

might as well be realized that L. H. Fountain is now a permanent fixture in the politics of medical research and that no good can come of maintaining only distant relations with him.

Fountain has made it clear that his interest in NIH is neither short-range nor casual. "My feeling is," he said, "that the committee will have to keep surveillance over NIH indefinitely, particularly because of the wide range of discretion that they have in using funds."

At the moment, no date has been set for further hearings, but material is being collected, some of it not particularly flattering to NIH (disappointed grant applicants are the source of some of it), and before the session is out it is probable that Congressman Fountain and NIH will meet again in the hearing room. In the meantime, would it be too impertinent to suggest that since Fountain and Shannon are in the same business—promoting the public welfare—they might find something useful to discuss over lunch?—D. S. GREENBERG

Space Controversy: Senate Committee To Hear Scientists on Moon Program

Controversy over the high priority assigned to the lunar landing program is beginning to bubble through the scientific community and will be the subject of a Senate hearing on 10 and 11 June. Meanwhile, the latest entry in the conflict is a public statement by eight prominent scientists in defense of the space effort. Perhaps the most noteworthy thing about the statement is that, while pro-space sentiments abound, the *New York Times* felt it was sufficiently significant at this time to be given front-page attention.

The hearing, called by the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, is scheduled to receive testimony from Philip H. Abelson, Lloyd V. Berkner, Lee Du Bridge, H. H. Hess, Polykarp Kusch, C. S. Pittendrigh, Simon Ramo, Martin Schwarzschild, Frederick Seitz, and Harold C. Urey.

The statement of the eight scientists who endorsed the Apollo project reads as follows.

"Some members of the scientific community have criticized the Apollo project, which is aimed at the achievement of the manned lunar landing in this decade. The critics assert that the scientific benefits of space research can be gained by heavier reliance on robot

instruments, with the manned flight program carried out at a slower and less expensive pace.

"This criticism raises important issues regarding the motives which underlie the United States space effort. In 1961 the Congress responded to the call by President Kennedy for a vigorous space program, including a commitment to the manned lunar landing within the decade, by voting overwhelmingly in favor of the funds requested. The support was reaffirmed in 1962.

"Was this support tendered for scientific reasons primarily, or was it motivated by a broader concern with national interests and national goals?

"We believe that the support given to the enlarged space program by the people and the Congress was not based primarily on scientific grounds. We believe it was based on a conviction that this program will, for many reasons, make an important contribution to the future welfare and security of the United States.

"On this basis we take issue with those of our scientific colleagues who criticize the Apollo program by contending that it does not have scientific value. We regard the criticism as invalid for two reasons.

"First, man-in-space makes an essential contribution to the scientific objectives of lunar exploration. The exploration of space will pose an immense variety of challenges, unexpected opportunities and unforeseen obstacles. In the early stages of experimentation, automatic apparatus is effective. In later stages, when important questions have to be answered by difficult experiments, very complicated instruments must be developed to attempt a crude imitation of human judgment and flexibility. Robot instruments will always play an important role in the exploration program, but situations are bound to arise in which the human performance is indispensable for achievement of the scientific objectives. A sound approach requires both the development of automatic instrumentation and a vigorous program to achieve an early capability for manned exploration.

"Second, science plays an important role in lunar exploration but is not the sole objective of that project. The momentum and significance of the lunar program are derived from its place in long range United States plans for exploration of the solar system. The heart of those plans is man-in-space. Although it is the responsibility of the scientist to see that research is a strong

element within the framework of the program, nevertheless, the impetus of the program is not derived from scientific research alone. Therefore, the pace of the program cannot be set only by the steady flow of scientific developments. It is essential that it be influenced also by the urgencies of the response to the national challenge.

"In making these remarks we wish to stress that the space effort is a national program which warrants the interest, criticism and active participation of the entire scientific community."

The statement was signed by Maurice L. Ewing, Robert Jastrow, Joshua Lederberg, Willard F. Libby, Gordon J. F. MacDonald, Lyman Spitzer, Harold C. Urey, and James A. Van Allen.—D.S.G.

Civil Defense: New Program in Race with Growing Apathy and Apathy Is Pulling Ahead

Cracks in the wavering foundation of the Administration's civil defense policy opened wider last week, when the abolition of civil defense in the state of Oregon coincided with the inauspicious opening of a broad civil defense review by the House Armed Services Committee. The modest program of surveying, marking, and stocking areas in existing buildings that offer some hope of fallout protection has aided states and local communities in achieving some protection for some of their citizens for some of the time, but it has never been popular, either in or out of Congress. Views of fallout protection have always shifted between the opinion that it costs relatively little and may possibly be of some use, and the opinion that given the strategic uncertainties, shelters for fallout alone are a cruel joke. If last week's events are a sound indicator, the latter view is gaining adherents, leaving some doubt that the Administration's program will survive intact.

What Oregon has done is to respond belatedly to an invitation issued by President Kennedy in his first major statement on civil defense, in May 1961. "Every American citizen and his community," Kennedy said, "must decide for themselves whether this form of survival insurance [fallout shelters] justifies the expenditure of time, effort and money. For myself, I am convinced that it does." Oregon, however, is apparently convinced that it does not. Two weeks ago the City Council of