

New Microfuge 11 & 12 The Little Centrifuges with Big Centrifuge Features.

Everyone's familiar with Beckman Microfuge™ centrifuges. They're indispensable in research, clinical, and industrial labs for spinning down small samples fast.

Now Beckman offers two advanced Microfuge models with features you'd expect only in larger centrifuges, plus higher speeds, forces, and increased capacity.

The Microfuge 11 holds tubes in slides, like the Microfuge B. But it generates much higher centrifugal forces—up to 11,600 g with a full load of 18 1.5/1.8 mL tubes.

The Microfuge 12 holds even more tubes—up to 60 of the 1.5/1.8 mL size—and spins them at even higher forces—up to 12,200 g. It's color-coded tube holders are also tube racks, and there is a clever holder/rack for decanting 1.5-mL tubes for such applications as RIA: you simply squeeze the sides of the holder together while inverting the tubes.

Both Microfuge 11 & 12 offer variable speed settings with precise speed control: you set the speed you want, and the 11 & 12 run at that speed no matter what the tube load. Both 11 & 12 have imbalance

BECKMAN

Microfuge 12

detection: the motor shuts off if the rotor has been seriously misloaded. And both models have automatic reset timers, a convenience for repetitive

BECKMAN

Microfuge" 11

runs. If you're in the market for a microcentrifuge, get one with big centrifuge

with big centrifuge features. Write for brochure SB-570 to Beckman Instruments, Inc., Spinco Division, 1117 California Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94304.

Special Offer: As an introductory offer, we'll give you \$200 off the price of a new Microfuge 11 or 12 with trade-in of any Beckman, Eppendorf, or Fisher microcentrifuge, regardless of its condition. Offer limited to one trade-in per new Microfuge 11/12, valid in the U.S. and Canada only; expires June 30, 1981.





Circle No. 373 for the Second Addendum to Catalog '80.

Highest specific activity CATECHOLAMINES Epinephrine, levo-[N-methyl, ring-2;5,6-3H]-

95-145Ci/mmol 0.2N Acetic acid:ethanol, 9:1, under nitrogen, foil-wrapped vial, dry ice NET-696 250μ Ci 1mCi

Norepineprine, *levo-*[*ring-*2,5,6-³H]-40-60Ci/mmol

0.2N Acetic acid:ethanol, 9:1, under nitrogen, foil-wrapped vial, dry ice NET-678 250μ Ci 1mCi 5mCi

Dihydroxyphenylethylamine hydrochloride, 3,4-[ring-2,5,6- ³H(N)]-

40-60Ci/mmol Ethanol:0.2N Acetic acid, 1:9, under argon, foil-wrapped vial, dry ice NET-673 250μ Ci 1mCi Circle No. 386 on Readers' Service Card

NEWEST LIGANDS

Call or write for our complete list of over 100. Adenosine receptor agonist Cyclohexyladenosine, N 6-[adenine-2,8-3H]-Adenosine receptor antagonist Diethyl-8-phenylxanthine, 1.3-[phenyl-4-3H]-Serotonin-2 antagonist Mianserin hydrochloride, [N-methyl-3H]-GABA agonist Piperidine-4-sulfonic acid, [ring-3H]-Irreversible cholinergic antagonist Propylbenzilylcholine mustard hydrochloride. [propy/-2,3- ³H]-Histamine-2 antagonist Tiotidine, [methyl- 3H]- (ICI 125,211) Potential barbiturate receptor ligand (1,3-Dimethylbutyl)-5-ethylbarbituric acid, (-)-5, [butyl-2,3,4-3H (N)]-Circle No. 387 on Readers' Service Card

Custom design and synthesis of **PHOTOAFFINITY PROBES**

Labeled in alanine-1 position to prevent possible loss of label by hydrolysis

Azido-2-nitrophenyl-β-alanine, **N-4-**[*alanine*-1-1⁴C]-40-60mCi/mmol Ethanol:water, 7:3, foil-wrapped vial, dry ice NEC-769 50 μ Ci 250 μ Ci Circle No. 388 on Readers' Service Card

TRH [125**I**]

Carrier free. Tested for binding and displacement in a specific RIA. Standard curve supplied with shipment.

Thyrotropin releasing hormone, [¹²⁵]- (monoiodinated pGlu-**His**-Pro-NH₂ ~2000Ci/mmol carrier free

~2000Cl/mmol carrier free Propanol:water, 1:1 NEX-153 10μ Ci $2x10\mu$ Ci 50μ Ci $2x50\mu$ Ci Prepared fresh for stock 2nd Monday each month Circle No. 389 on Readers' Service Card

Substance P (8-L-tyrosine) [125]

High specific activity $>500\mu$ Ci/ μ g Stable four weeks from production date Each lot tested for binding and displacement in a specific RIA

Substance P (8-L-tyrosine), [125]-

 $>500\mu$ Ci/ μ g Lyophilized from sodium carbonate buffer, pH 9.9, containing bovine serum albumin NEX-152 10 μ Ci 2 x 10 μ Ci 50 μ Ci 2 x 50 μ Ci Prepared fresh for stock third Monday each month Circle No. 390 on Readers' Service Card

Not for use in humans or clinical diagnosis

New England Nuclear

.

549 Albany Street, Boston, Mass. 02118 Call toll-free: 800-225-1572 Telex: 94-0996 (In Massachusetts and International: 617-482-9595)

NEN Chemicals GmbH: D-6072 Dreieich, W. Germany Postfach 401240, Tel. (06103) 85034, Telex 4-17993 NEN D NEN Canada: 2453 46th Avenue, Lachine, Que. H8T 3C9 Tel. 514-636-4971, Telex 05-821808 ISSN 0036-8075

