emy of Sciences report of 1956. This amounts to about 3 percent of natural background radiation and only about 1.5 percent of the total radiation dose derived from background plus medical and dental exposure to the gonads, as currently estimated.

HANSON BLATZ
City of New York Department of Health, New York

Ruth Benedict

Julian Steward, in his long and prevailingly generous review [*Science* **129**, 322 (1959)] of *An Anthropologist at Work, Writings of Ruth Benedict,* raises three issues which seem to call for clarification. He interprets my discussion of Ruth Benedict as a "figure of transition" as referring to her role in linking together the Boas period of anthropology and one small segment of contemporary culture and personality research known as "national character." I did not use the term in any such parochial sense, but rather in reference to the whole intellectual climate of opinion of the second quarter of the twentieth century.

Steward asks why I did not mention the Kardiner-Linton seminar held at Columbia University in the late 1930's. At the time that Abram Kardiner independently began to apply psychoanalytic theory to the study of culture, the major theoretical lines for the study of personality and culture (as in John Dollard's *Criteria for the Life History*) had already been worked out by Roheim, Sachs, Fromm, Erikson, Frank, Dollard, Sapir, Gorer, and myself, and Ruth Benedict was already familiar with them. Kardiner's one new contribution—his theory of primary and secondary institutions—neither she nor I found useful. Although it is uncertain to what extent Ralph Linton mediated the existing literature to Kardiner, I have always regarded Kardiner's work as an example of historical parallelism.

On the third point, the extent to which Steward feels that the Columbia University department of anthropology was, during his membership in the department, a continuation of the Boas tradition, Steward himself is surely the best authority.

MARGARET MEAD
American Museum of Natural History, New York

Winchester's Genetics

In a review of A. M. Winchester's book, *Genetics* [*Science* **129**, 91 (1959)], the reviewer dismissed the book as one that he could not recommend for use by students of the subject. He commented that the book was apparently written for college students with little formal education, and he seemed to imply that there was something wrong with such a text being anthropocentrically oriented. Since the book was published by a distinguished publishing house, and the series in which it appears is edited by a geneticist who was also then a member of the Editorial Board of *Science,* it seemed to me that something must be awry somewhere. I therefore sent for a copy of Winchester's book, and having read it I have now satisfied myself where things went awry. They went awry with the reviewer. He committed the cardinal sin of reviewing, namely, reviewing a book at a level for which it was not written and at which it was never intended to be read. The author quite clearly sets out the classes of readers for whom the book is intended: the nonspecialist student in genetics, the student of psychology, sociology, or medical science, and those wishing to take the course as an elective or as a part of a general education program.

As one who has had to learn his genetics from books, and who has read a representative number of them over the course of the years, I should like to protest the reviewer's unfair dismissal of this book, and to go on record as saying that Winchester's book is, in my opinion, a book eminently well suited to meet the requirements of a first and perhaps only course in genetics for the student who is not specializing in the subject. The text is clearly and soundly written, the illustrations, tables, and figures are clear and quite generally most interesting in themselves, and the problems are most helpfully constructed. The orientation toward man makes the book unusually interesting.

ASHLEY MONTAGU
321 Cherry Hill Road, Princeton, New Jersey

While it is true that Winchester's book is meant to appeal to students of varied backgrounds, it is apparently meant for biology students as well. This point, however, is really quite unimportant, for the real issue is whether any textbook that treats its subject in a trivial and superficial manner should be used in any course in our universities.

Montagu is entitled to his opinion of the book, but his obvious appeal to the authority of a member of the Editorial Board of *Science* is unworthy of serious comment. I am sorry, however, that I have piqued the sensibilities of an anthropologist by complaining about the excessive anthropocentric orientation of a textbook of genetics.

S. R. GROSS
Rockefeller Institute, New York