

have coincided with our own views from the outset. This would have been clearer if space limitations had not prevented our including in the article a column, "Based on whose work," which is part of our longer study (*Mental Health Research Institute Communication No. 273*, May 1970). This column lists Pareto among the forerunners of work on the social welfare function (19), and Moore and Frisch among the pioneers of econometrics (54). Pareto is also listed among the forerunners of general systems analysis (40).

The contribution of Marx to the role of innovations in socioeconomic change (12) seemed to us rather remote and general as compared with the more direct forerunners of Schumpeter's work on innovations (not interest rates), such as Böhm-Bawerk, Walras, Edgeworth, and Clark, all of whom we listed as pioneers. The role of Mitchell and the National Bureau of Economic Research in the 1920's as pioneers of national income accounting (39) did not seem to us as important as it does to Stigler.

The question of dating contributions which developed over a number of years is notoriously difficult. We listed Pareto together with Gini under the theory and measurement of income inequalities (1), despite Pareto's publication of 1897, because we felt that much of the decisive development toward making the theory operational in terms of measurements and quantitative comparisons across countries and groups occurred after 1900. We similarly included the next six contributions on our list, all of which started before 1900, but which seemed to us to have reached full stature only thereafter, such as Weber's work on bureaucracy (2), and Freud's development of psychoanalysis and depth psychology (4).

To have excluded these seven cross-1900 contributions would have made the post-1930 period look much more productive and still more quantity-oriented than the 1900-1930 period. It would also have increased the relative weight of a few major U.S. research communities, such as Chicago and Cambridge, and the weight of the cases in our study which were team-oriented, capital-intensive, and connected with research institutions. Thus it would have strengthened still further some of our findings. We chose to do the opposite: to include these borderline cases and to report those findings that would survive their inclusion.

Accepting Stigler's views on all these

matters or listing Samuelson's contribution as "comparative statics," rather than under our broadly interpreted heading of "econometrics" (54), would not have changed our major findings.

Collins' comments are much more distant from the nature of our study. In essence, he proposes an entirely different one. His notion of "real" science is centered on "explanatory theory," while our operational definition of a major advance called for the discovery of a demonstrable new fact or relationship, or of a repeatable new method or operation, and, in any case, for a major impact on social science. In the work of Maxwell, Hertz, and Marconi, it seems that Collins would have looked for their "explanatory theory," which was the "ether" theory, long since discarded. We would look at Maxwell's equations, Hertz's waves, and Marconi's wireless telegraphy, all of which remained lasting and cumulative contributions even though the accompanying explanatory theories have changed.

Collins, however, also objects to the finding of our study. He perceives them as denigrating the importance of the work of individuals in a "scholarly" and "ivory-tower" setting, and as extolling large team projects with "government funding." But the words "scholarly" and "government funding" are not ours.

We do report that much work came, and presumably will continue to come, from relatively few locations of concentrated intellectual effort such as London, the two Cambridges, Chicago, New York, and Washington. But most of this work was scholarly, as we understand the term, and though much of it required a good deal of capital, there were a wide variety of sources of support, public and private. We did not find that most of the advances required large bureaucratically organized research teams, nor did they need monolithic control by a single organization. What seems to have worked best were small teams in large places—a spatial concentration of stimulation and support, a plurality of persons, organizations, and initiatives, and some communication with the world of practical needs.

Here again, our main findings would stand, even if we had included the cases which Collins recommends. The work of Barnard and Maye, together with the studies that developed from it, was not a lone wolf affair, nor was it unconnected with the needs of practice. Likewise, the work of Michels and Lipset on power in organizations, of Becker

and Goffman on the social labeling of deviants, and of Chomsky (which we listed) on structural linguistics would have fitted in well with our findings of location at a relatively few centers, some connection with practical needs, and rising requirements of manpower and capital in recent decades.

KARL W. DEUTSCH

JOHN PLATT, DIETER SENGHAAS
*Department of Government,
Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138*

Registry of Women Scientists

I am a biologist engaged in the very disheartening task of seeking a teaching position for the fall 1971 academic year. Typical of the replies to my letters of application is the letter I received from the University of Colorado stating that "just under 300 applications" had been received for the position I sought. It is obvious that schools seeking faculty for 1971 will have an excellent market to select from—so much so that it would seem possible to hire exactly the person a school wanted. Accordingly it seems appropriate for schools hiring faculty to concern themselves with any imbalance (race, sex ratio) that might exist in their departments.

It is interesting to note that, at the recent meetings of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology held in Chicago, a group of women registered at the meeting organized themselves into the Association of Women in Science. The purpose of this new organization is "to promote equal opportunities for women to enter the professions and to achieve their career goals." An immediate aim of the new organization is to prepare a North American registry of women in science. This registry will be available to professionally trained women seeking employment and to employers seeking to fill academic or industrial positions. Thus, the registry will be of help to Magasanik (19 Feb., p. 631) in his desire to add qualified women to his staff. Inquiries regarding membership in the Association of Women in Science can be addressed to Dr. Gertrude Schloer, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, City University of New York, New York 10029.

PHYLLIS HARBER

*Argonne National Laboratory,
Argonne, Illinois 60439*