27 March 1981

Volume 211, No. 4489



	LETTERS	Equity a W. U. M.	and Economics: J J. Perry; E. Mar SSoviet Relation F. Denton	. J. Stone; W shall; Scienc is: C. B. An	W. D. Carey ce Funding i finsen et al.:	; The MX Q n West Gerr H. H. Iltis,	uestion: nany: W. M J. C. Coffe	lenden; y,	1368
	EDITORIAL	An Alte	rnative Funding N	Aechanism: .	R. Roy				1377
	ARTICLES	Energy	Supply Interruption	ons and Nat	ional Securi	ty: A. L. Ali	n		1379
		Researc R .	h in EPA: A Con Byerly, Jr	gressional Po	oint of View	: G. E. Brov	<i>vn, Jr</i> ., and		1385
		The Eve	olution of Cooperation	ation: R. Ax	elrod and W	. D. Hamilte	on		1390
NEWS AND	COMMENT	Dark Da	ays for Social Res	earch					1397
		Reagan	to Keep OSTP ar	d CEQ		· · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1398
		Reagan	Budget Would Re	shape Scien	ce Policies .				1399
		Federal	Job Exam to Be	Retired					1401
		Blue Sh	ield as a Medical	Cartel					1402
		New Ur	niversity Law Dec	creed in Chil	e	•••••			1403
		Briefing Ex Lo	: Nobel Follies; R port of Hazardou uisville's Friday t	teagan Selec s Goods Rai he 13th Exp	ts New OSH ses Congres losion	IA Director sional Ire; S	olving		1404
RESEA	RCH NEWS	Electron	n Microscope Cen	ter Opens at	Berkeley .	•••••			1407
		Meeting Ce	Highlights: Caffe Defect in Ment	eine's Stimul	latory Effect	s Explained	;		1408
		Data So	ught on Low Cho	lesterol and	Cancer	•••••			1410
BOO	K REVIEWS	Adaptiv Th	e Radiations in P e Paleobiology of	rehistoric Pa Plant Protis	nama, <i>revie</i> ts, <i>F. J. R</i> .	wed by F. W Taylor; Clin	'. <i>Lange;</i> lates		
BOARD OF DIRECTORS	FREDERICK MO	STELLER , Chairman	D. ALLAN BROMLEY President	E. MAR Preside	RGARET BURBID	GE ELOISE EDWAR	E. CLARK D E. DAVID, JR.	NANCIE DAVID /	L. GONZALEZ A. HAMBURG
CHAIRMEN AND SECRETARIES OF AAAS SECTIONS	MATHEMATICS (Raiph P. Boas Ronaid Graham	A)	PHYSICS (B) Maurice Goldt Rolf M. Sincla	aber ir	CHEMIS Robert William	STRY (C) W. Parry L. Jolly		ASTRONOMY (Dwen Gingerich Donat G. Wentz	D) :ei
	PSYCHOLOGY (. George A. Miller Meredith P. Craw	i) iord	SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, Al James G. March Gillian Lindt	ND POLITICAL SC	CIENCES (K) HIS Har Dia	TORY AND PHILO TY Woolf na L. Hall	SOPHY OF SCIE	ENCE (L) ENGI Micha Dona	NEERING (M) Iel Michaelis Id E. Marlowe
	EDUCATION (Q) Ann C. Howe Roger G. Olstad		DENTISTRY (R) Maynard K. Hine Harold M. Fullmer	PHARMACEUTIC Anthony P. Simo Robert A. Wiley	CAL SCIENCES (S nelli	5) INFORMATI George W. 1 Madeline M.	ON, COMPUTING Tressel Henderson	I, AND COMML	INICATION (T)
DIVISIONS		ALASKA DI	ISION		PACIFIC DIVISIO	N	SOUTHWESTER	N AND ROCK	MOUNTAIN DIVISIO
	John Bligh President		T. Neil Davis Executive Secretary	Beatrice M. President	Sweeney A	an E. Leviton	Sam Shushi President	an	M. Michelle Balcomb Executive Officer

SCIENCE is published weekly on Friday, except the last week in December, by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Second-class postage (publication No. 484460) paid at Washington, D.C., and at an additional entry. Now combined with The Science Monthly® Copyright © 1981 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Domestic individual membership and subscription (51 issues): \$38. Domestic institutional subscription (51 issues): \$76. Foreign postage extra: Canada \$24, other (surface mail); \$27. all-surface via Amsterdam \$55. First class, airmail, school-year, and student rates on request. Single copies \$2 (\$2.50 by mail); back issues \$3 (\$3.50 by mail); classroom rates on request. Change of address: allow 6 weeks, giving old and new addresses and seven-digit account number. Postmaster: Send Form 3579 to Science, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Science is indexed in the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature and in several specialized Indexes.

	K. E. Machin; Books Received	141:
REPORTS	Oxygen Isotope Ratios in Trees Reflect Mean Annual Temperature and Humidity: R. L. Burk and M. Stuiver	141
	Volcanic Origin of the Eruptive Plumes on Io: A. F. Cook et al	141
	Reworked Neritic Fossils in Upper Mesozoic and Cenozoic Central Pacific Deep- Sea Sediments Monitor Sea-Level Changes: J. Thiede	142
	Stable Lead Isotopes as a Tracer in Coastal Waters: V. J. Stukas and C. S. Wong	142
	Detection of a Milk Factor That Facilitates Folate Uptake by Intestinal Cells: N. Colman, N. Hettiarachchy, V. Herbert	142
	Aspirin Prevention of Cholesterol Gallstone Formation in Prairie Dogs: S. P. Lee, M. C. Carey, J. T. LaMont	142
	Repair of the Ultraviolet-Irradiated Male Genome in Fertilized Mouse Eggs: B. Brandriff and R. A. Pedersen	143
	Molecular Basis of Bunyavirus Transmission by Mosquitoes: Role of the Middle-Sized RNA Segment: B. J. Beaty et al.	143
	Non-Mendelian Inheritance of Mosquito Susceptibility to Infection with Brugia malayi and Brugia pahangi: M. Trpis, R. E. Duhrkopf, K. L. Parker	143
	Ultrasensitive Stain for Proteins in Polyacrylamide Gels Shows Regional Variation in Cerebrospinal Fluid Proteins: C. R. Merril et al	143
	Fluorocarbons Reduce Myocardial Ischemic Damage After Coronary Occlusion: D. H. Glogar et al.	143
	F-Cell Production in Sickle Cell Anemia: Regulation by Genes Linked to β-Hemoglobin Locus: G. J. Dover, S. H. Boyer, M. E. Pembrey	144
	Potent Contact Allergen in the Rubber Plant Guayule (Parthenium argentatum): E. Rodriguez, G. W. Reynolds, J. A. Thompson	144
	Metabolic Mapping of the Brain's Response to Visual Stimulation: Studies in Humans: M. E. Phelps, D. E. Kuhl, J. C. Mazziotta	144
	Pentobarbital: Dual Actions to Increase Brain Benzodiazepine Receptor Affinity: <i>P. Skolnick</i> et al	144
	Noise Raises Blood Pressure Without Impairing Auditory Sensitivity: E. A. Peterson et al.	145
	An Endocrine Approach to the Control of Epidermal Growth: Serum-Free Cultivation of Human Keratinocytes: <i>T. Maciag</i> et al	145
	Estrogen Receptors in the Nidatory Sites of the Rat Endometrium: D. Martel and A. Psychoyos	145

Throughout Geologic Time, J. A. Wolfe; Aspects of Animal Movement,

PRODUCTS AND MATERIALS Gas Chromatograph; Freezer; Chemical Analyzer; Affinity Purified Antibodies; Aliquot Mixer; Microbial Monitor; Centrifuges; Literature 1456

ANNA J. HARRISON WALTER E. MASSEY

Jack A. Simon J. Thomas Dutro, Jr.

