Letters

Education of Science Teachers

The recent exchange of letters on the education of science teachers [*Science* **129**, 744 (1959)] has shown clearly that a major point of disagreement between educationists and their opponents concerns the utility of education courses. On the one hand, the educationists assert that teaching is a profession which requires special, professional training; on the other hand, many people feel that anyone who knows his subject well can teach it satisfactorily. In practical terms, the question is: Can a college graduate teach as well, in his major subject, as a graduate with the corresponding degree in education? And, more generally, what mixture of education courses and "content" courses will produce the best teacher?

Both sides have produced arguments to support their views, but there has been very little objective evidence to support either view. What evidence there has been is one-sided, rather than comparative. Thus, the educationists ask, "Can 50 years of research in education be ignored?" while their opponents point out that education courses are widely regarded by undergraduates as easy to pass and negligible in content. What is needed in order to remove the controversy from the realm of mere verbal sniping to that of informed and intelligent debate is a body of facts on the effectiveness of teachers who have been trained in different ways.

A direct way of obtaining this information would be to compare the scores, on a nationally administered series of tests, of two groups of students: those whose teachers majored in education and those whose teachers majored in the subject concerned, without taking any education courses. Such tests already exist, and teachers of the second type are already at work with temporary accreditation in many places. Thus it might be possible to obtain the desired information from statistics or other information which already exists; on the other hand, it might be necessary to set up an extensive experiment, selecting teachers and students with appropriate backgrounds in order to free the comparison from systematic effects which might distort results obtained from the existing data. (For example, if poor students tend to take education courses because they are "easy to pass," this must be allowed for in comparing the intrinsic utility of education *courses* with that of "content" courses for training of teachers; but if we are interested in the relative effectiveness of education and "subject-matter" *graduates* as teachers, then such effects should be ignored.)

Until some such study is made, I do not see how the present controversy can be anything more than a difference of opinion which, for lack of evidence, cannot be resolved.

ANDREW T. YOUNG
11 Buena Vista Park,
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Luminous Wrist Watches

Joyet [*Bull. acad. suisse sci. méd.* **14**, 367 (1958)] reports that the average man's luminous wrist watch contains 0.36 μc of radium and the average woman's watch, 0.13 μc, both being of the type in which the entire dial is painted. A man wearing such a watch 24 hours a day receives a gonadal dose of about 21.8 mr/yr, and a woman receives about 12.7 mr/yr, as measured by Joyet.

A sample of 224 persons (a group of Government employees in New York City in all of the occupation categories and levels represented) was investigated. Questions were asked and observations were made as to type of watch and wearing habits, with the results given in Table 1.

When Joyet's results were combined with the results for this sample of New Yorkers, it was found that the average gonadal exposure of the 224 persons is calculated to be 3.83 mr per year per person. The fact that very few, if any, persons in the age group up to age 30 or 35 wear watches for the first 10 or so years of life should not be ignored. This would tend to reduce the figure 3.83 to about 2.5 mr/yr. This reduction might be offset slightly by the fact that, of the luminous watches worn, a larger fraction is worn by younger than by older adults. This was a general observation, and findings were not tabulated.

If we assume, then, that the average annual dose is about 3 mr from birth to age 35, the 35-year dose will be about 0.1 r, as compared with the estimate by Laughlin and Pullman of 0.03 r (range 0 to 0.3 r) given in the National Acad-

Table 1. Data on the wearing of luminous watches from a survey of 224 Government employees in New York City.

Item	Men	Women
Total number questioned	148	76
Number wearing watches of all types	114	57
Number wearing luminous dial watches:		
Less than 10 hr/day	0	0
10–19 hr/day	34	2
19–24 hr/day	16*	0

* Only one watch found with luminous points (Joyet's category P).

emy of Sciences report of 1956. This amounts to about 3 percent of natural background radiation and only about 1.5 percent of the total radiation dose derived from background plus medical and dental exposure to the gonads, as currently estimated.

HANSON BLATZ
City of New York Department of Health, New York

Ruth Benedict

Julian Steward, in his long and prevailingly generous review [*Science* **129**, 322 (1959)] of *An Anthropologist at Work, Writings of Ruth Benedict,* raises three issues which seem to call for clarification. He interprets my discussion of Ruth Benedict as a "figure of transition" as referring to her role in linking together the Boas period of anthropology and one small segment of contemporary culture and personality research known as "national character." I did not use the term in any such parochial sense, but rather in reference to the whole intellectual climate of opinion of the second quarter of the twentieth century.

Steward asks why I did not mention the Kardiner-Linton seminar held at Columbia University in the late 1930's. At the time that Abram Kardiner independently began to apply psychoanalytic theory to the study of culture, the major theoretical lines for the study of personality and culture (as in John Dollard's *Criteria for the Life History*) had already been worked out by Roheim, Sachs, Fromm, Erikson, Frank, Dollard, Sapir, Gorer, and myself, and Ruth Benedict was already familiar with them. Kardiner's one new contribution—his theory of primary and secondary institutions—neither she nor I found useful. Although it is uncertain to what extent Ralph Linton mediated the existing literature to Kardiner, I have always regarded Kardiner's work as an example of historical parallelism.

On the third point, the extent to which Steward feels that the Columbia University department of anthropology was, during his membership in the department, a continuation of the Boas tradition, Steward himself is surely the best authority.

MARGARET MEAD
American Museum of Natural History, New York

Winchester's Genetics

In a review of A. M. Winchester's book, *Genetics* [*Science* **129**, 91 (1959)], the reviewer dismissed the book as one that he could not recommend for use by students of the subject. He commented that the book was apparently written for college students with little formal education, and he seemed to imply that there was something wrong with such a text being anthropocentrically oriented. Since the book was published by a distinguished publishing house, and the series in which it appears is edited by a geneticist who was also then a member of the Editorial Board of *Science,* it seemed to me that something must be awry somewhere. I therefore sent for a copy of Winchester's book, and having read it I have now satisfied myself where things went awry. They went awry with the reviewer. He committed the cardinal sin of reviewing, namely, reviewing a book at a level for which it was not written and at which it was never intended to be read. The author quite clearly sets out the classes of readers for whom the book is intended: the nonspecialist student in genetics, the student of psychology, sociology, or medical science, and those wishing to take the course as an elective or as a part of a general education program.

As one who has had to learn his genetics from books, and who has read a representative number of them over the course of the years, I should like to protest the reviewer's unfair dismissal of this book, and to go on record as saying that Winchester's book is, in my opinion, a book eminently well suited to meet the requirements of a first and perhaps only course in genetics for the student who is not specializing in the subject. The text is clearly and soundly written, the illustrations, tables, and figures are clear and quite generally most interesting in themselves, and the problems are most helpfully constructed. The orientation toward man makes the book unusually interesting.

ASHLEY MONTAGU
321 Cherry Hill Road, Princeton, New Jersey

While it is true that Winchester's book is meant to appeal to students of varied backgrounds, it is apparently meant for biology students as well. This point, however, is really quite unimportant, for the real issue is whether any textbook that treats its subject in a trivial and superficial manner should be used in any course in our universities.

Montagu is entitled to his opinion of the book, but his obvious appeal to the authority of a member of the Editorial Board of *Science* is unworthy of serious comment. I am sorry, however, that I have piqued the sensibilities of an anthropologist by complaining about the excessive anthropocentric orientation of a textbook of genetics.

S. R. GROSS
Rockefeller Institute, New York