Letters

Overhead Costs

The current structure for the allocation of federal research funds results in the funding of science entirely on its merit, regardless of the cost. It promotes quality science and productivity, but it does nothing to contain costs. Consequently, scientists and institutions are motivated to inflate direct and indirect costs. Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.'s editorial of 29 March (p. 1545) suggests changes in the administrative structure of indirect cost funding. I suggest we also consider a modification of our current funding scheme to promote quality science, productivity, and cost effectiveness at a "grass roots" level.

The peer-review system should remain as it is, with a review of the budget and assignment of priority scores. But after the review, the "cost" of the grant would be calculated as the total direct and indirect costs divided by the number of years of funding approved. This "cost" would be included in determining funding priority. For example, grants ranking in the top 5% would be funded regardless of the cost. Grants with a priority of 5 to 10% would be funded only if the "cost" were less than a specified amount.The scale would continue downward so that large budgets go only to the highest priority science. The exact algorithm could be adjusted to fund a given number of grants with the available funds, and it could have limits so that nothing lower than a certain priority is funded. (There would be limits on the number of low-priority grants one investigator or lab could hold to prevent scientists from dividing a big project into many little ones.)

Once scientists know that the chance of being funded increases by having smaller budgets, the size of the budgets on grant applications to the National Institutes of Health would likely decrease and more science, and scientists, would be funded. Productivity and quality would not be adversely affected because scientists already have strong personal motivations for maintaining both. The public and our legislators might become more supportive once they know that we scientists are doing our part to cut costs. More "small science" would be encouraged, and science and teaching would become a more attractive profession to bright students who are currently discouraged by funding "horror stories."

We should acknowledge and respond to our country's fiscal limitations and get our own costs under control before we complain about a lack of funds or ask for more money. With the proper motivation and structure, we can use existing funds to support more of the best scientists and the best science.

BARRY T. PETERSON
Department of Physiology,
University of Texas Health Center,
Tyler, TX 75710

Koshland's continuing campaign to revise the method of charging overhead costs to research projects is important. However, the specific technique that he favors—a "universal overhead rate"—is not a good solution.

It would be better to create separate "cost pools" for administrative expenses, for use of facilities, and perhaps for libraries and other important cost categories, and to charge research projects with costs based on an overhead rate developed for each pool. The charge for facilities use, for example, would reflect the proportion of the facilities costs that each project caused.

This method would result in widely different charges among universities and among various types of research projects within a university, and these differences would reflect real differences in the costs that projects of various types actually incurred. For example, the facilities charge for projects based on library research or questionnaires would be considerably lower than for those that use expensive equipment. There would be a little more bookkeeping than with a single universal rate, but most well-managed businesses use such an approach, and they would not do so if they thought the additional cost was less than the benefits. Moreover, the overall "indirect cost" rate, which the public usually associates entirely with administrative costs, would be dramatically reduced.

ROBERT N. ANTHONY
Graduate School of Business Administration,
Harvard University,
Boston, MA 02163

Chimp-Language Wars

In her Research News article, "Déjà vu all over again: Chimp-language wars" (29 Mar., p. 1561), Ann Gibbons writes that the whole field of sign language studies of chimpanzees was "devastated" by a single article published in 1979 (*1*). But she does not note the large amount of evidence and debate that has appeared during the past decade. Our recent volume (*2*) summarizes the available evidence. We list here (*3*) all the reviews of this volume of evidence that we know to have appeared at this writing. Interested readers might wish to consult these reviews by distinguished biologists, anthropologists, and psychologists in internationally recognized journals. Not all of the reviewers have been equally favorable in their overall opinion of the book. Nevertheless, they agree that the scientific evidence is sound and that this field of research, which is very much alive, has not only survived Terrace's critique but has produced a significant body of additional evidence since 1979.

To us the "déjà vu" of the "language wars" is the traditional rejection of the modern view that the same basic laws govern the intelligent behavior of human and nonhuman beings. Jerome Bruner (*4*) put it this way:

> A third trend is also discernible: the bridging of gaps that before were not so much empty as they were filled with corrosive dogmatism. The gaps between prelinguistic communication and language proper as the child develops, the gap between gesture and word, between holophrases and sentences, between chimps signing and man talking, between sign languages and spoken ones, between the structure of action and the structure of language. I think that the renewal of interest in language as an interactive, communicative system has made these 'gaps' less like battlegrounds where one fights and dies for the uniqueness of man and more like unknown seas to be mapped."

BEATRIX T. GARDNER
R. ALLEN GARDNER
Department of Psychology and
Center for Advanced Study,
University of Nevada
Reno, NV 89557

REFERENCES

1. H. S. Terrace, L. Pettito, R. J. Sanders, T. G. Bever, *Science* **206**, 891 (1979).
2. R. A. Gardner, B. T. Gardner, T. E. Van Cantfort, Eds., *Teaching Sign Language to Chimpanzees* (SUNY Press, Albany, NY, 1989).
3. J. R. Anderson, *Primate Eye*, **42**, 41 (October 1990); S. Boysen, *Q. Rev. Biol.* **65**, 383 (1990); R. W. Byrne, *Anim. Behav.* **40**, 789 (1990); M. Hauser, *Am. Anthropol.* **92**, 1167 (1990); N. E. King, *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* **84**, 222 (1991); H. L. W. Miles, *Int. J. Primatol.* **12**, 1 (1991).
4. J. Bruner, in *Action, Gesture and Symbol: The Emergence of Language*, A. Lock, Ed. (Academic Press, London, 1978), pp. vii–viii.

Big Science, Little Science

Amidst all the discussion and controversy about "big science," its effects on little science, and priorities for the support system for science and scientists, there has been little or no discussion or analysis of what constitutes big or little science and how money and effort are actually divided. It seems worthwhile to try to devise ways to measure the distribution, and I propose a possibly useful index of support.

As an example of what is generally called "big science," I examined the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC) in terms of the support per scientist per year that it will