

Who won at Beijing 2008?

While the dust is settling over the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games, an event considered to be the greatest ever organized, it is universally acknowledged that China

won, by whatever measure one could bring in.

But the world of sports statistics is as 'dismal' a science as other disciplines

like economics or scientometrics (as a recent editorial¹ in *Current Science* so eloquently expressed). A look at <http://www.swivel.com/graphs/show/29404869> will confirm this. Sean Carmody (<http://twitter.com/seancarmody>) has meticulously dissected the results by medals tally, by weighted score, by GDP, by population, and so on. What intrigued me the most was his observation that 'the country with the most medals per capita is the Bahamas'. Naturally, I wanted to see who among the 87 countries that won medals at Beijing 2008, was at the bottom of the table. I have extracted this from the master table at Sean Carmody's website (http://www.swivel.com/data_sets/spreadsheet/1016460), and it is reproduced in Table 1.

Surely, by this measure the Bahamas and Jamaica won the honours at Beijing. And among the 87 countries that made it to the table, India took the wooden spoon. On a per capita assessment, the Bahamas was 2500 times more effective than India in winning medals at Beijing.

1. Balaram, P., *Curr. Sci.*, 2008, **95**, 431–432.

GANGAN PRATHAP

*Cochin University of Science and Technology,
Kochi 682 022, India
e-mail: gp@cusat.ac.in*

Table 1. On a medals per million basis, the Bahamas won at Beijing (http://www.swivel.com/data_sets/spreadsheet/1016460 extracted on 30 August 2008)

Classification	Rank	Country	Population	Total no. of medals	Medals/million
Top ten	1	Bahamas	307,451	2	6.5051
	2	Jamaica	2,804,332	11	3.9225
	3	Iceland	316,252	1	3.1620
	4	Slovenia	2,029,000	5	2.4643
	5	Australia	21,394,309	46	2.1501
	6	Cuba	11,268,000	24	2.1299
	7	New Zealand	4,274,800	9	2.1054
	8	Norway	4,778,500	10	2.0927
	9	Armenia	3,002,000	6	1.9987
	10	Belarus	9,690,000	19	1.9608
Bottom ten	37	Russian Federation	141,888,900	72	0.5074
	44	USA	304,917,000	110	0.3608
	68	China	1,325,637,000	100	0.0754
	78	Venezuela	27,953,701	1	0.0358
	79	Iran	70,495,782	2	0.0284
	80	Mexico	106,682,500	3	0.0281
	81	Nigeria	148,093,000	4	0.0270
	82	Sudan	38,560,000	1	0.0259
	83	Indonesia	231,627,000	5	0.0216
	84	South Africa	47,850,700	1	0.0209
	85	Egypt	75,219,000	1	0.0133
	86	Vietnam	87,375,000	1	0.0114
	87	India	1,136,961,000	3	0.0026

CSIR–UGC NET life sciences exam: Need for a perceptual change

These are my reflections after reading the correspondence by K. Choudhary *et al.*¹.

A person qualifying CSIR–UGC NET life sciences exam should be an expert not only in modern frontiers of life sciences as the authors claim, but also in classical aspects like systematics, embryology, morphogenesis, anatomy, plant and animal diversity, etc. Without the knowledge of these fields, how can a researcher choose a particular experimental organism for his studies? Biotechnology alone is not the only purpose for which life sciences waited for years and there are no particular branches that can be deemed the acme of life sciences. There are so

many basic scientific mysteries in plants and animals yet to be resolved, but not looked into seriously because of the craze for biotechnology. For the sake of scientific argument I accuse the so-called biotechnologists of being solely responsible for transforming field-oriented productive research into laboratory-oriented fuzzy research. Both field and laboratory-oriented experimentation are required for validating any hypothesis or concept. Will any of the so-called biotechnologists go on a survey of a hill or a plain, tracing the distribution and natural occurrence of the experimental system they work with? In order to avert these inconveniences,

bacterial strains and yeast serve as the prime experimental systems in most of the laboratories. Another awkward observation made by the authors is that the failure to qualify in CSIR–UGC NET exam has led to a shortage of qualified teachers of biotechnology in colleges and universities. More than a life sciences researcher, a biotechnology teacher has to have a broad idea of life forms rather than restricting to forms which accept genetic manipulation or fermentation processes. Coming to their request for specialized biotechnology subject area in the NET exam, again I find the rationale weak for the above-mentioned rea-