

EDIE FILTER

POPULAR CLARIFIER OF MANY PROBLEMS

WHAT'S YOUR 1959 JUNIOR SCIENCE FAIR PROJECT, EDIE?

I'M PLANNING A CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF STAINLESS STEEL.

WOW! SURE SOUNDS COMPLICATED!

NOT IF YOU USE EATON-DIKEMAN FILTER PAPERS.

SAY EDIE, HOW COME YOU ALWAYS USE EATON-DIKEMAN PAPERS?

BECAUSE THEY'RE MADE UNDER RIDGID QUALITY-CONTROL METHODS AND ARE ABSOLUTELY FREE FROM MINERALS.

I HEAR E-D FILTER PAPERS ARE BEST FOR CHROMATOGRAPHY, TOO!

YOU'RE SO RIGHT!

For more information, and FREE samples of E-D Filter Papers, write to

THE EATON-DIKEMAN CO.
Filtertown
Mt. Holly Springs, Pa.
"First with filter paper exclusively"

Title II of the act provides for student loans of up to \$5000, and in section 205 (b) (3) provides for cancellation of the obligation to repay up to 50 percent of the loan as a reward for specified time spent in teaching in public elementary or secondary schools. Thus, a student borrower who after graduation goes into teaching is entitled to what amounts to a bonus of up to \$2500. Yet regardless of the fact that a science department believes the man well qualified to teach science, he must also satisfy the education course requirements, which have been lobbied into the regulations in most states. The student who won't give time to all the required education department courses is penalized up to \$2500, and his services are lost to the public-school system. The student who must heed the \$2500 bonus provision must spend time on education department courses which might be better spent on solid subject-matter courses. The Defense Education Act thus becomes in effect a force feeder for the already disproportionately large education departments.

It seems more important than ever that scientists and science departments rather than educationists should prescribe the qualifications for science teachers—that a science department teaching recommendation be admitted in lieu of an arbitrary number of education courses for teacher certification. The American Association for the Advancement of Science can properly advise state regulatory bodies that the quality of teaching will be improved, not lowered, by elimination of all education department courses not deemed necessary by the science department to fit each individual case.

WILLIAM W. PORTER II

Los Angeles, California

Scientific Communication

A recent editorial [*Science* 127, 1145 (1958)] and a letter by D. Lebo [*Science* 128, 424 (1958)] have called attention to increasingly critical problems of scientific communication. Some attributes of an improved communication system are (i) capability of evolving from the existing system; (ii) reduction of delays in communicating results; (iii) coverage of a broad range of scientific interests (reversal of the trend toward overspecialized journals); (iv) guarantee of self-determination to the individual author (elimination of editor-referee censorial power and of pressure toward source-material abridgment); (v) guarantee of self-determination to the individual subscriber (elimination of unwanted material from his mail, unlimited availability of wanted material); (vi) incurrence of no added cost.

The following hypothetical system illustrates the possibility of reconciling these apparently divergent requirements. The contributor prepares a full account of his research, sparing no detail. He also prepares an abridgment of perhaps two pages and a conventional abstract. The full account receives an identification number and is permanently filed in a central repository. The abridgment is printed, with its number, in a bound journal resembling (except for its broader scope) the appropriate existing journal. Thus, the necessary evolutionary link with the present system is provided. The abstract is not, as now, adjoined to the article but is printed, with identification number, on a separate card.

The journal subscriber receives with each issue the corresponding stack of abstract cards (optionally he might wish to receive only the cards). These may advantageously be border-punched cards [G. Cohn, *J. Franklin Inst.* 266, 133 (1958)], partially prepunched to provide rough classification assistance. Most of the border holes are left unpunched, to allow the subscriber to apply his own information-retrieval methods and adapt his punching system to his personal needs and mnemonic habits. (The required tools are simple: a punch and a sorting needle. To retrieve abstracts in a given category, form cards into a deck in any order, pass the needle through the appropriate hole, spread and lift the deck; the punched cards fall out.)

By postcard, included with the abstract cards, subscribers request photocopies (or other facsimile reproductions) of those full accounts that interest them. If the latter prove scientifically exceptionable, the volunteer "referees" have a professional obligation to communicate their suggestions to the authors. Profiting from such criticisms, authors may issue revisions to supersede their earlier accounts. The constructive aspects of the present refereeing system are thus retained and enhanced, since a maximum number of maximally interested referees are effectively consulted. The editor, too, plays a more constructive role. He can select for full publication articles worthy of general attention, or those for which the demand exceeds the resources of economical facsimile copying, but he suppresses nothing and delays nothing.

Subscribers might be entitled to annual allowances of facsimile material, extra requests being charged on a per-page basis. The reprint problem is solved automatically. Savings in type-setting costs resulting from the abridgment policy might offset the cost of abstract cards.

It is hoped that these suggestions may encourage scientists to experiment with evolutionary improvement of traditional publication procedures.

T. E. PHIPPS, JR.

Falls Church, Virginia