

Harold Morowitz, in his February *Science* 82 column "Of Minds and Molecules," describes an interview he had as a young scientist, in which he tried to explain what he was doing in terms of "adenosine triphosphate" and similarly arcane language. At every turn the reporter balked "and we had to go back to square one." The article that finally appeared was garbled and gave a confused account of the research in progress. "The troubling issue persisting over the years," Morowitz writes, "is that one of the great intellectual triumphs of all time is written in tongue-twisting polysyllabic words such as nicotinamide-adenine-dinucleotide-phosphate. How is one to tell the story of this important achievement in biochemistry to a general public unfamiliar with such language? One of the most significant advances in understanding the nature of life remains unknown to most people because it is inseparable from very long words that intimidate the uninitiated and keep them from insights that hold a wide range of unexplored implications."

Tincke Bodde of *BioScience* has related thoughts on science information transfer. In the March issue he quotes **James Grunig**, professor of journalism at the University of Maryland, on the subject. The greatest contribution a scientist can make toward an accurate, informative news story about his work, Grunig believes, is "framing the story for the writer, putting his work into some kind of context — telling the writer, for example, why he or she wanted to do the research, what the problem was that he was trying to solve, or what the importance is of his research, basic or applied, to science or to practical life situations." Most scientists assume, rightly or wrongly, Bodde thinks, that the writer knows these details. A word to wise scientists is sufficient.