STATISTICS (U) Stephen E. Fienberg Fzrz Glaser

MERICAL SCIENCES (N) Morton D. Bogdonoff Jeah M. Lowenstein

GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY (E)

RUSSELL W. PETERSON HARRIET ZUCKERMAN WILLIAM T. GOLDEN Treasurer

> BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES (G) John A. Moore Walter Chavin AGRICULTURE (O) Martin A. Massengale Coyt T. Wilson ATMOSPHERIC AND HYDROSPHERIC GENERAL (X) SCIENCES (W) Herman Pollack Julius London S. Fred Singer SCIENCES (W) Julius London Glenn R. Hilst

WILLIAM D. CAREY Executive Officer

ANTHROPOLOGY (H) Alan R. Beals Priscilla Reining INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE (P) John Diebold Robert L. Stern

COVER

Cross-sectional positron computed tomography images of glucose metabo-lism in the brain of a normal human subject with eyes open (images, left) and eyes closed (images, right). Lighter colors correspond to higher metabolic rates. Note higher metabolic rate in the portion of the brain associated with vision (arrows) when the eyes are open as compared to when the eyes are closed. See page 1445. [M. E. Phelps *et* al., University of California School of Medicine, Los Angeles]

The American Association for the Advancement of Science was founded in 1848 and incorporated in 1874. Its objects are to further the work of scientists, to facilitate cooperation among them, to foster scientific freedom and responsibility, to improve the effectiveness of science in the promotion of human welfare, and to increase public understanding and appreciation of the importance and promise of the methods of science in human progress.

Introducing the <u>Science Centennial Review</u>, the ninth volume in the <u>Science</u> Compendia Series, exploring scientific and technological progress during the last 100 years, the future for new technologies, developments in research, and the interaction of science with society.

Edited by Philip H. Abelson and Ruth Kulstad

Among the contributing authors are: Philip H. Abelson, Science Kenneth E. Boulding, Past President, AAAS D. Allan Bromley, Yale University William D. Carey, Executive Director, AAAS P. Thomas Carrol, University of Pennsylvania Edward E. David, Jr., Exxon Corporation Bernard D. Davis, Harvard University Charles L. Drake, Dartmouth College Wolf Häfele, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis Franz J. Ingelfinger, The New England Journal of Medicine Robert M. Joyce, I.E. duPont de Nemours (retired) Daniel J. Kevles, California Institute of Technology Sally G. Kohlstedt, Syracuse University Saunders Mac Lane, University of Chicago W. Parker Mauldin, The Rockefeller Foundation Hugh J. Miser, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis Frederick Mosteller, Harvard University Anthony G. Oettinger, Harvard University Roger Revelle, University of California, San Diego Kenneth C. Rogers, Stevens Institute of Technology Vera C. Rubin, Carnegie Institution of Washington -Herbert A. Simon, Carnegie-Mellon University Michael M. Sokal, Worcester Polytechnic Institute Jeffrey L. Sturchio, University of Pennsylvania John Walsh, Science George W. Wetherill, Carnegie Institution of Washington Gilbert F. White, University of Colorado, Boulder Dael Wolfle, University of Washington, Seattle Sterling Wortman, The Rockefeller Foundation

192 pp. 1980 Illus.

ISBN: 0-87168-305-9 (cloth) \$14.00 ISBN: 0-87168-250-8 (paper) \$6.00

All orders under \$10 must be prepaid. Send orders to AAAS, 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20005

The Science Centennial Review

Business Officers, Personnel Officers, Comptrollers, Financial VP's and Plan Administrators:

Are your staff benefit plans doing their job as well as they could?

If your benefit programs have not been thoroughly reviewed recently, chances are they no longer meet the needs of your institution and its staff members as well as they once did.

Over sixty years of experience with educational institutions

As unique organizations, chartered to serve only the educational community, The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (TIAA) and The College Retirement Equities Fund (CREF) have worked with administrators at thousands of eligible institutions* to develop benefit plans to meet the specific needs of

these institutions and their staff members. TIAA began serving educational institutions in 1918 and CREF was founded as a companion organization in 1952.

An important service...at no cost

Upon request, a TIAA-CREF counselor will assist you with a review of your institution's Retirement, Tax-Deferred Annuity, Group Life, Major Medical and Total Disability plans.

We can tell you what institutions like yours are doing, whether your plans can be improved, how staff benefits costs can be contained and how TIAA-CREF benefit plans are designed to meet the special needs of educational institutions and their staff members. All at no cost or obligation.

For example, a TIAA disability plan can provide lifetime benefits to a disabled employee through a combi-



nation of monthly income payments and the continuation of retirement plan contributions. A plan offered by TIAA can also increase disability benefits on each anniversary of the initiation of benefits to help benefit levels adjust to cost of living increases. This is just one example of the way our plans have been developed to meet your institution's needs.

How to arrange for a review with your TIAA-CREF Counselor

Just complete the coupon below and return it to us today. A TIAA-CREF Counselor will contact you. Or, if you'd like more information about TIAA-CREF and the plans

made available to eligible institutions, please check the boxes for the benefit plans you're interested in.

TIAA CREF COllege Retin 730 Third Av (212) 490-90	urance and Annu rement Equities F venue, New York 000	ity Associatio fund , N.Y. 10017	on –
 Yes. I would like a TIAA-CREF Counselor to work with me on reviewing my staff benefit plans. Please have my Counselor contact me. I am interested in learning more about TIAA-CREF. Please send me material about: Retirement Plans Tax-Deferred Annuity Plans Group Life Insurance Plans Group Major Medical Plans 			
Name			
Title			
Institution	· · ·		- A second of the second second second second
Address			
City	State	Zip	
Business Telephone Number ()		S 32781

^{*}Colleges, universities, private schools and certain other nonprofit taxexempt educational and research organizations such as museums and libraries are eligible for TIAA-CREF's services.

In the Vanguard of Biotechnology ... Bethesda Research Laboratories

The quality of our products starting with enzymes—has been the initial reason for our growth and expansion in the field of biotechnology.

Now supplying molecular materials to organizations all over the world, Bethesda Research Laboratories' current activities include research in DNA recombinant technology and development of procedures for isolating enzymes for use in molecular and cell biology.

With a demonstrated track record, BRL has doubled its sales every year and is currently adding 28,000 square feet to support its 26 laboratories.

Our desire to attract top professionals in biotechnology is our committment to excellence.

Our projections for growth and career advancement are significant.

We earnestly solicit your inquiry.

Please send your C.V./resume, in confidence, to:

Mr. Wayne E. Fowler Personnel Director Bethesda Research Laboratories Box 577, 8717 Grovemont Circle Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760



LETTERS

Equity and Economics

William D. Carey, in his editorial on budget cuts in science "The threshold of pain: Coping with frugality" (27 Feb., p. 879), is quite wrong in stating that "What lies at the heart of the whole matter is the question of equity." Few if any of our fellow citizens will ever ask that science be cut in the name of "equity." They have the common sense to know that the future of science is inextricably linked with both the national economy and the national security. Science is part of the solution, not the problem.

And if science were excessively funded, little enough could be saved in any case. Above all, these cuts have taken place without any consultation with a government science apparatus much less a science adviser.

If the Reagan Administration succeeds this year-or in the coming years-in pulling up important roots of science just to be "equitable," we shall all be the worse off for it. In such circumstances, scientists would be foolish not to defend science; they would betray not so much the interests of their colleagues as the interests of their fellow citizens and of their country. With this in mind, the Federation of American Scientistswhich is not now and never has been a trade union for science-is planning to watch events closely and to react from time to time. Scientists are encouraged to write to us as events develop.

JEREMY J. STONE

Federation of American Scientists, 307 Massachusetts Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. 20002

AAAS will be heard from when rumors are superseded by fact and the danger can be assessed responsibly and with a sense of proportion.

