

guage, including resolution of semantic ambiguities and insertion or suppression of articles and auxiliaries. A report on CHINSYN, a synthesis-oriented Chinese-English machine-translation system, will be presented at the second annual meeting of the Association for Machine Translation and Computational Linguistics (29–30 July).

ALVIN KALTMAN

*Computer Concepts, Inc.,
Silver Spring, Maryland*

References

1. X. Umezawa, *Antibiotiki* 7, 561 (1962).
2. Mao Tse-Tung, *Mao Tse-Tung Hsüan Chi* (People's Publishing House, Peking, 1960), p. 1181.
3. F. Perrin, *Compt. Rend.* 1, 33 (1959).
4. Though arrived at independently, a similar train of thought is expressed in Paper No. 30, Georgetown University Machine Translation Research Project (1963), p. 180.

Two Camps in Science

Your editorial of 31 January ("Ethical problems: an invitation," p. 435) invites confidential descriptions of situations that have posed real ethical problems. May I suggest that in the last two decades a situation has arisen which provides a background to the problem of ethics. There are now two camps in science: firstly, those for whom science is a way of life, to be practiced for its own sake and for the public good; and secondly, those for whom science, like many other activities, is a road to money and power.

I express no opinion about the relative merits of the two classes, but we shall indeed be foolish if we fail, while there is yet time, to face this fact of scientific life.

BENJAMIN FULLMAN

*46, Marlborough Place,
London, N.W.8*

Civil Defense Testimony Misread

H. A. Sawyer, Jr. (Letters, 24 Apr., p. 366), has grossly misinterpreted the testimony I gave last year before the Hébert subcommittee [in a hearing on a bill regarding fallout protection in new public buildings].

Noting that of 30 witnesses "with claim to some scientific competence" 25 were for the bill and 5 against it, Sawyer says that, according to his interpretation, except for the psychiatrist the "anti" scientists objected to the bill because it did not go far enough. I was

one of these four and, moreover, the one who gave the most extensive testimony and was questioned at greatest length by the subcommittee. Sawyer's interpretation of my opinion is entirely erroneous. I objected to the program, and still object to it, because it is essentially useless, while carrying the very serious danger that people may nevertheless come to believe they are protected, in some meaningful way, against nuclear war. I further objected to the program because its technical basis was faulty in the extreme. These points were very clearly made in my presentation. Since Sawyer came to such an incorrect conclusion on a matter so straightforward, I would suggest that your readers examine his other statements on civil defense with great care before being persuaded by them.

Lest your readers come to believe, from the lopsided ratio of "pro" witnesses to "anti's," that the American people are generally in favor of this program, it should be borne in mind that the subcommittee invited the Defense Department to procure witnesses. Generally, this practice tends to produce such an unbalanced witness list.

WILLIAM F. SCHREIBER

*Massachusetts Institute of
Technology, Boston*

Trevor Robinson believes it would have been "surprising" if any "dissent" on the value of civil defense had come from Department of Defense witnesses in the famous Hébert subcommittee hearings of 1963. Robinson's letter (22 May, p. 954) gives the impression—intended or not—that the hearings were rigged as a parade of favorable witnesses, and that Representative Hébert and his colleagues handled the matter in a most naive way.

The records of the hearings, and the early press coverage, give quite a different impression. The hearings began with a memorandum by the subcommittee's counsel in which a completely unfavorable picture of civil defense was presented. In the first few days of the hearings various "opposition" witnesses either appeared or were cited through their writings. Then the subcommittee took testimony from the then Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense, Stuart L. Pittman, and from a few members of his staff. After hearing this testimony, the subcommittee decided to invite other Department of Defense witnesses.

Among these witnesses were research personnel, who were able to explore

the technicalities of the subject. The hearings, originally expected to take only a few days, then went on for several weeks. In the course of time the subcommittee's sentiment shifted from "anti" to "pro." However, the subcommittee was by no means passive, and it was not the kind of group that would be sold the Brooklyn Bridge.

Late in the hearings in July 1963, one of the Hébert group unofficially admitted that the original intention of the hearings had been to precipitate the demise of civil defense. . . . The subcommittee's reversal was quite honest. . . . Once they had been amply informed, they changed their minds. I do not recall that their hearings, which went on for at least two months, were ever closed to any witness who might have wanted to testify against the bill.

NICHOLAS ROSA

*1010 Noel Drive,
Menlo Park, California*

Krebiozen and Retine

It has been brought to our attention that the activity of retine is adduced, in various quarters, as evidence for the alleged anti-cancer activity of Krebiozen. We want to state that, judged by the chemical properties of retine and the properties of Krebiozen, as so far published, the two have nothing in common.

ALBERT SZENT-GYÖRGYI

ANDREW HEGYELI

JANE A. McLAUGHLIN

*Institute for Muscle Research,
Marine Biological Laboratory,
Woods Hole, Massachusetts*

Superfluous Textbooks

As one of those who decry the present cost of scientific books, I would like to comment on Crowder's article "Scientific publishing" (8 May, p. 633).

I do not disagree with a cost estimate of say \$15 to \$20 for a report of a conference or a good review of the state of the art. I disagree violently with the idea that every book publisher must have a textbook on every subject. There has been no new development in elementary heat transfer in 20 years. Why do we need two new books every year for introduction to heat transfer? The same situation exists in mathematics and other introductory fields