who is also a poet; a fellow psychiatrist; an American sociologist; and two geologists. A well-known anthropologist was a member until his recent death.

As for myself, I have solid claims to being "different." Many scientists and quasi-scientists are trying to emigrate to England and thence to the United States. But I know of only one other person, and that is J. B. S. Haldane, who has done the reverse and emigrated from England to India. Because I am a psychiatrist my claims to scientific status rest on a less solid foundation. I read *Science* and many other technical and scientific journals. I do a bit of clinical research; I think a lot about the nature of what is called schizophrenia; I sometimes forget to have my hair cut; I occasionally become so engrossed in something that I forget to attend a Rotary meeting even though I have to make a speech; I sometimes dream of attending a Rotary meeting minus pants. But my fellow Rotarians understand these things and make allowances. They sometimes call me a goose, but I have not yet laid my golden eggs. I am sure this lack has nothing to do with being a Rotarian.

R. B. DAVIS
89, Kanke Road, Ranchi, Bihar, India

Overdone Overhead

In a letter in your issue of 3 January (*Science* **143**, 7), Scheff asks for objective evidence of an earlier assertion in "News and Comment" that "in terms of morality, competence, and devotion to the public interest [scientists] are no better" than other professional groups. Perhaps his request is answered by Pake's letter in the same issue. One conclusion derivable from Pake's rather startling statements on the problems of administrative overhead for research grants is that scientists and scientific educators are certainly as prone as anybody else to look out for their self-interest. Pake admits that as a scientist he juggled accounts in efforts to circumvent what he evidently considered to be administrative highjacking of his grants; as an administrator he now blandly tries to justify even greater baksheesh.

His statement that "in the absence of overhead allowances . . . a private university would be forced to cut its research activities in science by a large factor, perhaps ten" is either sheer poppycock or evidence that Parkinson's Law has been fulfilled with a vengeance. Does this mean that the university's own contribution to scientific research is being supported to the extent of 90 percent by the "droppings" from research grants? If so, some fundamental questions may be raised about the extent to which universities are preparing to divest themselves of their traditional functions and responsibilities. If the universities cannot support "adequate" research programs on their own, or provide the milieu in housing, facilities, and administration for research programs whose direct costs are subsidized by public money, or if they would have to reduce the output of Ph.D.'s in science by a factor of ten in the absence of these large flat charges, then just what is the function of the university in mid-20th-century science? Could not both research and graduate-training functions be more efficiently taken over by other public- and government-supported research institutions, in the manner of the Rockefeller Institute's graduate program? And might not this provide a remedy for the deleterious effects upon scientific teaching in the universities that are ascribed to "professional research"? Research grants already provide the men that the universities now think they are unable to hire without subsidy; the many fringe benefits of course include enhancement of the institution's prestige and its ability to attract and keep scholars in other fields. But are we now to give up as fiction the assumption that research grants are made primarily for the support of the research for which they are solicited, and to recognize them as an accepted subterfuge for the public support of higher education?

These questions are asked in the full recognition of the financial difficulties facing all institutions of higher learning and with a fairly well-educated estimate of the burdens imposed by top-heavy research programs. But perhaps these burdens are unnecessarily self-imposed. Pake does not address himself to the essential question—which Krombein (*ibid.*, p. 8) states succinctly: Does adequate administration actually cost so much? Krombein's example of the $14,000 administrative cost of a 2-year program is dwarfed by Pake's example, in which as a researcher he "lost" this amount to administration each year over a 14-year period. . . . Surely the funds which can be wisely used on the expenses of research itself by one investigator (even as the principal of a team which uses up, let us say, $75,000 a year) do not require the equivalent of one full-time administrative officer and a stenographer—a staff which in a more rational day could be expected to handle the job for an entire school. A university that needs a quarter of a million dollars to administer a million had better let its financial operations out on contract to some private money-management firm. . . .

ALAN MATHER
*Memorial Hospital, P.O. Box 1548
Wilmington 99, Delaware*

An Aye for "I"

Here's an endorsement of F. Bruce Sanford's proposal [*Science* **142**, 1526 (1963)] augmenting Clemence's suggestion that "I" is not a dirty word.

For 13 years as a technical editor I wrote articles which frequently contained personal impressions. I followed the stupid convention, using "this writer," "this reporter," and every other trite device used by the journalists of this country. One day, some years back, I swore off and used personal pronouns. A daring desk man let the copy go by, thousands of readers read it, and our world stayed in one piece.

There is no valid reason for professional jargon in any of the sciences. If we are ever to reach the broad masses of people, it's going to have to be done with 42nd-Street-English, not with the stilted phrases that too often pass for scientific language.

DAVID A. ANDERTON
*30 South Murray Avenue,
Ridgewood, New Jersey*

It seems strange that the use of "I" should cause guilt complexes and anguish in American scientific writers. Is this possibly due to surreptitious influences derived from Germany, where the royal *Wir* and *der Verfasser* still loom large? No such problem seems to exist in the country where the English language originated, and whose inhabitants have a reputation for understatement and self-effacement, but whose authors say "I" if they mean "I"—at least in the earth-science literature that I (that is, we, the author, the present writer) read(s).

CURT TEICHERT
*U.S. Geological Survey,
Denver, Colorado*