of engineering (fluids, structures, and mechanics). What runs up the cost of books is the greed of publishers who talk faculty members into writing unneeded textbooks so that each publisher can get a share of the market.

Last year I considered writing a text on vacuum engineering. I inquired of every U.S. book publisher, and they all indicated that my book would be the only book on the subject. Well, I didn't write the book, and now I am glad, because *five* new books on vacuum engineering came out in 1963–64. I refuse to believe that publishers do not know what the competition is doing, and I can only conclude that I was deliberately misled by publishers' representatives who came to the university to persuade faculty members to write textbooks.

STUART A. HOENIG
College of Engineering,
University of Arizona, Tucson

Timing of Research on Social Change

Wolfle's editorial of 6 March chides social scientists for not taking better advantage of opportunities to study the impact of major social changes and cites the 1964 tax cut as an example. Readers of *Science* will be interested to know that the Brookings Institution has just launched a project to measure consumers' responses to the tax cut. The study will be based on successive quarterly reinterviews during 1964 and early 1965 of a panel of households interviewed last year by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. It will be undertaken as part of Brookings' program of studies of government finance, supported by the Ford Foundation. The Council of Economic Advisers took the lead in stimulating the interest of the various groups involved, and your editorial did not go unnoticed during the discussions.

The Federal Reserve Board is planning to extend its survey of financial characteristics of households for 1964 and 1965 and to obtain income and saving data for 1963 and 1964. This will provide annual data for comparisons of saving, by income classes, before and after the tax cut, while the Brookings-SRC study will provide information on the timing of responses to the cut.

Much of what is said in the editorial regarding the reluctance of many social scientists to study political, social, and economic changes as they occur is justified. Nevertheless, the editorial went too far in three respects:

1) Economists were well aware of the need for a study of the impact of the tax cut; in fact, planning did take place before the cut was enacted. But the uncertain legislative situation made it awkward to approach a foundation or government agency for support of such research before the tax cut actually became law. The Ford Foundation was sounded out about the possibility of helping to finance the study a few days after the President approved the bill, and it acted on the grant request within a month.

2) You overstate the availability of funds for large-scale projects in the social sciences. While it is true that such funds have been growing in recent years, they are insignificant compared with those available for research in the natural sciences. The money for a Mohole project, or for a high-energy accelerator, would finance all the research now done in economics for many years to come.

3) We do not have a mechanism for launching studies quickly in the social sciences. Money is doled out in relatively small amounts and only after time-consuming negotiations. The Brookings-SRC study is an exception to this rule. It would not have been approved in time had it not been for the enthusiasm of the Council of Economic Advisers, the existence of an ongoing program at Brookings for research in this field, and the willingness of the Ford Foundation to move rapidly.

It is hoped that this experience will help to draw attention to the critical need for establishing special procedures to facilitate prompt action on significant research opportunities when the occasion calls for it.

JOSEPH A. PECHMAN
Brookings Institution,
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW,
Washington, D.C. 20006

All in the Same Boat

In a letter to *Science* (29 Nov. 1963) E. L. Klingelhofer explained the misspelling of scientists' names by his psychology students (each student had been asked to list ten names) as a possible indication of "deepseated and general hostility toward scientists. . . ." Commenting on this admittedly psychoanalytic interpretation, A. R. Patton (7 Feb.) wondered whether Klingelhofer would not have found that this hostility "extends far and wide" if he had also asked for ten names of composers, novelists, football players, heads of nations, and so forth.

Intrigued by these speculations, I requested the students (40) in my introductory psychology class to write the names of ten scientists, ten novelists, and ten composers. The mean number of misspelled names per student for each category was as follows: scientists, 1.1; composers, 1.3; novelists, 1.0. "Cavalier renditions of names," as Klingelhofer put it, appeared in generous proportions for all three categories. Here are some choice examples: Avogrado, Beckerel, Calperneous, Einstine, Frued, Gallieo, Pablov, Sauck, and Switzer; Bache, Bettoven, Chikoufski, Heiden, Lyst, Motzart, Shopan, Struss, and Stravischi; Dostovesky, Falkner, Hemmingway, Lawernce, Maupesant, Mellville, O'Henery, Warton (Edith), and Weilder. These data would seem to dim that "small ray of hope" which Klingelhofer held out to the humanist. Evidently we're all in the same boat.

FRANK COSTIN
Department of Psychology,
University of Illinois, Urbana

Logical Conclusion?

In his 1 May editorial ("Distribution of federal research funds," p. 491), Philip Abelson imaginatively transcends the simple notion that research funds are to support research. He points out that doing research makes a man a better teacher and suggests, in effect, that some research funds be diverted from the most competent scientists to less competent ones teaching in some 700 institutions in this country which award baccalaureate or higher degrees in science but at present receive no research grants from NSF.

We can go even further. Good students can choose their colleges but not their high schools, and students are influenced early. Therefore, why not give research grants to all high school biology teachers? In fact, just as doing research makes you teach better, it makes you learn better, so why not . . . .

ROGER MILKMAN
Syracuse University,
Syracuse, New York