

reproduce the results claimed by the Russians have failed). But any such new discoveries, we can be perfectly sure, will involve not the overthrow of neo-Mendelian genetics, but its fruitful extension.

Prof. Nuzhdin is responsible for the statement that "Huxley . . . is forced to serve a definite purpose, his masters dictate their will to him. To oblige them he published his slanderous article against the Soviet Union" [sic]. It is probably enough to direct the attention of readers of *Nature* to the fact that a responsible man of science can make such astonishing, false and unsupported allegations. But I take this opportunity to state publicly that no individual or organisation even suggested, much less urged or ordered, that I should write anything on the subject; that, apart from the standard rate of payment made by *Nature* to its contributors and the customary royalty arrangements with my publishers, I have received no fee or payment for writing my articles or book on the subject; that my only salaried employment since 1942 has been in the service of an international agency of the U.N. (Unesco); and that I wrote the articles at Naples before returning to Great Britain from the Unesco Conference in Lebanon.

In conclusion, I wish emphatically to deny Prof. Nuzhdin's statement that my attitude towards the Lysenko controversy is dictated by anti-Soviet bias or that "it is just another link in the general campaign which the reaction is waging against the Soviet Union". In point of fact, I have always been highly appreciative of the achievements of Soviet science in general (see my little book, "A Scientist Among the Soviets" (1932)); and my article on the state of biology in the U.S.S.R. in 1945, in *Nature*<sup>2</sup>. What I have been concerned about are the methods, shocking to free men of science, which have been employed to proscribe a branch of science on ideological grounds. I must refer readers to my book "Soviet Genetics and World Science" (1949) for confirmation and for the lurid and almost incredible details.

JULIAN HUXLEY

31 Pond Street,  
Hampstead,  
London, N.W.3.

<sup>1</sup> *Nature*, 165, 704 (1950).

<sup>2</sup> *Nature*, 156, 254 (1945).

### Technological Education in Great Britain

NUMEROUS documents and articles have discussed the difficult problem of technological education in Great Britain, and it is remarkable that few contributions have appeared from the technical colleges. Indeed, some statements betray a complete ignorance of what is being done in major colleges of technology. At the conference held in the Royal Society's rooms on March 27 (see *Nature*, April 22, p. 627), the views of only one principal of a technical college are mentioned, whereas many associated with the universities are quoted. It is this omission that has prompted me to write this letter. In a leading article in *Nature* of May 13, p. 737, it is stated that "the question of higher technological education lies right outside the field of technical colleges in general, as at present constituted. Their function is essentially the provision of the vastly greater number of technicians which industry also requires; and to equip and staff them essentially for the training of technologists

would impede the performance of their primary function."

The words "in general" possibly limit the application of this statement, although how is not clear. It is true that the majority of technical colleges in Great Britain come within the category mentioned above; but some of the major colleges of technology do not. It is the failure to appreciate that those few (the Percy Committee suggested twenty-seven) colleges of technology are providing education mainly for the technologists and not for technicians that leads to endless confusion. These major colleges of technology have three-, four- and five-year full-time courses in operation which are often of university degree standard in content and attainment, and they are attended by large numbers of students. These are the colleges which should be included in any discussion on higher technological education, for the courses in these colleges are founded on research and, where appropriate, on basic science. Most of the colleges do not provide courses for technicians to any greater extent than the universities and university colleges.

A further problem is presented by the establishment of 'national colleges' which will undertake the most advanced work and research in a technology. For example, a National College of Rubber Technology (of which I am director) is being financed from Government funds through a Ministry of Education scheme, and some of its work will be associated with the Northern Polytechnic. It is highly undesirable that Government or other funds should be wasted in creating an exactly similar establishment under the University Grants Committee. Assuming rubber technology to be a suitable subject for a first-degree award—degrees in many similar technologies are already awarded in universities—can it be justly contended that because the courses are established under a Ministry of Education scheme, the students are necessarily unsuitable for, and are to be deprived of the chance of obtaining, a first degree or a truly equivalent qualification?

The few major colleges of technology I have in mind are providing higher technology, worthy of a degree or equivalent award. The students have full social and athletic facilities which compare favourably with those in the universities. The staffing is comparable, although the recent increase in university salaries without a corresponding increase in the salaries in colleges of technology has embarrassed the latter, who are now losing their staffs to the universities. Like the universities, they could, of course, be improved. However, their facilities should be used and developed to the full, either by affiliation with the university scheme or by having available a national award equivalent to a degree. Possibly what is more important, these colleges should not be ignored in discussions on higher technology. Most of the views expressed in the article in *Nature* are as acceptable to the colleges of technology as to the universities; but it must be appreciated that these colleges of technology are not technical colleges established primarily for the equally important function of training technicians. They are not offering technicians' courses, and would require complete reorganisation if they were to change from higher technological education to instruction of technicians.

T. J. DRAKELEY  
(Principal)

Northern Polytechnic,  
London, N.7.