cides that existing books do not fit his course needs, who proceeds with the development first of course notes and then of a manuscript. It is the faculty member's peers at other colleges who decide that the manuscript is good and desirable, and signify that they will adopt the book if published. You may be sure that the publisher could not himself create the book and absorb his own output.

Perhaps the best refutation of Hoenig's statement is furnished, appropriately enough, by a review in the same issue of *Science* (p. 41). Commenting on a new Addison-Wesley book, the reviewer said: "What a wealth of books on algebra . . . are available today! However, it is probable that Haag's *Structure of Algebra* is close to unique; certainly it meets a definite need."

I rest my case.

LESLIE J. WILSON
Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Massachusetts

Money, Accounting, and Research Talent

In production or the buying of services and in the development of ideas to accomplish specific purposes, accountants have developed methods for keeping track of expenses and of just what each dollar is buying. On such an accounting basis Congress might properly say, for example, that it is costly and inefficient for every government department to engage in scientific research, and that such research should be centered in one agency—the National Science Foundation. Another department—for example, Defense—might then attempt to justify a research program of its own by proposing specific projects, tightly budgeted, with red tape to limit duplication, and so forth.

But all this defeats its own purpose, because it destroys the atmosphere in which science thrives and because executive attempts to control research, and the time spent by researchers in justifying their work, add unnecessary costs. The point of this communication is that there is another and different answer to the question of how the money that Congress allocates to research can best be spent.

Money made available for scientific research buys talent—talent of a type that is hard to obtain in any other way. Good research attracts good scientists, and they in turn attract talent of other kinds, in development and engineering. Such talent is very responsive if properly treated, and its presence helps give a department the power to accomplish its purpose in many ways. No matter what specific research the individuals are working on, by their intelligence and independent thinking they inspire the whole department. Every department needs talent of this kind.

It does not matter where research is done (in fact, history teaches us that some of the most significant results come from the most peculiar and unpredictable places). The results become available to all, and the knowledge is power that the whole society can use to its advantage—to feed and clothe itself better, to defend itself better, to keep the peace better.

What Congress might well ask the executive departments, then, is: "Have you got your proper share of scientific talent? Are you paying those of outstanding talent enough to keep them? Are you paying the mediocre ones little enough to encourage them to go elsewhere? Are you contracting out enough research to universities to have sufficient contact with and feedback from these main centers of talent and excellence? Are you leaving the talent in your employ free to recognize and exploit new understanding? Is your accounting system able to tell you how much excellence you are buying, or is it telling you only how much mediocrity you have working on 'projects'?"

WALTER H. BRATTAIN
P.O. Box 239, Murray Hill, New Jersey

Timing Calls for Papers

Calls for papers for scientific and technical meetings are received anywhere from 10 months before the deadline for papers or abstracts to a week or two *after* the deadline. Somewhere between the two extremes must lie the ideal lead time for issuance of calls. Too early issuance gives people time to forget about the meeting before the deadline; issuance too late at the very least annoys contributors, and at worst results in major loss of papers.

A recent survey by Technical Meetings Information Service indicates that most people want at least 2 months' lead time; my own experience indicates that 6 weeks between release of call and deadline is an absolute minimum. Here is a more detailed schedule of time to allow. The time given is after receipt of the call. Two more weeks should be allowed for printing, mailing, and delivery of the calls.

Operation	*Weeks*
Routing calls via interoffice mail, posting on bulletin boards, or publicizing in internal company newsletter	1
Time required for potential authors to react and submit abstracts for internal company processing	2
Editing abstract and obtaining internal company approval for release	3
Total	6
If Department of Defense security clearance is required, add	8
If complete papers are required rather than abstracts, add	4
If the call is sent to a monthly magazine for publication, add	5

Each of the totals obtainable from the above figures should be considered a minimum. To be on the safe side, an additional 4 weeks should be allowed. Thus, the lead time for issuance of calls should range between 10 and 27 weeks, depending on the conditions specified.

HARRY BAUM
Technical Meetings Information Service, New Hartford, New York

Intrauterine Ring

I fully agree with Greenberg's reserved attitude toward Bellamy's appraisal of the intrauterine contraceptive pessary (Letters, 19 June, p. 1409). I would even go much further than Greenberg and emphatically warn against this device. In a considerable percentage of cases it produces the adverse effects Greenberg mentions. Furthermore, it appears very probable that it does not prevent the ascent of spermatozoa and the fertilization of the ovum but merely prevents or disturbs its nidation and development, that is, induces an early abortion of the fertilized ovum.

Besides that, it is not such a cheap device as Bellamy believes, since its insertion as well as its control and removal require the services of a well-trained gynecological specialist. Finally, there is no need for such a hazardous device since there are other more reliable and harmless contraceptive devices available.

JOSEF NOVAK
1199 Park Avenue, New York 10028