That there are problems and challenges in the development of the SSC dipole magnets comes as no surprise. Producing the dipole magnets is probably the single greatest technical challenge in building the collider. In any technically demanding program, the R&D phase is where problems are uncovered and solved. It would be unrealistic to expect every prototype to achieve all final design goals.

As part of our overall analysis and assessment of the SSC design, the Collider Dipole Review Panel produced a strong, critical report. The new SSC Laboratory is grateful for their fine effort. As their report shows, we do know how to build individual SSC magnets. The next step is to finish developing the methods for building all the magnets needed to achieve the great scientific promise of the SSC.

ROY F. SCHWITTERS
Director,
Superconducting Super Collider Laboratory,
2550 Beckleymeade Avenue, Suite 240,
Dallas, TX 75237–3946

Response: Key aides to the House and Senate appropriations committees and the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee told *Science* just before the publication of the article that they did not recall receiving copies of the magnet report. Schwitters says the report was available to anyone who requested it. That may have been the case, but the SSC Laboratory made little effort to see that it was widely circulated to Congress before legislators had to decide how to vote on measures to double SSC's $100-million budget and to start construction.

As for the magnets' operating margin, Department of Energy officials have previously maintained that an upper performance bound of 6.7 teslas at 4.35 K would be adequate. The report issued by the review panel was the first open acknowledgement that a higher operating field would be necessary, if the SSC is to operate as advertised.

—MARK CRAWFORD

Asian-American Students

I write with reference to two News & Comment articles about Asian-American students, one by Constance Holden (18 Aug., p. 694) and another by Robert Buderi (18 Aug., p. 694).

Neither article clearly distinguishes between native-born and U.S.–born Asians. National Research Council data analyzed by Betty Vetter (*1*) demonstrate a vast difference in earned U.S. science and engineering degrees between these groups of Asians. Educational research focusing on cultural (including family) influences on learning, notably the studies of Harold Stevenson (*2*), also supports the conclusion that there are significant differences between oriental students schooled and nurtured in their native cultures and oriental students born, nurtured, and schooled in the United States.

Understanding such differences is essential to consideration of the issues Holden and Buderi discuss. If research data on these differences are ignored by admissions officers, then our educational systems and our students will get the wrong message.

CECILY CANNAN SELBY
School of Education, Health, Nursing, and Arts Professions,
New York University,
New York, NY 10003

REFERENCES

1. "Early release of summary statistics on science and engineering doctorates" (National Science Foundation, Washington, DC, 1988).
2. H. W. Stevenson, *Child Dev.*, in press.