The intellectuals' association with the activists and street demonstrators in Los Angeles in June is most unfortunate. Admittedly most of the demonstrators were peaceful, but some of them were not, and their willingness to resort to physical assault has been amply demonstrated to administration officials at various points around the country. The ads in the West Coast papers calling for demonstrators were thinly veiled incitements to riot. The Los Angeles police knew this, and they had no intention of permitting the President of the United States to be physically assaulted. As for the peaceful ones: "He who lies down with dogs will rise up with fleas."

The intellectuals have much to offer the nation, but a Ph.D. does not also confer omniscience and infallibility in world affairs. The harsh realities of politics indicate that Lyndon Johnson will be president until 1972; if the intellectuals wish to serve the nation (and I hope they do) they had best make their peace with him. Without Johnson's acquiescence they will be effectively excluded from the decision-making process of government, to the detriment of us all. Perhaps if the intellectuals stop bombing Johnson now he may negotiate.

ROBERT M. LUKES
223 Bramton Road,
Louisville, Kentucky 40207

Accelerator Project Problems

I was deeply disappointed by the antiscientific flavor of Nelson's commentary (21 July, p. 294) on the 200-Bev accelerator project. Although I have a special interest in this matter, I believe that my disappointment must be shared by anyone who believes, as I do, that basic research is one of the most important, stimulating, and rewarding activities of modern-day man. The New York *Times* editorial of 16 July, which was gratuitously reprinted by you, would have been similarly disturbing except for that newspaper's previous advocacy of the project at a time when the State of New York was still in the running for the site. In view of this reversal of position, one might easily conclude that regionalism was a factor with the New York *Times*. . . .

Also the quote used by Nelson did not come from Wilson's letter to Senator Pastore as claimed, but rather from

a telegram that he and I jointly sent to Illinois legislators at the time of their consideration of open housing statutes. Thus, although the words are ours, the framework within which they fit is quite different from the one reported in Nelson's article. . . .

We fully intend that the Laboratory shall be aggressive and imaginative in seeking ways to achieve *de facto* open opportunity. Toward this end we have adopted a nondiscriminatory pledge which must be signed by any landlord, owner, or agent who wishes to list housing with the Laboratory. We are actively seeking ways in which the Laboratory will be truly accessible to the labor force and talent of the minority groups now located in Chicago. As the Laboratory recruits employees from these minority groups, it will play an active role in establishing accessible housing in the communities immediately surrounding the Weston site.

EDWIN L. GOLDWASSER
National Accelerator Laboratory,
1301 West 22 Street,
Oakbrook, Illinois 60521

Because of a production error, for which Nelson was not responsible, the quoted excerpt from the Wilson-Goldwasser telegram to the Illinois legislature was mistakenly described as having come from Wilson's letter to Pastore. The telegram was actually an enclosure in Wilson's letter to Pastore. The error, though small, is regrettable. Also regrettable is the inclination of many persons in the high-energy physics community to brand as "antiscientific" (i) those who do not share their enthusiasm for high-energy physics, in this case the New York *Times*; and (ii) those who reprint the views of those who do not share their enthusiasm. The *Times* editorial was not "gratuitously" reprinted. It was deemed to merit space in the news columns, because, as was stated in an introductory note, the editorial represented a departure from the *Times*'s longstanding, undeviating support of all basic research. Since the *Times* is generally considered to be a publication of some influence, there is every conceivable justification for bringing this turn of events to the attention of the scientific community. The advancement of science, to which *Science* is dedicated, is not served by the perpetuation of fantasy or obliviousness toward attitudes that do not coincide with those held by particular segments of the scientific community.—D.S.G.