viscosity, $[\eta] = Lt(\eta_{sp}/C)C \rightarrow 0$, can be found by extrapolation to zero concentration.

Staudinger's formula (1) with $K_m = 5 \times 10^{-4}$, and C in base molar concentration, has been used here in calculating the molecular weight, the concentration in gm./dl., adopted in determining intrinsic viscosity, being converted into base molar unit. The formula suggested by the testing committee of Industrie-gemeinschaft Chemiefaser⁶ was also tried and found to give more or less the same figures.

The results shown in Table 2 are the mean of four different observations for each sample of alpha-cellulose prepared from the same jute.

The molecular weight of jute alpha-cellulose is different for different methods of delignification, indicating apparently some degradation during delignification, the greatest degradation occurring in the chlorine dioxide method.

Alpha-cellulose was isolated in the above cases with 17.5 per cent caustic soda at room temperature

Table 2

Sample	Intrinsic viscosity ($[\eta]$ dl./gm.)	Mol. wt.	Degree of polymerization
Cotton purified	6.60	213,840	1,320
α-Cellulose from Cross and Bevan's cellulose	4.47	144,828	894
α-Cellulose from chlorite cellulose	4.10	132,840	820
α-Cellulose from Norman and Jenkins's cellulose	3.09	100,035	618
α-Cellulose from chlorine dioxide cellulose	2.60	84,240	520

Table 3

Sample	Mol. wt.	Degree of polymerization
α-Cellulose from chlorite cellulose with 17.5 per cent caustic soda	132,840	820
α-Cellulose from chlorite cellulose with 9.3 per cent caustic soda	182,250	1,125

by the American Chemical Society method⁷ with slight modification. Treatment of jute cellulose with 9.3 per cent (w/w) caustic soda at room temperature also gives alpha-cellulose⁸. The results in Table 3 tend to show that a less degraded product is obtained when a weaker caustic soda is employed.

K. B. PAL
 H. CHATTERJEE
 P. B. SARKAR

Technological Research Laboratories,
 Indian Central Jute Committee,
 Tollygunge, Calcutta 33.
 Nov. 15.

¹ Staudinger, H., and Feuerstein, K., *Ann.*, **526**, 72 (1936).

² Chowdhury, J. K., and Bardhan, T. P., *J. Ind. Chem. Soc.*, **13**, 240 (1936).

³ Chattopadhyay, H., and Sarkar, P. B., *Proc. Nat. Inst. Sci., India*, **12**, 23 (1946).

⁴ Corcy, A. B., and Gray, H. L., *J. Text. Inst.*, **16**, 853, 1130 (1924).

⁵ Launer, H. F., and Wilson, W. K., *Anal. Chem.*, **22**, 455 (1950).

⁶ Zart, A., *Melland Text.*, **32**, 39 (1951).

⁷ Ritter, G. J., *Indust. Eng. Chem., Anal. Ed.*, **1**, 52 (1929).

⁸ Sarkar, P. B., Mazumdar, A. K., and Pal, K. B., *J. Text. Inst.*, **39**, T44 (1948).

"Academic Freedom and Civil Rights"

My name was mentioned in *Nature* of December 22, p. 1053, in connexion with a "reported statement" on academic freedom.

I made no such statement. I would like to emphasize that reports of events twelve thousand miles away are rarely accurate when seen through abbreviated cables. It seemed ironical to me to find that, having defended academic freedom all my life, I am now taken to task for breaking down its foundations. The rule about professors not standing for Parliament is eighty years old and arose out of a quarrel between Hearn and the Council. Hearn evaded the statute by having himself made a dean of the Faculty of Law, and drafted the statute carefully so that he was not a professor. He immediately stood for Parliament again and remained a member of the Legislative Council until his death. No further attempt was made by the Council to prevent him from sitting in Parliament. It has always been regarded as a humorous incident in our history, but the rule has remained on the books ever since.

I am not aware that the rule has ever been formally debated in Council since. I hazard the opinion that it has survived not to curb academic freedom (for professors are perfectly free to express their views either in speeches or in letters to the press, and, in fact, do so) but because it is in practice too difficult for a professor to run his department and to sit in Parliament. The newer universities make great demands on the time of their staff, and so does politics in a growing country. It is almost impossible to do the two tasks at once, as anyone who understands the Australian scene will appreciate. There have been exceptions in other States in the past, but they belonged to more leisured times.

I venture to emphasize that academic freedom is in no danger in Melbourne—indeed, the recent debate in Council (which was so misrepresented by sections of the press) emphasized the fundamental importance of the university being a forum for the discussion of all views.

G. W. PATON
 (Vice-Chancellor)

University of Melbourne.