

Letters

Hysterical Advice

I doubt that Robley C. Williams and his colleagues (Letters, 22 May) would ask for or accept President Nixon's advice in seeking a solution to an intricate problem in molecular biology. . . . The President's problem in Southeast Asia is highly technical and complex. It requires courage, also an expertise not found in baby doctors, college youths, chaplains, politicians, Nobel laureates, or even in molecular biologists and virologists, however sincere in their protest or competent in their own fields. Of course, any citizen may properly express disapproval of the war and may demand an end to it. The question, obviously, is *how*? Few scientists or politicians are qualified to tell President Nixon exactly how to end the war or to threaten him with political punishment if he doesn't adopt the dangerous run-sheep-run technique implied in those hysterical words "immediate withdrawal" used so unscientifically by Williams and his colleagues.

PAUL F. RUSSELL
Westover, North Edgecomb, Maine

Recently 44 Nobel laureates were quoted as requesting the President "simply and urgently" to take decisive steps toward a "termination of U.S. participation in the southeast Asian war" (12 June, p. 1325). It is of interest that the type of men who so punctiliously refrain from expressing opinions outside their niches in their particular disciplines should so easily be inveigled into participating in a political pressure group. They apparently assume that political competence is common to all men. Their action assumed no responsibility and contained no discussion of methods, consequences, or alternatives. Do these appellants mean that the President should issue an order today that all troops in Southeast Asia be immediately evacuated? If not immediately, when? Why? How? These are specifics that the President must consider in *his* discipline. Only now, after several years of war, are some legislators

beginning to realize this need for responsibility in advocacy, as the public must assume responsibility when it votes. Political action by authorities on molecular biology, bacteriology, and other respected categories of study is not helpful. It can be understood in students of 18 or 20 years of age. Nobel laureates should know better.

ALBERT S. ARKUSH
*501 Forest Avenue,
Palo Alto, California 94301*

"Loaded" Committees

Philip M. Boffey and John Walsh (22 May, p. 949) report two criticisms of the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior, namely, that potentially hostile critics have been vetoed and that the television industry has been given overly prominent representation on the panel.

Several pages later Nancy Gruchow reports that the President's Task Force on Science Policy has called for a doubling of NSF's budget and a more integrated management of federal support for scientific research and graduate education. The task force consists of 13 persons. Seven are university personnel and at least two others are directly associated with scientific research.

Isn't it time we looked at overrepresentation of our own "industry"?

J. PETER WHITE
*Department of Anthropology,
University of California,
Berkeley 94720*

Education: Lost in the Shuffle

The editorial by A. Hunter Dupree (10 July, p. 131) reveals, in an indirect way, the underlying cause of the difficulties our universities now face. Education is the basic reason for the existence of the university. Public support for the

university rests on the unarticulated but fundamental premise that students can receive a superior education there. The present actions of the federal government are largely in response to the disenchantment of the public with the universities which, they feel, have been distracted from their primary responsibility for education. But Dupree's editorial and several other recent editorials and articles in *Science* illustrate the fact that education is regarded by many faculty members as only one of several diverse functions and responsibilities of the university.

Universities would do well to devote their attention to education as their only proper endeavor. Political, moral, and social reform, for example, are not areas in which the public is willing to grant the university a role of leadership, however fervently the university community wishes it would. The partnership between government and university of which Dupree writes must ultimately be based on the concept of the university as an educational institution. I believe it would dispel much of the present confusion over the role of the university in our society if we clearly defined our educational function and critically examined other activities with the question, "Does this activity contribute to the educational goals of this institution?"

A. J. DESSLER
*Department of Space Science,
Rice University,
Houston, Texas 77001*

Rational Turn to an Oracle

I was fascinated by W. Ross Ashby's letter (15 May) explaining that "chance is in no way a 'denial of rationality' . . . [but rather] the intelligent man's method of selection when he knows that the quantity of information available to him as selector is less than the quantity of selection demanded of him." Ashby hereby provides the epistemological justification for the use of the I Ching and similar systems of divination. It is the rare human decision that is based on the necessary quantity of information. Most are exceedingly difficult precisely because the information on which one could base a "rational" decision is unobtainable: Should I marry this girl? Is this the right job for me? Therefore, after subjecting one's situation to the most rigorous analysis possible (in Ashby's words, "use all that you know to shrink the range of possi-