

my report. After lengthy debate and several amendments, the *Statement* was returned to the executive board with instructions to submit a revised version to the Fellows for a mail referendum.

At this point, David Aberle introduced a resolution condemning the United States' actions in Vietnam. After several amendments which eliminated specific reference to the United States and called on all parties to the Vietnam conflict to seek methods of peaceful solution, the resolution was passed at the end of the meeting which already had lasted some 3 hours.

Readers of the Marshall and Suggs letter could not escape the impression that there was but one meeting, that the meeting was asked to approve the "Beals report" rather than the *Statement* by the executive board, and that the Vietnam resolution and the report and *Statement* were connected. None of this is correct.

In the January 1967 *Fellow News-letter* the executive board and I published a "Background report on problems of anthropological research and ethics." This is the only printed document dealing with the findings of my survey. The executive board also circulated by mail a revised *Statement on Anthropological Research Problems and Ethics*, together with a ballot. Over 70 percent of the Fellows returned ballots and 92.5 percent of these approved the *Statement* ("Anthropologists overwhelmingly approve research ethics statement," 21 Apr., p. 365).

Contrary to assertions by Marshall and Suggs, the *Statement* does not condemn individuals working for the CIA; rather it objects to anthropologists pretending to carry on research while secretly working for the CIA. Marshall and Suggs also assert that the intention of the *Statement* is to make it undesirable for anthropologists to work for the government on "realistic administrative terms." The *Statement* clearly expects anthropologists and anthropology to be used in government and makes concrete representations for the improved use of anthropology. In Washington I found wide awareness that the present "realistic administrative terms" are not producing the kind of social science assistance and advice that government needs.

Quite aside from their misrepresentations of the *Statement* and its confusion with my report, Marshall and Suggs do not understand the function of a professional organization and are unable to distinguish the responsibilities

of the citizen and the scientist any more than are the proponents of the so-called Aberle Resolution as expressed by the Bordaz' letter in the same issue of *Science*.

RALPH L. BEALS

Department of Anthropology,
University of California, Los Angeles

Interdisciplinary Communication

The response to the article, "The skin" (by Rushmer, Buettner, Short, and Odland, 21 Oct. 1966, p. 343), was a deluge of requests for reprints from an astonishing diversity of undergraduate, medical science, clinical, and industrial laboratories. One objective of the article was to determine whether interest could be stimulated in applying the competence and technology of many diffuse disciplines to this most accessible of tissues. Accordingly, after publication, a questionnaire was devised and mailed to 500 individuals who requested reprints. A list was also enclosed, giving the names and addresses of the first 433 respondents, arranged according to their professional affiliation. The third enclosure was the reprint of the article.

Responses to the questionnaires must be evaluated with caution (see Tables 1 and 2) since there may be significant discrepancies between what people think and do and what people *say* they think and do. The need for caution is well expressed in *How To Lie with Statistics* [D. Huff and I. Geis (Norton, New York (1954))]. The principal reasons given for requesting the reprints included current research activity, interest in multidisciplinary research, and information content of the article. Of the respondents, 83 were sufficiently interested to write additional details regarding their research and many sent informative reprints. The number of individuals who stated they routinely request reprints (22) before reading articles (16) was smaller than I would have anticipated. One might expect some reluctance to check these two questions.

In response to question 2, nearly half (134) indicated that a list of names and addresses of investigators interested in the same subject would be of interest to them, and 61 indicated that the prospects of setting up a cooperative or collaborative relationship was appealing. A substantial number (51) indicated that they planned to seek in-

Table 1. Questionnaire on reprints and distribution of responses.

Choices	Distribution
<i>Question: Why did you request reprint?</i>	
Engaged in studies of the skin	120
Planning studies of the skin	47
Interested in multidisciplinary research	139
Intrigued by the philosophy	35
Specific details were of interest	121
Need to refer to certain points	93
Routinely request reprints	22
Request reprints before reading the articles	16
Other reasons	83
<i>Question: Will the enclosed list of names be of any interest to you?*</i>	
I discovered a potential collaborator with similar interests	19
The prospects of setting up a cooperative or collaborative relation are appealing	61
Will contact one or more of the individuals listed	28
Will seek information from one or more of the individuals	51
Other reasons	28
<i>Question: How would you regard circulation of such lists?</i>	
Generally useful	88
Useful for specific types of articles	146
Waste of time	48
Imposition	2
Unethical or reprehensible	2
No reply	22

*Yes: 134; no: 147; no reply: 26. Several respondents made more than one choice.

Table 2. Summary of disciplines represented by the 308 individuals who returned questionnaires.

Biology	16	Medicine	18
Psychology	11	Pediatrics	6
Anatomy	12	Psychiatry	8
Biochemistry	15	Cancer	8
Microbiology	11	Radiation	10
Pathology	13	Public health	15
Pharmacology	14	Dentistry	10
Pharmaceutical industries	11	Veterinary medicine	12
Physiology	16	Unclassified	71
Dermatology	18	Surgery	9
		Engineering	4

formation from one or more of the individuals. The most common suggestion was for more information regarding the specific research interest than was conveyed by departmental affiliation or addresses. Despite this obvious defect, nearly half of the respondents indicated that such lists of names and addresses would be useful for specific types of articles.

Judged from this particular experience, multidisciplinary research can be encouraged to some degree by publication of articles emphasizing questions requiring investigation rather than reports of what has already been accomplished. Such efforts are most likely to be rewarded if the manuscripts are published in scientific journals serving a large segment of the scientific community. More communication between disciplines should be established by every reasonable means.

ROBERT F. RUSHMER

Department of Physiology
and Biophysics, University of
Washington, Seattle 98105