tent, but we still find that requests for reprints draw negative replies. Many of the foreign journals are not within the reach of all Indian workers, and the cost of Xerox service, even when it is available, is prohibitive. May I therefore ask, through your columns, that requests for reprints from developing countries be given priority by investigators working in more affluent circumstances.

SHANTA S. RAO
Institute for Research in Reproduction, Parel, Bombay-12, India

Brazen Rule

In his most informative review of *Environment, Power, and Society* by H. T. Odum (14 May, p. 664), Leigh refers to a variant of the Golden Rule, the "silver rule": do not unto others as you would not have them do unto you. A much greater departure from the Golden Rule is, unfortunately, all too well known to us. It can operate, or threaten to operate, whenever there are two or more opposing individuals, groups, or societies. This type of behavior deserves a proper metallic label. This might be the "brazen rule": do unto others before they do unto you.

T. EDWARD REED
Departments of Zoology and Anthropology, University of Toronto, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada

Chin Up

If John W. Gardner believes that "talented young people should not . . . be led to assume that there is always a market for talent . . ." (News and Comment, 21 May, p. 823) then I hope that the gods will forgive him and that nobody else listens.

Hear, hear, young people with talent: Don't let the soothsayers shout you down. Talent was, is, and always will be the rarest and most valuable thing in this world, sought for and fought over by everyone who needs someone to help him accomplish anything. Let the prophets of doom droop with their "projections." If you have talent, young man, if you really have talent, then the world is yours and you don't even need me to tell you that.

HENRY FAUL
Department of Geology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 19104

Modern AAAS Responsibilities

Key words in the "AAAS Bible" (the Arden House conference statement of 1951) quoted in Philip Boffey's article on the AAAS mission (30 Apr., p. 453) are "relations of science to government, and indeed the relations of science to our society as a whole." These two "relations" tend to merge, since all branches and agencies of the government are managed by people, and are properly influenced by popular opinion.

The AAAS has access to competent men in all scientific disciplines, and would serve the public well by providing expert advice on government support of science, and by initiating special studies in this connection. Many of the presently neglected problems of science are interdisciplinary, and require active investigation by small working groups in order to get started toward a solution.

I think the AAAS should seize the initiative and set up such working groups, each one charged with producing a brief report within a year or less, with a review session at the next annual meeting. The most difficult requirement is the selection of topics and members for these groups. I suggest that a small action committee with rotating membership be appointed by the Board of Directors with the responsibility of reviewing suggestions from AAAS members or from such government agencies as the President's Science Advisory Committee, the departments of Interior, Commerce, Transportation, Health, Education, and Welfare, and so forth. The committee would organize three or four working groups each year, and evaluate their reports in the light of critiques in special sessions at the annual meeting. Emphasis should be on brevity and specific recommendations for government action. Where there was general agreement, the recommendations should be publicized and formally transmitted to the government agency best able to act upon them.

The general level of AAAS recommendations should be somewhat more on science objectives than on the consumer benefits emphasized by Ralph Nader's "raiders." Examples of topics that could be studied include: cancer research relative to other public-health programs (for a working group of two or three medical specialists, a psychologist, a sociologist, and an economist); national potential for power production (two nuclear physicists, two geologists,

a meteorologist, and an economist); continuation of the space effort (two astronomers, a geologist, a physicist, a chemist, and an economist); the needs for atmospheric research (two aerologists, a meteorologist, a geographer, an agriculturist, a forester, and an economist).

Such reports would have considerable educational value—students might even find them "relevant"—and the studies should become valuable inputs to government from the scientific community. Eventually they might speed up government action to use our advanced technology.

THORNTON PAGE
18639 Point Lookout Drive,
Houston, Texas 77058

Interdisciplinary Science

The general conclusions of Baram's article "Social Control of Science and Technology" (7 May, p. 535) raise in my mind a specter of problems of a greater magnitude than science and society now face. No responsible scientist would disagree that our judicial system has been slow to respond to needed change and that problems relevant to the needs of a complex society are better solved by teams of experts drawn from many fields of endeavor. However, Baram dismisses the current efforts of scientists, and especially biologists, toward these goals, using quotations which are about 180 degrees from most statements I have heard expressed by fellow biologists. Even more surprising is the cursory dismissal of the very real dangers of social control of science and technology as exemplified by Soviet genetics during the Lysenko era.

Baram appears to espouse the oft-heard admonitions of the instant experts of "interdisciplinary" science, who are distrustful of scientific peer groups and perhaps also of man's basically just nature and desire to understand the world he inhabits. I fear that the construction of non-peer, social "do-gooder" agencies specifically given the mission of regulating the range of man's curiosity will do irreparable harm, and may ultimately result in restricting man to the level of the lowest common denominator.

W. S. SILVER
Department of Biology,
University of South Florida,
Tampa 33620