-WILLIAM D. CAREY

The MX Question

I want to both commend and criticize Eliot Marshall's article (News and Comment, 13 Feb., p. 681) that resulted from his interview with me. Generally the article is excellent and quite accurately represents my views. However, in the discussion of the MX missile, there are two errors of fact. The first is the assertion by an anonymous "submarine fan" that I overstated the weakness of submarines and that the Navy got a retraction of one of my statements. I have *not* retracted any statements that I actually made about submarine vulnerability, although I have occasionally corrected misquotes or misinterpretations of what I said. I challenge the "submarine fan" to produce the retraction he claims the Navy got. If I am going to be accused of being inaccurate and unfair, the person making that value judgment should be identified as well as the statements he is criticizing.

The second error is the bald assertion that I played the good soldier despite my private misgivings about the MX plan. I consider this a serious allegation, and yet it is offered lightly, almost as if it were a compliment, and without a shred of evidence, almost as if it were self-evident. It is, in fact, not true. I proposed the MX program to the Administration, and it is therefore a complete distortion of fact to suggest that my subsequent support of it was done only out of a sense of duty. I consider myself an "arms control advocate" and find that position perfectly compatible with being an MX supporter.

Marshall also suggests I have become "flexible" on the MX question, and that I now believe we could give up on landbased missiles and expand our submarine missile forces. My views on that question are the same as they have been for several years. I believe it is best to maintain a survivable land-based missile force. If for any reason that is not done, the second-best plan is to expand our submarine-based missile force. I have testified many times that there are no technical reasons against expanding our Trident force or adding a SUM-like system to our Trident force (although it is a delusion to think that either of these alternatives would be cheaper than MX). I prefer an MX solution because I am concerned that we cannot be positive that we can maintain forever the present invulnerability of the submarine forces, particularly if we allow the Soviets to concentrate on that problem. Thus I am neither an "MX fan" nor a "submarine fan." I believe our best security lies in maintaining a diversity of survivable land-basing and survivable sea-basing for our missile forces.

WILLIAM J. PERRY 3645 N. Monroe Street, Arlington, Virginia 22207

I regret having understated Perry's enthusiasm for the land-based MX missile system, and I am glad he has taken the opportunity to demonstrate that his zeal was not that of a ''good soldier'' but of a true believer.



Introducing the LKB 4400 Amino Acid Analyser.

With its modern modular design, the LKB 4400 marks a new beginning in amino acid analysis. Providing tomorrow's technology at today's price.

Fast Analysis Time

The results you get from this fastworking analyser can be seen in a matter of minutes. Just 65 min. to be exact for a complete protein hydrolysate analysis. And physiological fluid analysis in under 3 hours.

High Sensitivity

The LKB 4400 is highly sensitive to all your analyzing needs. It has the unique ability to detect less than 100 picomoles of amino acids. Low Sample Volume: An Automatic Convenience

Any volume from 5-160 μ l can be used to load the sample capsules. And you get built-in convenience with the standard 72-sample autoloader. Data handling accessory is optional.



Modern Modular Design

More attractive. More accessible. More compact. Made of stainless steel instead of plastic, the LKB 4400 has a higher resistance to chemical corrosion. And its easily serviceable modular design enables the operator to achieve maximum results with minimum downtime.

Integral Refrigeration Unit

Preserves samples and prolongs ninhydrin reagent lifetime to obtain optimal use and economies. The reagent receives additional protection from a blanket of nitrogen gas.

High Temperature Reaction Coil

A unique design feature of the LKB 4400, this high temperature reaction coil develops the color in under two minutes while maintaining the resolution achieved on the analytical column.

Solid-state Column Heating

The latest liquid chromatography technology eliminates the need for circulating water baths by providing fast temperature rise capability. This improves chromatographic performance, reduces analysis time, and increases cost effectiveness.

Circle No. 391 on Readers' Service Card

Full Safety System

Particular emphasis has been placed on safety. In the event of any irregularity, a warning is immediately flashed on the readout panel and the system automatically shuts down until the problem is solved.

Stop. Look. Compare.

Before you buy an amino acid analyser, compare the LKB 4400 against its competition. Feature for feature. Dollar for dollar. You'll find the results speak for themselves.

LKB	LKB Instruments, Inc. 12221 Parklawn Drive Rockville, Md 20852 Tel. 301-881 2510		
Yes, I want to compare and save. Please have a representative contact me for a demonstration.			
Please send m information o	e additional n the LKB 4400.		
Name	Title		
Institution			
Address	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
City S	tate Zip		
Phone			



for Peptide Catalog SB-464 to Beckman Instruments, Inc., Bioproducts Operation, 1117 California Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94304.



Circle No. 375 on Readers' Service Card

Readers interested in learning about the submarine debate are referred to the *New York Times* article of 5 October 1980 by Richard Burt: "Brown admits aides distorted MX issue: Pentagon sought to push missiles by exaggerating Soviet gains against U.S. submarines."—ELIOT MARSHALL

Science Funding in West Germany

In his recent letter about the federal government's role in basic research (16 Jan., p. 226), Senator Harrison Schmitt takes issue with Milton Friedman's concern about academic freedom being inhibited by excessive federal support of basic science. Senator Schmitt states that during the last decades, due to a drastic reduction in the proportion of private research funds relative to federal funds, the direction of such research has been channeled and prostituted in many instances.

A balance between government and private funding of research is important, but establishing exactly what that balance should be is very difficult and indeed depends on the science system being considered. In the Federal Republic of Germany, support for basic science depends almost exclusively on government funds. Out of a total of approximately \$2.7 billion spent by German universities on research in 1978, only \$50 million came from private sources, mostly from industry. A similar situation prevails in nonuniversity research institutions doing basic research. In spite of this seeming imbalance, there is no serious inhibition of academic freedom in my country. This may be partly due to the policy of the government to support basic research predominantly by financing the budgets of a few large, independent, scientific funding organizations, such as the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (the equivalent of the National Science Foundation, but without organizational ties to the government) and the Max-Planck Society. There is little government interference in the process of distributing these funds to research institutes and individual researchers.

The German scientific community is highly sensitized to any threats to this independence from the government. Also, the Max-Planck Society stresses the importance of the existence of some—very limited—private funds they can use without having to give an accounting to the government. Similar views are maintained by researchers from academic institutions. These views probably reflect an emphasis on the principle of pluralistic sources for basic research more than a recognition of the monetary contribution private funds make in this area of science and technology. Nevertheless, private institutions continue to have an important complementary role in encouraging and supporting scientific research in fields which, for one reason or another, do not meet the requirements for funding or are not sufficiently supported by large funding institutions.

WERNER MENDEN Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, Washington, D.C. 20007

U.S.-Soviet Relations

No action on the part of American scientists affecting cooperation with their Soviet colleagues could be justified which increases the chances of nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union. This far-but this far only-we are in agreement with William Carey (Editorial, 24 Oct. 1980, p. 383). In advocating resumption of U.S.-U.S.S.R. scientific exchanges and meaningful cooperation between U.S. and Soviet scientists, Carey appears to misunderstand the purposes and effectiveness of efforts like the moratorium on professional cooperation with Soviet scientists advocated by Scientists for Sakharov, Orlov, and Shcharansky (SOS). His editorial misrepresents the position of "leaders in science" in the United States on such actions.

