two examples of ways in which this attitude might be fostered.

First, farmers whose crops are raided by monkeys should be directly compensated for their losses. Thus an individual farmer might choose to plant specifically for monkey consumption and expect to receive fair market value for the food the monkeys eat.

Second, villages should be encouraged and helped to build and maintain large monkey corrals in which known populations could be maintained. Training should be provided to keep simple records of births and deaths within the corrals. Animals harvested from these corrals could bring a premium price because of known parentage, age, and, perhaps in the long run, disease history.

Similar examples could be provided without difficulty. The exact form that commercialized monkey farming would take depends in some measure upon the methods by which the program were financed and administered. Here there are a number of options, including multilateral governmental programs (the United Nations), bilateral governmental programs (between the United States and Indian governments), and programs involving existing or newly developed private Indian enterprise operating under contract to major monkey users (for example, the National Institutes of Health). In our opinion this last approach would be the most economic of time and money. But in any case the criterion for success will be involvement of those people who are closest to the sources of supply. Providing these farmers and villagers with valid incentives for participation in a sound harvesting program would allow the development of a mutually beneficial arrangement between their economic needs and the maintenance of monkey populations. This is the positive balance that will bring success.

GORDON BERMANT
S. CHANDRASEKHAR

Battelle Seattle Research Center,
4000 N.E. 41st Street,
Seattle, Washington 98105

Polemic in the Political Arena

Many scientists and officers of science-oriented organizations have been expressing alarm at the growing disenchantment of the public with science and the support of science research with public funds. May much of this be our own fault?

. . . When a relatively well-known person such as George Wald can fill a column in *Science* (Letters, 11 Dec.) with a polemic on a political subject and close it with the statement "This is what President Nixon plans to hire 1000 new FBI agents to enforce," one is entitled to question whether such a scientist and science publication are entitled to much public respect. If Wald wishes to write like a ward heeler in a political fight, he is entitled to the deference and respect given to such persons, and if *Science* wishes to open its columns to such petulant and unscientific statements, it does no service to science or to scientists.

F. N. PETERS

400 Golden Gate Point, Sarasota, Florida 33577

I am sure George Wald would resent any attempt by an attorney to interpret his laboratory research for him. He might then leave the art of interpreting or construing statutes to those who are expert in *that* field.

A major problem with statutes is that they may be too narrowly drawn, so that if the legislator blunders, the crook goes free. The accepted solution is to follow the example of the U.S. Constitution and draw the statute in broad and ambiguous terms. What is genuinely a crime does not then escape punishment because it was not so specified in meticulous detail—an impossibility if the statute books are to be kept to reasonable size.

Obviously, the broadly-drawn statute must then be construed appropriately. The FBI agents to whom Wald refers are themselves attorneys, for the most part, as are all federal prosecutors. We might assume they have at least a modicum of common sense. . . definitive construction of statutes is done by the courts. One element which the courts require in a criminal prosecution is *mens rea,* or criminal intent. . . . I would anticipate that any court would be willing to take judicial notice of the fact, for instance, that to do chemical research requires possessing chemicals.

Far from being a positive contribution, Wald's letter attacking certain provisions of the Organized Crime Control Bill may be regarded as typifying the single most dominant problem occurring at the Science-Society interface, namely, scientific arrogance. And, unfortunately, the bigger the "name" that suffers from presumptive omniscience,

the greater the damage that is done. Is it any wonder, then, that the policy-makers seek to send the scientists en masse back to their test tubes with an air of don't-call-us-we'll-call-you? [A case in point, from the letter (11 Dec.) of Robert S. Morison: "the difficulties such scientists will encounter if the political leadership of the country persists in basing its recommendations on conventional wisdom rather than on scientific evidence."] If the political leadership wished to conclude that scientific objectivity is not all that it's cracked up to be, I, for one, would not blame them one bit. . . .

WILLIAM S. LOVELL
Oregon College of Education, Monmouth, Oregon 97361

Women, Please Apply

The role of women in society is being reexamined. The participation of women in many fields of endeavor is often restricted by their sex even when their qualifications are not in question. In "Women in Academe" (25 Sept., p. 1284), Patricia Graham argues that this is the case in the academic community and discusses a number of factors reinforcing the situation. Among these are subtle discrimination against women; adverse social consequences of women's success; reduced internal aspirations and expectations; ambivalences about combining career and family on the part of women; and other cultural factors. The article also suggests corrective measures, the most significant being an increase in the number of women faculty.

It has been argued that women scientists tend not to seek faculty positions in departments such as ours because of the very factors discussed by Graham. We recognize the existing obstacles. If women are to participate in science, we must actively support qualified women who aspire to do so. As a first step, we are making the effort to locate qualified women for faculty positions in our department in the areas of neurobiology and development. We would be pleased to learn of suitable candidates. We hope that other faculties will take similar action.

BORIS MAGASANIK
Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge 02139