

Galileo was acclaimed by Maffeo Barberini, who wrote a poem in his praise (quoted by de Santillana, p. 156), who gave him friendly audience after becoming Pope Urban VIII (*ibid.*, pp. 162–166; Koestler, pp. 472f, 480), and who loaded him with honors (de Santillana, p. 171; Koestler, p. 472), but who later turned against him (de Santillana, pp. 191f, 217f, 222, 283; Koestler, pp. 482f, 495).

As for the condemnation of works referring to the movement of the earth, this was flouted by the Jesuits in China (Koestler, p. 495).

Finally, McGregor's slur on Gibson's questions is unwarranted. In the light of the vaunted claims of science to objectivity, honesty, experimental method, and so on, a *single* example of authoritarianism, "pull", acquiescence, or any other of the evils mentioned by Gibson (*Science*, 18 Sept. 1964, p. 1276) is too many. Perhaps a reading or rereading of Barber's "Resistance by scientists to scientific discovery" [*ibid.* 134, 596 (1961)] would be beneficial.

DAVID F. SIEMENS, JR.  
Los Angeles City College,  
855 North Vermont Avenue,  
Los Angeles 29, California

## The Waldemar Experience

The Waldemar Medical Research Foundation has been under attack of a more serious nature than might at first appear from the information given in *Science* (News and Comment, 2 Oct., p. 39). The scientific staff of Waldemar asks that our present plight be widely publicized so that scientists may be forewarned and therefore forearmed against similar attacks upon other scientific groups in future. The attack on our laboratory by a local newspaper can only be characterized as an anti-intellectual attack on the freedom of scientific inquiry and on academic freedom. The charges against Waldemar are baseless and were fabricated by the newspaper, under lurid headlines, through implication and innuendo. Were ours a unique situation, this warning to the scientific community would perhaps be unnecessary. But other such attacks have occurred. Queens College, a division of the City University of New York, has been the butt of continued harassments by newspapers on the false grounds of religious

discrimination. Several years back, Miami Cancer Institute was similarly beset by newspapers.

The scientific community should have channels for aiding beleaguered institutions such as ours with statements of support. Should not *Science* provide these? *Science* is the only organ that has brought our plight to the attention of the community of scholars, and the article by Elinor Langer presented our situation concisely and quite clearly. But its effect is diluted by a nonpartisan tone. Abraham Lincoln told a story about a wife who was nonpartisan even when her husband was attacked by a bear. "Go it, husband! Go it, b'ar!" she exhorted.

Langer wrote, "The Waldemar story . . . underscores the vulnerability of private research laboratories that lack affiliation with a large university or other institution." The strengths of small institutions are no more or less than those of larger ones, and affiliation with a larger institution might not have prevented such an attack. Moreover, scientists have long urged the importance of small institutions in scientific research. We at Waldemar have found that a small band of scientists can build a research center that offers unique advantages both in freedom of work and in support of each other's research efforts, and in addition a large measure of responsibility in a cooperative effort rooted in informed community support. Langer says, "There is no doubt that Waldemar's experiment in establishing close ties with the local community has failed." This is not so. On the contrary, the responsible elements of the community favor Waldemar's activities and recognize their value. The experiment is still in progress. A little assistance may yet make it a success.

LEO GROSS  
Waldemar Medical Research  
Foundation, Inc., Woodbury,  
Long Island, New York

## Academic Organization of Science

Booker's interesting suggestions on academic organization in physical science (2 Oct., p. 35) can well be extended even further in two respects. First, the arguments presented for the unification of the "theoretical, experimental, observational, and applied" are generally applicable not only in physi-

cal science as he defines the term, but also in biology, chemistry, mathematics, and even in a number of the areas typically classified as the humanities and the social sciences. Second, there is need to recognize within this unification a fundamental and necessary difference between the viewpoints of the "pure scientist" and the engineer; this has to do with the role of economics in the exercise of their responsibilities.

Several of the points mentioned by Booker were already in the academic plan of the new California State College at Palos Verdes, now preparing for opening with undergraduate programs in September of 1965 and for adding graduate work later. The entire curriculum is within a framework of the liberal arts and sciences and is being organized into three schools—natural sciences and mathematics, humanities and fine arts, and social and behavioral sciences. Specialized programs in the applied arts and sciences will be developed within this framework. A new type of basic studies program and a unique combination of both departmental and interdepartmental majors for baccalaureate students will provide further means for achieving both depth and breadth, and for properly relating the applied to the theoretical.

ROBERT B. FISCHER  
School of Science and Mathematics,  
California State College, Palos Verdes

## Tempora Mutantur

In my early days, authors were financially compensated for contributions to some scientific periodicals in Germany. Dael Wolffe (editorial, 13 Nov., p. 869) reports that nowadays journals are following the leadership of the American Institute of Physics in levying page charges against the authors' institutions.

At present, each newborn child is an additional tax deduction. But overpopulation may soon make it mandatory to levy a tax for each offspring, as suggested by Joshua Lederberg and F. H. C. Crick (see Crick's *Man and His Future*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1963, p. 275).

Are we ready? Lothar's *tempora mutantur* is amply proven, but what about his *nos et mutamur in illis*?

STEFAN ANSBACHER  
Jocinah Farms, Marion, Indiana