At a press conference in Washington, D.C., on 16 October in which the five of us participated, we made it clear, as does the SOS pledge signed by 7900 scientists from 44 countries (including 33 Nobel laureates, 187 members of the National Academy of Sciences, and 82 fellows of the Royal Society), that such activities do not prevent and are not intended to prevent contacts between U.S. and Soviet scientists on such matters as arms limitation or other aspects of world peace. We are aware that such contacts played an important role in the test ban treaty and, while we doubt that scientists can play an effective role in ameliorating the current U.S.-Soviet impasse, we would support any actions by scientists in the search for peace and disarmament.

It is our firm belief that the moratorium advocated by SOS and, more generally, the sharp reduction in Soviet–U.S. exchanges, which have been valuable to us as well as to the Soviets, not only do not bring us any closer to the confronta-

Napco[®] announces: the years-ahead incubator system that won't be matched.

The new Napco water jacketed 6000 series embodies more important benefits and features than any incubator ever marketed.

Here are some of over 15 advances in incubator design.

1. More accurate control of chamber temperature.

By positioning sensors not only in the water jacket, but also in the chamber itself, Napco permits more precise chamber monitoring than other water jacketed incubators.

2.New electronic controls, digital display.

New solid state control



system reduces chamber variances, and scanning digital displays monitor chamber parameters.

3. The first modular design.

All control elements can be unplugged from the chamber module for quick service.

4. Unique wet-jet air flow system.

The exclusive wet-jet air flow system provides maximum chamber uniformity and assures the highest relative humidity available in any incubator.

5. More secure chamber uniformity.

Superior new Napco door closure systems ensure integrity of inner chamber.



6. The only water jacketed CO₂ incubator

you can get really clean. Shelf standards and plenums can be easily removed for cleaning in five minutes. This leaves an empty, perfectly



smooth chamber that can be swabbed for easy management of spores and contaminating organisms.

7. The best service in the industry.

If you should ever have an equipment breakdown, a Heinicke-Napco Minute Man will be on his way to you in 48 hours. You'll seldom need the Minute Man service because Heinicke and Napco instruments are built to work. But if you do, dial toll free 800-327-9783.

Introducing a new constant flow incubator~ the 4000 series.

The new modular Napco constant flow system embodies a unique principle that offers superior results in tissue culture and related disciplines. Each of the modular chambers has its own individual controls and separate metering system, to accommodate specific environments in each module.

Appliance Company

A Heinicke Company 3000 Taft Street Hollywood, Fl. 33021 800-327-9783 or (305) 987-6101 Telex: 512610

Available at the following dealers: Curtin-Matheson, Fisher Scientific Co., Preiser, Sargent-Welch, S.G.A. Scientific, Scientific Products, Arthur H. Thomas Co., In Canada: Canlab, Fisher Scientific Co. Ltd., Sargent-Welch of Canada Ltd.

> All Napco water-jacket incubators are available in three space saving models.

Circle No. 130 on Readers' Service Card



tion which Carey dreads but are, indeed, effective means to create a climate in which progress toward peace will again be possible. What Carey proposes is just what the Russians rely on after the jailing of an Orlov or a Shcharansky, or the exiling of Sakharov, namely, a brief period of Western protest followed by détente as usual. We are convinced of the necessity of a consistent, long-term commitment to the position espoused by our French colleagues on 16 October in Paris that "scientific cooperation is only morally acceptable if fundamental libertiesfreedom of expression, of movement, of association and the freedom to workare effectively guaranteed." Nothing less will serve when the most basic human rights of our colleagues in the Soviet Union are being violated. Moreover, precisely because of the fact that Soviet scientific elites are "extraordinarily valued professionally," as Carey says, and because contacts with the West are eagerly sought and encouraged, curtailment of such contacts may induce Russian scientists to bring pressure to bear on Soviet authorities, causing them to relax their rigid control of scientists and to moderate their brutal treatment of dissidents and refuseniks. In the words of Sakharov, "It will be totally unforgivable if the West fails to use this leverage" (1). Unlike Carey, we think there is some evidence to support our view. Of course, this policy has not helped "the besieged defenders of Afghanistan"; none of us ever expected it would. But Sakharov is in exile rather than in jail, others are in jail rather than dead, and a considerable number of Soviet scientists have emigrated. The strongest evidence favoring this position is the virtually unanimous support of our activities by Sakharov and other dissidents and refuseniks within and outside of the U.S.S.R.

We must also register our dismay at Carey's call for a "reopening of scientific traffic" with the Soviet Union purely on the grounds of "expediency." We are not naïve idealists; rather it is clear to us that to ignore Soviet violations of the human rights agreements they formally entered into at Helsinki can only support the Soviet belief that they can with impunity violate any agreement not convenient to keep. To reinforce this belief is a sure road to the confrontation Carev wished to avoid. And we reject the view that "The quarantining of Soviet science, however principled, defeats the chances for engaging . . . in a dialogue of reason." To the contrary, Sakharov asserts, out of deep concern and profound insight, that "... the fear in the West that... defense of human rights may harm arms negotiations is unfounded" and that "the human rights issue is ... a paramount practical ingredient of international trust and security" (1).

Where human rights are concerned, principle, sound policy, and the best chance of achieving meaningful détente are congruent.

CHRISTIAN B. ANFINSEN National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland 20205

ERNEST D. COURANT Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973

PAUL J. FLORY

Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

MORRIS PRIPSTEIN Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley 94720 ANTHONY RALSTON State University of New York at Buffalo, Amherst 14226

References

1. A. Sakharov, *Alarm and Hope* (Random House, New York, 1978).

As three scientists who participated in an extended botanical exchange program in Siberia during 1979, we wish to commend *Science* on the conciliatory and understanding view of intellectual and cultural exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union as stated in Carey's editorial.

During our visit, we talked to scores of scientists at all conceivable levels and found genuine concern for mutual understanding as well as fear of the attitudes of many American factions toward the Soviet Union. A true desire for peace was overwhelming among the Russians we met, most of whom had lost family during World War II. They were not, as we are sometimes led to believe, simply parroting propaganda on the advice of superiors.

We hope that Carey's thoughtful editorial will help reverse the antagonistic trends of the last few years and will lead to increased person-to-person contact between scientists of the United States and the Soviet Union.

HUGH H. ILTIS Department of Botany, University of Wisconsin, Madison 53706

JANICE C. COFFEY Department of Biology, St. Mary's College, Raleigh, North Carolina 27611 MELINDA F. DENTON Department of Botany, University of Washington, Seattle 98195 27 MARCH 1981



If you should ever have an equipment breakdown,a *Heinicke-Napco Minute Man will be on his way to you in 48 hours.* You'll seldom need the Minute Man service because Heinicke and Napco instruments are built to work. But if you do,*dial toll free 800-327-9783.

HAR The accepted standard for precision weighing.

Cahn Instruments, for over twenty years the leader in instrumentation for accurate weight measurements at the microgram level, now provides a wide choice of balances for your specific applications.

