# Letters

## The Pursuit of Eminence

A major conclusion in the article by L. G. Wispé on traits of eminent American psychologists [*Science* **141**, 1256 (1963)] was stated with such proper scientific dispassion that it took a while for its full significance to sink in. Wispé's conclusion was that the attainment of eminence (in psychology, at least) tends to go hand in hand with insensitivity to the needs of others. I think this highly significant finding deserves restatement, so I offer the following lines:

If it's eminence you're seeking here's a strategy to use:
Don't ever learn to put yourself in other people's shoes.
If you seldom think of others you're likely to succeed.
(Altruism, Charlie, is the one thing you don't need.)

O, here's what you do if you want to be outstanding—
Here's how to be if you want to make your climb—
Here's how to act if renown's what you're demanding—
Just be selfish all the cotton-pickin' time.

PETER L. PETRAKIS
*1716 Clement Street,*
*San Francisco 21, California*

## Curbing Authors

Although frequent complaints appear about the proliferation of scientific literature, constructive suggestions have been few. To ask journal editors to exercise greater discretion is to imply that these hard-working gentlemen are not already doing the best job they can. I therefore propose the following imperative, to be adopted by responsible scientific societies around the world:

Thou shalt not commit authorship more than once per year.

I think this would inflict a minimum of hardship on productive workers and would prevent the appearance of reports of a study in several different places under different titles. Authorship would include all forms of joint authorship and contributions to symposiums. Exceptions might be made in cases of review articles solicited by the editor.

How much such a ban would contribute to decreasing the ever-growing mountain of scientific publications cannot be estimated, but there could not but be a significant drop.

J. E. HOLMES
*10781 Richland Avenue,*
*Los Angeles 64, California*

## Polynesian Origins

Ferdon's hypothesis (*1*) that the Polynesian culture had many sources is a statement of the obvious: all cultures are influenced by other cultures at some point in their histories, and Polynesia is no exception. Further, in regard to Polynesia in particular, the concept of multiple origins is in no way novel, for it has been an accepted working hypothesis in Polynesian anthropology for many years. One of the outstanding features of the literature of the area is the implicit and explicit recognition of possibly exotic culture traits and trait complexes in Polynesian culture, as exemplified in the writings of the Handys (*2*), Linton (*3, 4*), Heine-Geldern (*5*), Schmitz (*6*), Anell (*7*), and others. Physical anthropologists such as Shapiro (*8*) have also indicated multiple origins for the Polynesian race. Ferdon attempts to convince the reader that anthropological thought on Polynesian origins was tradition-bound and unimaginative, yet this literature, as well as his own statements (that there is a wide range of theories on the origin of Polynesian culture), indicates the true picture.

Ferdon attempts to show that Heyerdahl's activity was a stimulus to research in Polynesia, maintaining that only two excavations had been made in Polynesia prior to World War II. However, in the reference which he cites, an entire chapter is devoted to a discussion of *numerous* excavations in New Zealand dating far back into the 19th century. Actually, before World War II, surface archeology had been done by Emory (*9*) and Bennett (*10*) in Hawaii, by Emory in Tahiti (*11*) and the Tuamotus, and by Linton in the Marquesas (*4*). The British Museum and the Franco-Belgian Expeditions dug on Easter Island (*12*), and Emory and his associates dug some sites in the Hawaiian group (*13*). These excavations may not have been acceptable by modern standards; they were nonetheless excavations, and in New Zealand, at least, created a lively interest in the antiquity of the Maori. After World War II, archeological activity increased in the Pacific (which is not separable from Polynesia), with work of a more scientific nature by R. Duff in New Zealand in the late 1940's and by Gifford in Fiji in 1949 (*14*). It is no wonder that Emory, who had done so much previous archeological work in Polynesia, began Hawaiian excavations in 1950. Ferdon's characterization of the Hawaiian program is quite misleading: according to Emory himself (*15*), the Hawaiian program was begun as a regular archeological survey jointly sponsored by the University and the Bishop Museum. Later, the Bishop Museum embarked on a 5-year program sponsored by the Wenner-Gren Foundation, and it has subsequently obtained NSF and other funding. Because of a lack of trained students and volunteers, the Hawaiian program (like any other large academic program) has always involved training, but it is not only or even mainly a course for student training. It utilizes large numbers of volunteers, working mainly during university vacations. Some 60 sites have been investigated, yielding material far superior in volume to that obtained anywhere else in Polynesia to date.

After Emory's work, excavations were carried out by Gifford (*16*) in New Caledonia (1953) and Yap (1956), by Spoehr (*17*) in the Marianas (1953), and by Osborne (*18*) in Palau (1953). The work of the American Museum in the Marquesas was conceived in 1954, 2 years before Heyerdahl's Easter Island expedition, at a time when his intentions were not even known. Consideration of the chronology of these other archeologi-