full-scale epidemiologic study would be justified. Since a closer perusal of these lists does not support this belief (*2*), the full-scale study is not justified. Our 1981 report specifically states that "This [the investigation of multiple myeloma in these veterans] should not *at first* involve a full-scale epidemiologic study" (emphasis added). The implication is clear that the full-scale study might follow if evidence of increased risk were found.

In my opinion, the 1983 multiple myeloma panel carried out fully the recommendation of the 1981 panel.

BRIAN MACMAHON
School of Public Health,
Harvard University,
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

References

1. "Panel on Feasibility and Desirability of Performing Epidemiological Studies on U.S. Veterans of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Final Report to Director, Defense Nuclear Agency" (National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1981).
2. "Panel on Multiple Myeloma among Hiroshima/Nagasaki Veterans. Final Report" (National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1983).

R. Jeffrey Smith writes about a recent National Research Council (NRC) report assessing the evidence for allegations concerning an unusually high incidence of multiple myeloma in U.S. veterans who participated in the occupation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The article does not distinguish between the motivation for directing a question to the NRC and the manner in which the NRC addresses the questions it accepts. Federal agencies bring questions to the NRC for a variety of reasons, sometimes because they need an authoritative answer to a scientific question that lies at the heart of a social or political issue. It is the NRC's function to find in the question those elements where scientific analysis and judgment of the facts by a balanced committee will assist the agency and the nation in determining their policies. Contrary to the implication in the article that the NRC mixed politics with science, the authoring committee in its report dealt only with the scientific issues.

The comments by Seymour Jablon and Brian MacMahon should be understood in the context of the distinction I have drawn above.

A second important point is that the study was *not* intended to be primarily an epidemiologic investigation. Its purpose, to paraphrase the contractual charge, was to examine allegations that there is an unusually high incidence of multiple myeloma among veterans of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki occupation forces and to present what is currently known about the incidence rate of multiple myeloma in similar populations. That is exactly what the NRC committee did, and its report does not portray the study as a full-scale epidemiologic effort. When one considers the charge to the committee, the methods used to identify and evaluate all possible claimants were appropriate. Except for the official from the National Association of Atomic Veterans, the persons quoted in Smith's article appear to agree with our committee's basic findings, and we believe that the NRC has successfully answered the scientific question that it was asked to address. Unfortunately, the social and political concerns survive.

ALVIN G. LAZEN
Commission on Life Sciences,
National Research Council,
Washington, D.C. 20418

Control of Ph.D. Programs

Dennis Doverspike (Letters, 5 Aug., p. 506) comments on my remarks (Letters, 24 June, p. 1336) and raises to the most general level the issues posed by the differences between Steven W. Mosher and the Stanford anthropology department (News and Comment, 13 May, p. 692). I would like to clarify a few issues raised in my *Society* article (July/August 1983, pp. 4–15), from whence my letter derived, and to place in sharper relief the issue of who should control Ph.D. programs.

First, no one is seriously asserting "that only scholarship and not behavior should determine who is awarded a Ph.D." Rather, the notion of misbehavior is so broad that for it to be employed as grounds for dismissal requires the public documentation of such presumed personal forms of misconduct. To do otherwise is to return graduate studies to a darker age of not so long ago, when behavior was linked to conformity and even to denigration rituals as "proof" of scholarly worth.

Second, professional responsibility is precisely what caused candidate Mosher such grave anguish. Responsibility to women who were victimized by unwanted eighth- and ninth-month abortions and responsibility to parents faced with official criticisms of those who had more than one or two children and were encouraged to engage in unofficially sanctioned acts of infanticide. It is precisely this ambiguity in the notion of professional responsibility—to anthropology as a science of discovery or to a discipline with a narrow code of conduct—that led

the issues in the Mosher case to become entwined with the concerns expressed by Doverspike.

Third, not only a faculty has the "right to decide who may study." The history of 20th-century academic life is partially at least a history of the democratization of that life. And democracy means precisely the adjustment and adjudication of the control of graduate programming and decision-making. This implies a role for the administration, the media, the courts, and, yes indeed, the relevant graduate students. Surely we have not come so far in the counterrevolution against the counterculture as to deny the elemental reforms that it brought about.

IRVING LOUIS HOROWITZ
Department of Sociology,
Rutgers, the State University of
New Jersey, New Brunswick 08903

Breeder's Rights and Germplasm Diversity

In his article "The international breeder's rights system and crop plant innovation" (4 June 1982, p. 1071), John H. Barton states that "there should be international legal requirements prohibiting any restrictions on the export of germplasm (but allowing import quarantines), encouraging or requiring the collection of native materials as part of the process of spreading new varieties, and laying down much stronger requirements for placing material into collections as part of any patent process." This is desirable, he argues, for purposes of the maintenance of germplasm diversity. However, one adverse effect of such a requirement would be to deny the country the possibility of benefiting commercially from the presence of unique genetic resources within its jurisdictional boundaries. In such a case the country has little incentive, other than altruism, to incur costs to protect unique species. Thus commercial pressures for deforestation and other activities that may result in the destruction of species are not balanced by incentives for protection resulting from the possibility of capturable commercial gains that might accrue to the country at some future date. Perhaps allowing for patents and exclusive rights to unique species is one way to effectively promote their preservation.

ROGER SEDJO
Forest Economics and Policy Program,
Resources for the Future,
1755 Massachusetts Avenue, NW,
Washington, D.C. 20005

Sedjo is quite correct that breeder's rights laws and flow restrictions on international germplasm could create a material incentive for nations to preserve unique species. Under current or likely laws, however, this effect is only indirect. Existing breeder's rights laws exclude natural species; the sensed need for novelty along with practical legal requirements for uniformity and identifiability make it hard to extend the law to cover such species. Conceivably the holder of a protected variety might be required to pay royalties to donors of major genetic sources of that variety; such an approach would create a major barrier to breeding research and is explicitly rejected in current law.

The free flow approach appears preferable. Flow restrictions would impose severe costs on research, and there are already strong altruistic motives and scientific traditions supporting germplasm preservation.

JOHN H. BARTON
Stanford Law School,
Stanford, California 94305

Longevity of Women

Apropos Constance Holden's article "Can smoking explain ultimate gender gap?" (News and Comment, 9 Sept., p. 1034), it is easy to believe that traditionally heavier smoking by men contributes greatly to the relatively greater longevity of women. But heavier drinking, too, must be considered.

Next in line of culprits, I propose the after-dinner nap. Think of the good cooks now enjoying sprightly later years who traditionally jumped up from the dinner table and spent up to 2 hours scooting around the kitchen cleaning up while hubby hoisted himself to his feet, lumbered into the living room, sank into his easy chair with his newspaper, or stretched out on the couch for an hour of shut-eye. No wonder Kannel finds that "women maintain the advantage" as regards cardiovascular mortality.

This, too, shall change! As women's smoking and drinking habits come to more closely resemble those of males, even the good cook will be piling the dishes hastily into the automatic dishwasher and dashing into the living room to join hubby in front of the television set, while the cholesterol accumulates equally in the sedentary vessels.

JULIA F. MORTON
Morton Collectanea,
University of Miami,
Coral Gables, Florida 33124