Microbalances

Cahn Series-20 Automatic Electrobalances[®]: Select the one that best fits your needs. Rugged and reliable in design, Series-20 Microbalances are used whenever accurate and



highly precise weighings are required. Examples include quantitative and instrumental analysis, filter weighing, standards preparation, biological samples, etc.

- □ 0.0000001 g (0.1 microgram) sensitivity
- □ Automatic weighing
- □ Exclusive "No Penalty" tare
- Portable, use on any reasonably flat surface
- \square Five models to choose from

Circle Reader Service Card No. 380

Semi-Microbalances

Cahn Toploading Millibalances[®]: Fast accurate weighing of small samples. Used widely in biomedical and biological research, quality control and checkweighing applications.

- □ 0.00001 g (10 microgram) sensitivity
- Fast, accurate weighing
 No special environment required

Circle Reader Service Card No. 381



Analytical Balances

The TA 450: A Microprocessor Controlled Toploading Analytical Balance at the price of a mechanical balance. The TA 450 combines the precision and accuracy of the classical analytical balance with the speed and ease of operation of an electronic toploading balance.



- □ 0.0001 g (0.1 milligram) sensitivity
- Unique "StayPut" airhood for easy access to the weighing chamber
- □ Full range (+ or −) pushbutton tare
- Push-button storage and recall of weighings
- □ Two year warranty

Circle Reader Service Card No. 382



Where weighing a little means a lot.

Cahn Instruments, Inc. 16207 South Carmenita Road, Cerritos, CA 90701 Phone (213) 926-3378 TWX 910-583-4806

Want the only dispenser with a Teflon-coated plunger? Ask for the Teflon Dispenser.

Why does a Brinkmann Dispensette seem to work more smoothly than other bottle-top dispensers? The secret is its Teflon-coated plunger.

Oml

Oml

Dispensers with glass or polypropylene plastic plungers often 'freeze' or 'stick' when used with alkaline reagents. On a Dispensette, the Teflon coating on the plunger insures smooth operation with most reactive chemicals (except HF), even with many concentrated acids and bases.

Of course, it takes more than a smoothly-working plunger to make a dependable dispenser. Instead of external glass tubing that could break or chip, Dispensettes are equipped with flexible Teflon filling and discharge tubes that can easily be cut to any desired length. Simply pull them off and a Dispensette is ready for autoclaving at 120°C without further disassembly.

Dispensette offers a wide selection of models for fast, accurate dispensing of volumes from 0.1 to 50ml, with better than ±1.0% accuracy and ±0.1% reproducibility. There is hardly a standard size screw-neck reagent bottle, can or container (even STJ 24/40 and 29/42 glassware) which a Dispensette will not fit, either directly or with optional screw-in adapters.

Some Dispensette design features have been copied by other dispensers, but none has its smooth, foolproof operation. That's because only Dispensette has a Teflon-coated plunger. Write for literature: Brinkmann Instruments, Inc., Cantiague Rd., Westbury, N.Y. 11590. In Canada: Brinkmann Instruments (Canada), Ltd.

BBrinkmann Dispensette[®]

Available from: Ace Scientific

Beckman Instruments, Science Essentials Operations Bio-Rad Laboratories/Cole-Parmer Instrument Co. Curtin Matheson Scientific/Fisher Scientific General Scientific/Markson Scientific/Preiser Scientific Sargent Welch/Scientific Products/SGA Scientific Arthur H. Thomas/VWR Scientific/Wilkens-Anderson Co.

> For information circle R S # 297 For demonstration circle R S # 298

Dispensette® is a registered trademark of R. Brand Co.



MORE CONVENIENCE

New pre-blended Ampholine[®] carrier ampholytes for electrofocusing are available in three narrow and one wide pH range. Now there's no need to spend time mixing to achieve these specific ranges. Just select the preblended Ampholine you need (pH 2.5 to 4.5, 4.0 to 6.5, 5.0 to 8.0 and 3.5 to 9.5). They're designed to give the same linear, virtually drift-free pH gradient achieved using standard Ampholine with LKB Agarose-EF or acrylamide gels.



1376

MORE POWER

The new Model 2197 Power Supply for electrofocusing and electrophoresis offers top-of-the-line features at a very affordable price. The Model 2197 delivers up to 2500V for high-resolution electrofocusing and its 250mA output makes it useful for other electrophoretic techniques. Choose constant power/constant voltage/constant current/time control modes to suit your application. Automatic crossover between running modes compensates for varying gel conditions. Built-in timer with alarm and automatic shutoff allows for time control. With accurate control of four parameters, vou can achieve maximum resolution and reproducibility in all your electrofocusing and electrophoresis experiments. Bright LED display lets you monitor performance easily and the Model 2197 is designed to comply with all relevant safety standards.

MORE ECONOMY

LKB's new capillary gel casting system easily produces gels only one quarter the thickness of standard ones. You save substantially on reagent use and you'll be able to employ higher voltage for decreased run times because the new thinner gels dissipate heat more efficiently. The capillary gel casting kit works with agarose and acrylamide gels. Combine it with the new pre-blended Ampholine and the 2500 volt power supply to significantly reduce your run times while cutting costs. Ask your local LKB representative for more information on these new products and the complete line of LKB instruments and consumables. Depend on the leader in electrofocusing to give you more.





Head office: LKB Produkter AB Box 305 S-161 26 Bromma, Sweden Tel. 08/98 00 40, telex 10492

Main US sales office: LKB Instruments, Inc. 12221 Parklawn Drive Rockville, Md 20852 Tel. 301-881 2510 telex 230 89 682

Other sales offices in: Athens (for the Middle East), Copenhagen, Ghent, The Hague, Hong Kong, London, Munich, Paris, Rome, Turku, Vienna

Circle No. 330 on Readers' Service Card

SCIENCE, VOL. 211

SCIENCE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Sci-ence*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board 1981: Peter Bell, Bryce Crawford, Jr., E. Peter Geiduschek, Emil W. Haury, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Mancur Olson, Peter H. Raven, Wil-liam P. Slichter, Frederic G. Worden 1982: William Estes, Clement L. Markert, John R. Pierce, Bryant W. Rossiter, Vera C. Rubin, Maxine F. Singer, Paul E. Waggoner, Alexander

ZUCKER

Publisher William D. Carey

Editor Philip H. Abelson

Editorial Staff

Managing Editor ROBERT V. ORMES

Business Manager Hans Nussbaum Assistant Managing Editor JOHN E. RINGLE Production Edito ELLEN E. MURPHY

JOHN E. KINGLE ELLEN E. MURPHY News Editor: BARBARA J. CULLITON News and Comment: WILLIAM J. BROAD, LUTHER J. CARTER, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, ELIOT MARSHALL, COLIN NORMAN, R. JEFFREY SMITH, MARJORIE SUN,

NICHOLAS WADE, JOHN WALSH Research News: RICHARD A. KERR, GINA BARI KOLATA, ROGER LEWIN, JEAN L. MARX, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, M. MITCHELL WALDROP

Administrative Assistant. News: SCHERRAINE MACK: Editorial Assistants, News: FANNIE GROOM, CASSAN DRA WATTS

