

risk the initial uncertainties of standing for election unless he can do this from the relative security of a legal partnership, business ownership, considerable private means, or a position of leadership in a trade union. By default, our societies are firmly eliminating from potential political leadership an increasing proportion of their most intelligent and able men, because more and more men of the highest caliber are entering a steadily widening range of professions. Professional men in their thirties with family responsibilities, who are on salaries and lack private means, cannot campaign for Congress. In the smaller Western countries, or in times of recession, they cannot readily find suitable professional re-employment if they fail to gain re-election after their first term. This growing group is finding that, while their representatives may not be hostile to their interests, they seldom show intuitive understanding or deep insight into their world. The professional community is educated, aware, and articulate, but Congress and Parliament contain all too few men who readily comprehend this critical group in our dynamic modern society.

By the same token the very best advice of your "devil's advocates" will not be fully effective unless Congress includes enough men with the appropriate background and political savvy to be at once enthusiastic in their vision and cautious in their skepticism concerning proposed legislation in technological areas.

It is becoming urgent to devise conditions under which a reasonable proportion of young professional men with a developed political bent may campaign for election within the present party framework. Public life is notoriously insecure, but the established representative learns to live with this and to slowly build legitimate backstops against his potential failure to achieve re-election. It is the new candidate or the novice congressman who is most clearly "out on a limb." The principal employers of graduates (government, universities, and contract research industries) should seriously consider various schemes to guarantee such a candidate suitable re-employment, at least up to the point where he has been elected to a second term. The number of people involved from any one organization would be minute, and the man being reinstated after one term in Congress might well have grown considerably in overall stature. Beyond the second successful election, the fledgling represent-

ative should be achieving political maturity and should be prepared to face the same future uncertainties as his colleagues in Congress.

There remains the harder task of persuading many local and state conventions to choose sane, honest, well-equipped men as candidates, rather than free-wheeling demagogues with a gift of gab, or of graft. This is a very real problem, and one which is scarcely being discussed at present. Alternatively, the election process is considered (as in your editorial) to be a distinctly dubious means of providing Congress with adequate advice in technological areas. Here we have a dangerous confusion of two equally important but quite different issues. The one is concerned with specific judgments now exercised by Congress, particularly in matters of budget control. The other is concerned with the range of intrinsic qualities and mental outlook among the individuals who will in fact be able to offer themselves as candidates for election to responsible public office in the years ahead.

E. W. RADOSLOVICH
*Commonwealth Scientific and
Industrial Research Organisation,
Adelaide, South Australia*

Disclaimer

The letter by Carleton Putnam (13 Dec. 1963, p. 1419) has already evoked able and thoughtful replies (24 Jan. 1964, p. 306). My attention has been called, however, to a statement in his letter which incorrectly describes the position of the "authorities" listed on pages iv-vii of the George report ("The Biology of the Race Problem," prepared by commission of the Governor of Alabama, 1962). Putnam writes, "*The Biology of the Race Problem* is almost entirely a collection of the views of scientists other than George, views which have been published again and again in scientific books or journals." On the contrary, George's book consists of *quotations* and *abstracts* from published works and *views* which are George's and not necessarily those of the original writers.

The use of a list of "authorities" in a sociopolitical polemic raises a nice point of scientific propriety. The authors cited are not, to my knowledge, misquoted, and the material abstracted is in the open literature. George has a right to use these quotations and even

to interpret them in a manner congenial to the original authors. The racial problem is not unique in having the same data interpreted differently by different individuals. The prominent display of the list, however, tends to mislead readers as to the extent of the scientific support for George's conclusions regarding racial differences and their application to the school segregation problem. Putnam's letter strengthens the possibility of misunderstanding, since it does not contain George's disclaimer (p. vii), "I do not ascribe any particular opinion to any of these people regarding the school integration problem; but as to the specific points on which they are cited, their testimony is authoritative." Unfortunately, only those who know the "authorities" personally will be able to guess at their actual social and ethical convictions. As one of the cited "authorities," I should like to dissociate myself from the implication that I share George's views on the desirability of racial segregation.

JOHN L. FULLER

*Jackson Laboratory,
Bar Harbor, Maine*

... George stated the scientific facts and then drew his conclusion. His opponents have consistently questioned this conclusion and put forward their own conclusions without disproving George's facts or producing any contradictory facts of their own. Yet they have managed to leave with the newspapers and the public the impression that they have refuted the evidence itself. Witness the headlines in the *New York Times* [1 Nov. 1963]: "Scientists Rebut Theories. . . . Say There is No Evidence to Support Any Hypothesis of Inherent [Racial] Differences." Such headlines, never disclaimed, do more than "tend" to mislead.

CARLETON PUTNAM
4415 Kirby Road, McLean, Virginia

Rhythm and Natural Selection

G. Hardin's letter, "Ultimate failure of rhythm" (6 Mar., p. 995), points out very well that if time of ovulation is genetically controlled the use of the rhythm method of avoiding conception would lead to selection for genes causing irregular ovulation. He concludes, "In the long run, the 'natural' method, no matter how perfected, will be frustrated by natural selection." However, several factors which would make se-