Department heads will need to do more than just refuse to have NIH career fellows in order to ameliorate university teaching and attitudes. Some suggestions are:

1) University salary scales and promotion policies must reward good teaching.

2) Teaching involves more than lecturing. Introduction of graduate (and some undergraduate) students to modern research methods and thought is no less important, and generally it is better done in the laboratory or the seminar room than in the lecture hall.

3) The position and function of the graduate student must be reevaluated. It is largely through the graduate student that current attitudes and abuses will be transmitted to future generations. One way to minimize the manipulation of students would be to adopt the external examiner system, so successfully used at many universities throughout the world, to insure a reasonable standard of performance, and to adopt a rule that dissertation research is published only under the name of the student who did the research.

The real research parasite in the university is the individual who feeds on the research of others who are under him. At least if he has a career award he will have more time to do some of his own research.

CLYDE MANWELL
2 Greenway, Plympton,
Devonshire, England

Population Control in Man

Judging by Wynne-Edwards's conclusions ("Self-regulating systems in populations of animals," 26 Mar., p. 1543) and by subsequent letters (14 May, p. 892; 25 June, p. 1669), the greatest interest in population-control mechanisms is their identification in human society. Many of the mechanisms of control in primitive man mentioned by Wynne-Edwards (for example, human sacrifice and deliberate impairment of fertility) appear to be tied in with rituals which had no feedback mechanism—that is, they would continue to operate with the same intensity regardless of whether the population were declining or increasing. Without feedback, such mechanisms cannot be biologically useful. Other factors mentioned, such as "social interaction"—conventional competition, communication, and organization—appear to be peripheral and relatively minor and ineffective as population controls in human society.

Historically, populations of man appear to have been controlled largely by famine, pestilence, and war. Each of these has a built-in feedback mechanism. Famine does not occur when population density is low; pestilence spreads slowly when population density (and resultant social contacts) is low, but rapidly and through a higher percentage of the population when population density is high. In primitive times, war appears to have been waged largely by one tribe against neighboring tribes as a means of expanding (or defending) its hunting or agricultural territory. In primitive times, therefore, war as a population control may be regarded as analogous to fights which occur between songbirds, each trying to establish (or defend) its own "territory." The winning tribe, with its newly won resources, could expand; the losing tribe was killed, enslaved, or driven to less hospitable territory. As tribal units have grown into nations, and as technology has increased the population-supporting potential of most land areas, war has taken on new meaning—it has been waged just as much for ideological reasons as for the acquisition of resources for living.

Modern civilization has largely conquered pestilence. Moral and ethical development has made modern nations more likely to help their neighbors in adversity than to prey on them; war as a method of population control now seems intolerable—especially since it has the potential of destroying civilization itself. Of the three great historical population controls, only famine remains unaltered. Since the recent revolutions in industry and agriculture, the specter of famine has grown dim; it has not disappeared but has been pushed by technology out of sight around a curve in the road ahead. We may yet push famine a little farther beyond the curve, but the world's population appears to be approaching that curve at high speed. Is man to revive war as a means of population control? Or is he destined for a brutal encounter with famine?

Gibson's observation (Letters, 14 May, p. 892) that the rate of population growth of several nations was declining before World War II gives us hope that there is an alternative. Gibson points out that the controls were social—"late marriages and small families were fashionable." He neglects to point out that knowledge of contraceptive methods made this type of social control possible. Among populations that have little knowledge of contraception (for example, India and China), social controls are largely ineffective. Such populations, even now, are limited primarily by pestilence and famine.

Can man use his intelligence and rationality to avoid war and famine by making social control of the world's human population a reality? Or are his collective actions so circumscribed by ignorance, lack of understanding between nations, religious taboos, or blind faith that a loving God will provide, that there is no real alternative to war and famine?

VICTOR E. ARCHER
4370 Spruce Circle,
Salt Lake City, Utah

Metric System

The recent announcement of the British government's decision to abandon the English system of measurements and adopt the metric system should arouse serious thought among American scientists. The admission by the British that their own long-cherished system of weights and measurements is inefficient and unsuited to modern progress and world economy should make Americans consider whether they are going to be the last to hang onto a system of wholly incompatible units, each divided into fractions without common denominators, whereas a fully logical decimal system has been in use in continental Europe and elsewhere for years.

It is considerably to our discredit that U.S. foreign-aid missions have been sending abroad specialists unaccustomed to the metric system. These people have been fostering education, mechanization, agriculture, and so forth, based on the English system, often badly confusing people in new nations, some of which had just adopted the metric system on gaining their independence from Britain, and hampering improvements in other areas where the metric system has been in longer use. . . . Surely a start in the right direction can be made with our people and products going overseas, as well as with education in our country in general. British manufacturers have learned that they have to make products with