Senior Editors: ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, RUTH KULSTAD

Associate Editors: Sylvia Eberhart, Caitilin Gordon, Lois Schmitt

Assistant Editors: Martha Collins, Stephen Kepple, Edith Meyers

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, Editor; LIN-DA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG

Letters: CHRISTINE GILBERT

Copy Editor: ISABELLA BOULDIN

Production: NANCY HARTNAGEL, JOHN BAKER; ROSE LOWERY; HOLLY BISHOP, ELEANOR WARNER; MARY MCDANIEL, JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, SHARON RYAN

RYAN Covers, Reprints, and Permissions: GRAYCE FINGER, Editor; GERALDINE CRUMP, CORRINE HARRIS Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD G. SOMMER Assistants to the Editors: SUSAN ELLIOTT, DIANE HOLLAND

Membership Recruitment: Gwendolyn Huddle Membership Recruitment: GwENDOLYN HUDDLE Member and Subscription Records: ANN RAGLAND EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachu-setts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Area code 202. General Editorial Office, 467-4350; Book Reviews, WZ 1027. Carlta Decime 6 J. 20005. Area code 467-4367; Guide to Scientific Instruments, 467-4480; News and Comment, 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. For "Information for Contributors," write to the editorial office or see page 187, Science, 9 January 1981. BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202.

Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO Production Manager: GINA REILLY

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES Marketing Manager: HERBERT L. BURKLUND Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Steve Hamburger, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Dicht G. 2010 (2010); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHI-CAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-581)

ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-730-1050.

An Alternative Funding Mechanism

At a recent science policy seminar in Washington, Philip Handler described the changes in the actual meaning of "peer review" in research funding. He pointed out that in the 1950's, informal phoning around by the program manager in a funding agency to a select group of active scientists served to strengthen the judgment of the manager. Thus was born peer review. The complicated time- and creativity-consuming process that has since evolved and that we also call peer review serves a different purpose. Handler's view was that the peer review process now functions as a legitimating balance wheel between the inherent elitism of science and the egalitarianism demanded by the structure of American democracy.

The wastefulness of the present system, which takes on the average 2.5 full-time equivalent person-years just to get and manage \$1 million, is admitted on all sides. Yet the question is often asked rhetorically: Is there an alternative system that can achieve the same goal of equitable funding of the best science? The answer is that there is, and it has many advantages over the present system. The system I describe below is only one example of a genre of systems that could be called productivity-based formula systems for research funding. Underlying the new system is the changing social contract between science and its patron society. The change of Administration and of the national mood is an opportune framework within which to rewrite this contract. Alternative systems based on what Philip Abelson once referred to as "performance rather than promise" will provide a much firmer basis for public accountability.

University research is unique in one important respect in reasons for commanding public support: It makes possible the education and training of research personnel principally at the graduate level. In addition, universities conduct varying percentages (depending on the field) of the total national basic research effort. Finally, universities are part of the research base drawn on by mission agencies to achieve national goals. The formula suggested here arrives at a figure of merit for support of basic research on the basis of these three benefits or services, which are the principal outputs of university research. It takes the general form:

Dollars per year to university department or similar-size research unit

= A \times (number of M.S. degrees + 3 \times number of Ph.D. degrees)

+ B \times (number of papers published in refereed journals)

+ C \times (amount of research support from U.S. and state mission agencies)

+ $D \times$ (amount of research support from industry)

All productivity bases would be on a rolling average for the preceding 3 (or 5) years. The work of the administering agency would be a once-a-year collection of the required data and negotiation of the award, and oversight of regulations concerning misuse. Approximately 15 percent of the funds could be reserved for entering (young) faculty and special initiatives at the discretion of the program manager.

The advantages of this productivity-review system over the proposalreview system are several. (i) It saves a substantial fraction of the total intellectual effort of the science community. (ii) It provides an honest, contemporary rationale for non-purpose-linked funding of both the production of scientists and engineers and the conduct of the science. (iii) It offers Congress and other policy-makers great flexibility in emphasizing or deemphasizing aspects such as university-industry coupling by varying the coefficients of the equation. (iv) By allowing scientists to follow their own best judgments, it is more conducive to genuine innovation. (v) It is potentially a rigorous yet decentralized peer review system for the industryuniversity coupling component. (vi) It provides the appropriate mix of populist spreading of the wealth with recognition of excellence. (vii) It rewards performance instead of promise-a paradigm with major potential in the 1980's.-RUSTUM ROY, Director, Materials Research Laboratory, Pennsylvania State University, University Park 16802

A new low in electron microscopy.

150X with high resolution.

Now with the Zeiss EM-109 you can scan at familiar light-microscope magnifications, then by just turning a switch go immediately to 3000X or even 250,000X. Resolution at 150X is 200Å: at high magnifications, 3.44Å. The quality is such that photographs can be enlarged many times, or 35mm slides can be projected without distortion or loss of quality.

The easy and efficient Specimen Saver.

Zeiss' patented system with new high quality electron optics lets you achieve low magnifications without burning your specimen. **MDF** Micro-Dose-Focusing makes focusing easier than ever. **TFP** Trans-Fiberoptic-Photography lets you change film outside the vacuum. **IGP** lon-Getter-Pumping keeps EM-109 ultraclean, always ready. **Nationwide service.**



Circle No. 268 on Readers' Service Card

Carl Zeiss, Inc., 444 5th Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10018 (212) 730-4400. Branches: Atlanta. Boston. Chicago. Houston, Los Angeles, San Francisco. Washington. D.C. In Canada: 45 Valleybrook Drive. Don Mills. Ontario. M3B 2S6. Or call (416) 449-4660.



Information for Contributors

The Editors of Science

Papers published in Science often receive far more attention than papers published in specialty journals. As a consequence, the rate of submission of papers is high-about 5000 manuscripts are submitted each year. The rejection rate of about 80 percent contrasts with that of most specialty journals, which is usually about 30 percent. Most of the material submitted to Science is of good quality and worthy of publication, and virtually all the scientific papers are eventually published somewhere. In selecting papers for Science, the editors must consider the needs of a broad audience. Insofar as the input of manuscript permits, preference is given to items that seem to be of general significance.

General Information

Four types of signed papers are considered: Articles, Reports, Letters, and Technical Comments. The author's membership in the AAAS is not a factor in selection. Papers are considered with the understanding that they have not been published and are not under consideration elsewhere. Authors will usually be notified of acceptance, rejection, or need for revision in 6 to 8 weeks (Reports) or 8 to 10 weeks (Articles).

Outside reviews. Almost all Articles and Reports, including those solicited by the editor, are sent to two or more outside referees for evaluation. Referees suggested by authors are used at the discretion of the editors. Papers that depend on statistical inferences for their conclusions may be sent to statisticians (in addition to other referees) for review.

Length limits. Papers that exceed the length limits cannot be handled expeditiously and in some cases will be returned without review. The limits are stated below in number of pages based on standard-size pages ($8^{1/2}$ by 11 inches) typed with double spacing throughout (including the references and notes) and with 1-inch margins.

1) Articles: Up to 20 pages of text, including the references and notes, and one table or figure for approximately every three manuscript pages.

