

scription of the 1959 situation within grade. It is probably less valid in 1963, since, in the wake of two subsequent federal pay increases, the Civil Service Commission has abandoned above-the-minimum pay as a recruiting incentive—except for a few specialties in grade levels which are attractive to recent degree recipients.

JOHN LYMAN

National Science Foundation,  
Washington 25, D.C.

#### References and Notes

1. E. S. Uyeki and F. B. Cliffe, Jr., *Science*, **139**, 1267 (1963).
2. *Federal Employees' 1961 Almanac*, Federal Employees' News Digest, p. 153.
3. Although the law requires that the Civil Service Commission publish a "full and complete list of all persons occupying administrative and supervisory positions in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government," some agencies seem to interpret this requirement as not applying in detail to "field activities." For example on pages 214–215 of the 1959 *Federal Register* only names of commanding officers are indicated for 19 Navy "Special Field Activities," including several Navy laboratories, and many important Navy activities employing civilian scientists in supervisory or administrative positions are omitted altogether.
4. Two of the shortage categories that I recall were physicist, upper air, and oceanographer, physical. It was amazing how rapidly meteorologists and geological oceanographers switched into these fields.

#### Rhinogradomemorabilia

I was delighted to see [*Science* **140**, 625 (10 May 1963)] G. G. Simpson's very scholarly review of *Anatomie et Biologie des Rhinogrades* by Harald Stümpke.

For years I have been keenly interested in the species *Nasobema*. Morgenstern preferred the spelling *Nasobēm*, the dash over the letter e signifying that the word rhymes with game.

As the learned reviewer regretfully points out, his grant did not allow him to consult the original manuscripts in which principal observations of the creature are recorded. Having to rely on translated translations, I fear that he failed to note a semantic error which has crept into the proceedings and which may well abort the infant discipline of rhinogradology.

Using an unduly loose translation of the recordings of principal observations, Stümpke asserts that the "ancestor of the rhinogrades was plainly a shrew." This is plainly not a shrewd guess at all. Permit me to marshal my material for contradiction:

Morgenstern, in typically poetic fashion, uses a poem to present the *nasobēm* to a world which within a few brief

decades was to be presented with such other precious gifts as nasal sprays and nasal twangs.

Evidence cited in that poem indicates that *Nasobema lyricum* was at least the size of an adult rhinoceros or possibly a very large moose.

In describing the creature, Morgenstern says that it "schreitet." The German *schreiten* denotes a method of locomotion which in English we would call to stride or to proceed majestically. This can hardly be said of a shrew, but is appropriate of a large, somewhat pompous beast which ponderously stomps about on its noses.

I am suggesting that the point here presented will force complete re-examination of all basic concepts in rhinogradology, together with an enormous amount of phylogenetic study by some of our best minds who are currently engaged in study for the other NASA (not the *Nasobema* and Supraterrestrial Agency). This research will probably deplete all uncommitted research grant funds, so that G. G. Simpson may not be successful in obtaining fiscal support for further translations of rhinogradomemorabilia.

I am therefore adding here my own feeble effort, freely adapted from the German, in which I have carefully avoided references to such un-American encyclopedic works as Brehm, Meyer, or Brockhaus:

#### The *Nasobēm*

It nose-strides firmly through the ferns

That *nasobēm* of Morgenstern's.  
Its calf accompanies the critter  
Which is devoted to its litter.

You will not find the genus listed  
As public proof that it existed  
In zo-o-catalogues; its sire  
Was Morgenstern's poetic lyre.

But, none-the-less, the *nasobēm*  
Strides with its calf and without shame

Just as this little rhyme discloses  
Along its way upon its noses.

BERNDT L. KOLKER

University of Kansas City,  
Kansas City 10, Missouri

I am quite fascinated by "the most startling zoological event so far in the 20th century—the discovery of the *Rhinogradentia*. . . ." It broadens my education as a physical scientist beyond my usual sources of information such as the physicist R. W. Wood.

Some years ago I was greatly im-

pressed by the discoveries of the British Museum's expedition to the Gobi Desert, reported in Augustus C. Fotheringham's monograph on *Eoornis Pteroveloxy Gobiensis* (Buighleigh Press, London, 1928). This was reviewed in the *Cornell Daily Sun* of 6 March 1934, and the monograph was reprinted in 1948 in a fourth edition, of which I have a copy.

The discovery and the remarkably full descriptions of this bird, including its habits, life history, anatomy, cytology, physiology, pathology, and social and moral significance, together with 38 photographs and drawings deserve to be recalled as another "startling zoological event" of the 20th century.

WORDEN WARING

Fairchild Research and Development  
Laboratory, Palo Alto, California

#### Report Evaluation:

##### Quality or Quantity

No one can question the validity of your editorial [*Science* **140**, 577 (10 May 1963)] entitled "Some needed reforms," and I am sure that we deplore those practices that you deplore, endorse those corrections that you suggest, and generally agree with your statements.

However, you failed to mention one reform, a reform that would call upon university administrators to devote more time to evaluation of the quality of research reports, and much less to quantity, when deciding upon increases in rank, salary, or both.

Contrary to general opinion, research people have not resigned membership in the human race. We too have assumed responsibility for mortgages, education of our children, medical expenses and so forth. University administrations frequently deny the existence of a "publish or perish" philosophy, but their actions deny their words. In practice the philosophy is based on a count of published papers rather than a weighing of their worth.

In light of this, who can honestly condemn the researcher who takes the easier path and publishes frequently if not well?

I find myself incapable of proposing means of implementation. If you can devise a way for those who determine our futures to evaluate papers on their worth, we shall all be in your debt.

JOHN F. BESTER

University of Southern California,  
Los Angeles 7