

## DO YOU QUALIFY FOR ANY OF THESE GROWTH POSITIONS WITH SRA?

**Science Editor:** Bachelors and Masters degree with a major in one of the sciences required. Applicants should also have a minimum of 3 years' teaching experience, and 2-3 years' editorial and/or writing experience. This job requires a thorough knowledge of at least one scientific discipline, and an awareness of curriculum and curriculum trends in science. Experience in supervising the work of others is essential.

**Assistant Editor (Junior High Science Materials):** BA or BS with a major in one of the sciences required. MA or MS preferred. One to two years of editorial experience are mandatory. Junior or senior high school teaching experience is highly desirable. Writing ability a must.

**Assistant Editor (Elementary Science Materials):** There are a number of openings in this area. A college degree with a major in one of the sciences required. Editorial writing, and production experience would be extremely helpful, as well as teaching and laboratory or library research experience.

**Assistant Editor (Grades 3-4, elementary science program):** A college degree with a major in one of the sciences, psychology, or education is required. Editorial and elementary school teaching experience would be useful. Writing ability and knowledge of science learning theory or psychology are required.

**Editorial Assistant (Elementary School Program):** Applicants should have a college degree, with a major in one of the sciences, or in education. Experience in Elementary teaching, editorial or production work, and writing of any kind would be helpful. Knowledge of one scientific discipline or of psychology is required.

*If you feel qualified for one or more of these editorial opportunities, send an outline of your background and interests to Mr. Roy Willis, Dept. 824-C2, Science Research Associates, 259 East Erie Street, Chicago, Illinois. SRA is an Equal Opportunity Employer.*



**SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES**

A subsidiary of IBM

### LETTERS

## *To the Editor*

### The Value of Vitamins

Dear Sir:

Your article in "Science News" for Feb. 11, 1967, page 146, entitled "Money Wasted on Unneeded Vitamins," by Barbara J. Culliton, is very disturbing.

The fact is that more money is wasted on tranquilizers and diuretics. Properly used, vitamins, minerals and amino acids would make it unnecessary to use the avalanche of tranquilizers and diuretics which have monopolized the prescription market. Vitamins and minerals are the only materials in the entire medical armamentarium that make a person better for taking something. Tranquilizers and diuretics will leave him worse.

Most physicians scoff at the idea of using vitamins and minerals, which gives Dr. Goddard the courage to carry on his ill-understood campaign against the best medication the medical profession has ever had.

Cooked food, no matter how good it is to start with, produces some type of nutritional deficiency. We have not yet answered completely what this depletion is, and until we do, scientific exploration should not be shrouded in political and governmental controversy and controls.

John A. Meyers, M.D.  
Baltimore, Md.

### On Subviral Infectious Agents

Dear Sir:

I do congratulate Mrs. Marley on assimilating this complex story (SN: 2/18; p. 169), in such a readable fashion. We seem to have reached an interesting cross-roads. Now we must try to ask the right questions and to devise experiments that will give us the critical answers.

I am so glad she consulted my good friends in the States—Dr. Alpers, Dr. Gibbs, Dr. Leader and Dr. Abinanti. Most worthwhile problems are solved by examining them from every point of view.

Iain H. Pattison  
Head, Department of Pathology  
Institute for Research on  
Animal Diseases  
Compton, Berkshire, England

### A Dissenting Voice

Dear Sir:

I was interested to note the difference in format between the last issue and the new issue. You seem to have gone more "in-depth" on certain topics and are also discussing policy. This is probably a good idea, as policy does affect science.

My complaint, however, is with your "in-depth" articles. I find it is extremely difficult to get information from them. Instead of saying "how it works" the articles tend to talk around the subject, giving opinions, criticisms and comparisons without telling what the subject is.

Your style is sort of "Time Magazine-ish"—fun to read, but useless for facts.

It would make reading much simpler if you would put facts first, discussion later.

Since I read to extract information, it would be very advantageous to know if I'm interested in an article without having to read every last word of it.

Robert Parvin  
Bechtel Corp.  
San Francisco, Calif.