2) Reports: Up to seven pages of text, including references and notes, and two tables or figures that together will occupy no more than half a printed page.

3) Letters: Up to 250 words.

4) Technical Comments: Up to two pages of text, including references and notes.

Selection of Manuscripts

1) Articles: About half the Articles published in Science are solicited by the editor. Both solicited and unsolicited Articles undergo outside and in-house review. Articles are expected to (i) provide a review of new developments in one field that will be of interest to readers in other fields, (ii) describe a current research problem or a technique of interdisciplinary significance, or (iii) present a study of some aspect of the history, logic, philosophy, or administration of science or a discussion of science and public affairs. Readers should be able to learn from a technical Article what has been firmly established and what are significant unresolved questions; speculation should be kept to a minimum. Preference is given to Articles that are well written, well organized, and within the length limit. Balance of subject matter in Science is an important consideration when a choice is made between acceptable Articles.

2) Reports: Reports are selected on the basis of reviewers' comments and an in-house review. Reports are expected to contain solid research results or reliable theoretical calculations. Preference is given to those that describe departures or discoveries that will be of broad interdisciplinary interest or of unusual interest to the specialist. In making the final selection, the editors take into consideration (i) the reviewers' comments: reports most likely to be accepted are those that receive persuasive outside reviews favoring publication; (ii) clarity of presentation within the prescribed length limit; and (iii) subject matter in relation to that of other papers on hand. An attempt is made to balance the subjects of Reports so that one discipline is not overrepresented to the exclusion of others.

3) Letters: Letters are selected for their pertinence to material published in Science or because they discuss significant problems of interest to most scientists. Letters of a highly technical nature are usually transferred to the Technical Comments section. Letters pertaining to material published in Science may correct errors, provide support or agreement, offer different points of view, clarify, or add information. Outside reviewers may be consulted on questions of accuracy. Insinuations and conjecture about another author's motives, abilities, or intelligence are considered inappropriate for publication. The selection of letters is intended to reflect the range of opinions received.

4) Technical Comments: Technical Comments may be selected for publication if they express significant criticisms of papers published in *Science* or offer useful additional information. Technical Comments are usually sent for an opinion to the authors of the original papers before being reviewed. Discussions of minor issues or priority claims are not deemed appropriate, nor are questions that can be resolved by correspondence between the critic and the original authors.

5) Book Reviews: The selection of books to be reviewed and of reviewers is made by the editors.

Submission of Manuscripts

Submit an original and two duplicates of each manuscript together with a letter of transmittal giving:

1) the name(s) and telephone number(s) of the author(s);

2) the title of the paper and a statement of its main point;

3) the names, addresses, telephone numbers, and fields of interest of four to six persons in North America but outside your institution who are qualified to referee your paper;

4) the names of colleagues who have reviewed your paper; and

5) the fields of interest of readers who may want to read your paper.

Manuscript Preparation

Typing. Use double spacing throughout the text, tables, figure legends, and references and notes.

Units of measure. Use metric units. If measurements were made in English units, give metric equivalents.

Symbols and abbreviations. Define all symbols, abbreviations, and acronyms.

References and notes. Number references and notes in the order in which they are cited in the text. Place references cited only in tables or figure legends after the text references. Gather all acknowledgments into a single, brief statement at the end. Use *Bibliographic Guide for Editors & Authors* (American Chemical Society, Washington, D.C.) for abbreviations of journal titles. For journals not listed there provide the full title. Use the following forms:

For a journal paper: H. Smith, Am. J. Physiol. 98, 279 (1931).

For a book: F. Dachille and R. Roy, Modern Very High Pressure Techniques (Butterworth, London, 1961), pp. 163-180.

For a paper in a compilation: F. Dachille and R. Roy, in *Reactivity of Solids*, J. H. de Boer, Ed. (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1960), p. 502.

For unpublished material: A. Giraud, paper presented at the American Nuclear Society Conference, Washington, D.C., November 1976.

Illustrations. For each illustration submit three copies of a quality suitable for reproduction. Label each on the back with the name of the author and the figure number. Plan figures for the smallest printed size consistent with clarity. Color may be used if necessary but authors are billed accordingly. Cite all illustrations in the text and provide a brief legend for each.

Tables. Type each table on a separate sheet, give it a number and title, and cite it by number in the text. Give each column a heading. Indicate units of measure in parentheses in the heading for each column, and do not change the unit of measure within a column.

Equations and formulas. Use quadruple spacing around equations and formulas that are to be set off from the text. Define all symbols.

Special Requirements and Procedures

1) Articles: Provide a title of one or two lines of not more than 26 characters and spaces each; a brief author note giving your position and address; and a summary of 50 to 100 words. The summary should convey to the general reader the main point of the paper and outline the results or conclusions. The introduction should portray the broad significance of the work, and the whole text should be intelligible to scientists in different disciplines. Explain all technical terms likely to be known in only one field. Insert short subheadings at appropriate places in the text to mark your main ideas. Provide a reference list in accord with Science style. Reference lists should not be exhaustive; citation of a single review article can often replace many references. A maximum of 40 references is suggested.

2) Reports: Provide a title of one or two lines of not more than 54 characters and spaces each, and an abstract of 50 to 75 words. The abstract and the first portion of the report should portray for the general reader the results described and their significance. The body of the report should be intelligible to scientists in other fields of expertise. Complete documentation need not be presented but should be available in cited references.

3) Letters: Letters should be short (up to 250 words) and to the point; they should be carefully phrased, free of technical jargon, and nonrepetitive. When a Letter refers to an Article published in *Science* the original author is usually given an opportunity to reply. Letters are frequently shortened and edited. Letters are acknowledged by postcard; authors are notified if their letters are accepted for publication. Letters must be typed with double spacing.

4) Technical Comments: Technical Comments on Reports or Articles are published at the end of the Reports section. When a Technical Comment is accepted for publication the authors of the original paper are usually given an opportunity to reply.

5) Book Reviews: Instructions accompany review copies when they are sent to reviewers.

Printing and Publication

Editing. Before being sent to the printers, papers are edited to improve accuracy and effectiveness of communication. When changes are needed because the author's meaning is not clear, the editor may consult the author by telephone; when the editing is extensive, the manuscript may be returned to the author for approval or further adjustment before the type is set.

Proofs. One set of galley proofs is provided for each paper. Alterations should be kept to a minimum and marked only on the proofs. Extensive alterations may delay publication.

Scheduling. Papers are not scheduled for publication until Science has received corrected galley proofs from the authors. The median delay between acceptance of papers and mailing of galley proofs to authors is 4 to 8 weeks (allowing for editing and typesetting); the median delay between receipt of authors' galley proofs by Science and publication is 4 to 6 weeks (allowing for proofreading, layout, and paging). There may be additional delays in publication for papers with tables or figures that present problems in layout and for papers accompanying cover pictures.

Reprints. An order blank for reprints accompanies proofs.

Cover Photographs

Particularly good photographs that pertain to a paper being submitted will be considered for use on the cover. Submit prints (*not* slides, negatives, or transparencies) together with the manuscript, and indicate in the letter of transmittal that a possible cover picture is enclosed.