but that recommendations (ii) and (iii) were intended by the proposer to be contingent upon (i):

This Conference notes with approval the resolution carried unanimously at the International Congress of Microbiology at Copenhagen in 1947 in the following terms:—

"The IVth International Congress of Microbiology joins the International Society of Cell Biology in condemning in the strongest possible terms all forms of biological warfare. The Congress considers such barbaric methods as absolutely unworthy of any civilised community and trusts that all microbiologists throughout the

world will do everything in their power to prevent their exploitation,'

This Conference agrees that scientists have a duty to make clear their opposition to this misuse of biological knowledge, since it realises that silence would generally be interpreted as meaning agreement with such developments.

It realises that, in the present state of international tension, governments may feel bound to prepare measures for defence of the population of their countries against the threat of attack by biological weapons. Research into defence against biological attack, however, necessarily requires simultaneous research into methods of using biological weapons and once such knowledge is accumulated, under conditions of secrecy, it may not be possible to prevent it being used. Further, secret work, whether aimed at methods of defence or attack, only increases international suspicion.

This conference therefore calls on H. M. Government:-

- (i) to enter into negotiation with other Governments with a view to a general formal repudiation of any use of biological warfare and to working out practical measures to ensure that this repudiation is effective;
- (ii) to refrain from imposing conditions of secrecy upon workers at any government-sponsored research institute engaged in work which might bear on the problems of biological warfare; and to allow inspection of such institutes by accredited representatives of a recognised international organization;
- (iii) to secure the full publication of the results of all such research, including secret work already completed, whether or not it was directly concerned with biological warfare.

The present discussions between the Great Powers on disarmament and the control of atomic energy have once again quickened the hopes of people everywhere that agreement may be reached and the threat of a third world war removed. This Conference affirms the view that:

- 1) International agreement on the elimination of atomic weapons with strict international control and inspection is essential if the present international tension is to be eased.
- 2) Now that it is agreed by all the Powers that the elimination of atomic weapons must be linked with the control and reduction of conventional armaments there can be no basic political objection to such an agreement.
- 3) There are no insurmountable technical difficulties in the way of establishing an effective system of control and inspection, containing in itself automatic guarantees of its fulfilment and possible to operate even in a period of international tension.
- 4) The differences in policy on international control between the various countries are not as great as has sometimes been suggested and are capable of resolution by compromise.
- 5) In particular, the stress that has been laid on international ownership of large-scale atomic establishments is not justified. Although such ownership might facilitate control, it is not essential for effective control. Since it constitutes a major stumbling block we respectfully suggest to our Government that it should use its influence to secure that this proviso is not allowed to hold up a general agreement.

A. H. Gordon

Science for Peace Committee, London, England