

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

1970

GUSTAF O. ARRHENIUS	RICHARD C. LEWONTIN
FRED R. EGGAN	ALFRED O. C. NIER
HARRY F. HARLOW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
MILTON HARRIS	

1971

THOMAS EISNER	NEAL MILLER
AMITAI ETZIONI	BRUCE MURRAY
EMIL HAURY	JOHN R. PIERCE
DANIEL KOSHLAND, JR.	

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

DAEL WOLFE

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News Editor: JOHN WALSH

Foreign Editor: DANIEL S. GREENBERG*

News and Comment: LUTHER J. CARTER, PHILIP M. BOFFEY, JOEL R. KRAMER, ANDREW HAMILTON, NANCY GRUCHOW, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research Topics: ROBERT W. HOLCOMB

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART

Editorial Assistants: JOANNE BELK, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, CORRINE HARRIS, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, MARSHALL KATHAN, PAULA LECKY, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, MARGARET LLOYD, VIRGINIA NUSSLE, PATRICIA ROWE, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, BARBARA SHEFFER, RICHARD SOMMER, YA LI SWIGART, ALICE THEILE, MARLENE TUCKER, MARIE WEBNER

* European Office: 22 Mulberry Walk, London, S.W.3, England (Telephone: 352-9749)

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

KAY GOLDSTEIN

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Robert S. Bugbee, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); MEDFIELD, MASS. 02052: Richard M. Ezequille, 4 Rolling Lane (617-444-1439); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Herbert L. Burklund, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772)

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: 202-387-7171. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page 7, *Science*, 4 July 1969. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Chance, or Human Judgment?

For some kinds of decisions, chance may be better than human judgment. Adoption of the policy of selecting draftees by a random drawing of birth dates has been widely commended as the most democratic method available when the number of men who must be drafted is only a fraction of the number of men available.

If risk should be allocated by lot, perhaps benefit should be also. The Federal City College (the new land-grant college in Washington, D.C.) had many more applicants than could be admitted to its first class. Selection on the basis of grades or test scores was inappropriate, for the institution was intended to be an "open door" community college. A lottery solved the selection problem. In December, the arts and sciences college of the University of Illinois used a lottery to choose its quota of 3350 new students from among 4200 well-qualified applicants for admission in the autumn of 1970. In this case, the 850 losers were less impressed with the democratic fairness of a lottery than were the 3350 winners; public pressure, including pressure from parents of rejected applicants, persuaded the university to reconsider, and to accept all 4200 qualified applicants. The university has, however, announced that, if necessary, it will use random selection for 1971.

There are other selection decisions that could be made by chance. Traditionally, the best medical care has been available to the affluent, and in some places also to the indigent. If excellent medical care is not available to everyone, would not allocation on a random basis be more equitable?

A general principle can be stated: when the number of eligible people exceeds the number who must bear a particular burden or who can receive a particular benefit, the most democratic, equitable, and moral basis for allocation is by chance.

* * *

The use of a lottery to decide who will receive a benefit that cannot be granted to all or who will bear a burden that need not fall on all is a denial of rationality. Under an earlier method of selecting draftees, local draft boards could take into account the particular circumstances of individual men and the particular needs of the country or the communities in which they lived. Errors and biased decisions no doubt occurred, but the system honored the rational judgment of a group of one's fellow citizens, not the luck of the draw.

To choose students by a random process is to deny the ability of the faculty to select those applicants who show greatest promise or who appear most likely to benefit from higher education.

In times of battle or catastrophe, a triage officer selects the ill and wounded who most need, and who are most likely to respond favorably to, prompt medical attention. A physician is surely more competent than a pair of dice to make such decisions and to determine which patients should be given access to limited medical resources.

To use a lottery to allocate risks or benefits is not only a denial of rationality, it is also a denial of man's humanity; each man is reduced to a cipher, distinguished from other ciphers only by the uniqueness of the combination of digits that identify his records in a growing number of office files.

* * *

Should Judgment wear a blindfold, or should she be required to see the persons judged?—DAEL WOLFE