If it is conceded that an exhibit for the specialist is of practically no educational value to the public—is to it primarily a collection of meaningless curios—then it is patent that museums drawing largely on public funds can not honestly adopt such an arrangement, but must follow one that will give a fair equivalent for value received.

Museums that may be privately endowed so as to be independent of public funds may, of course, adopt any method they choose; but it would appear to be a foolish waste of energy and money to throw open to the general public a specialists' museum.

The college student is not here considered because his own institution makes special provision for him.

Looking from the standpoint of popular education at the ethnological exhibits of the American Museum, I have been greatly pleased to note the decided advance that the last few years has shown in the matter of arrangement. I can imagine a man of average education, with no special knowledge of the Eskimo or the Plains Indian, viewing those exhibits for an hour and coming away with a fair general idea of the peoples represented, such as he could not possibly have acquired in many hours under former conditions. This man will represent more than ninety per cent. of the visitors to the museum. He it is who is paying a considerable proportion of the expenses of the museum and now is getting his dues. At the same time I presume that the specialist can be amply cared for in this department, as I know to be the case in certain zoological branches.

I hope that there will be no backward step to the condition of storage exhibition with, to the public, its meaningless repetition of specimens that have little or no information to convey.

Henry L. Ward
Public Museum, Milwaukee,
April 15, 1907

Magazine Science

The science in the magazines is not always bad. Much of it is not only most illuminating to the non-specialist mind (including in the term all those who are specialists in some one subject, but whose college knowledge of all other subjects is wholly antiquated), but is also of the highest order of authority. For instance, the March number of the *Century* contains a very important article by Professor Hugo de Vries on the work of Luther Burbank, and in the May number of the same magazine there appeared one by Professor Stratton on railroad signaling in connection with color-blindness. But the article on color in the number for April belongs to the class of the antiquated and the non-scientific to a degree that has become, fortunately, most unusual. Criticism of an article like this is not worth while, but one can indicate its character by a few quotations. We are told that "two tuning forks of discordant rates of vibration, set in action close together, will make no sound" (as if vibrations of exactly opposite phase were the only ones that give discordant notes); and that "it is possible that the harmonies of color waves may some day be reduced to mathematical tabulation." The writer believes in the 'capacity of brain cells to note rhythmic variations' of various degrees of speed; he affirms that "the brain receives impressions in the form of waves of vibration," and also that "two kinds of light waves are emitted from all objects, color waves and white waves."

After this one is not surprised to find that he thinks there are red-blind individuals who see green, and green-blind individuals who see red, and that, in fact, all the knowledge about color that has been gained in the last twenty years or so is *terra incognita* to him. It seems a pity that three full pages of bright colored illustration should be wasted in propagating error. And this is an article which the New York *Evening Post* took the trouble, upon two separate occasions, to praise! It is said that the *Youth's Companion* employs a reputable scientist whose sole duty is to see that no patently false science, or other matter of fact, appears in its columns. It would be wise if less modest journals followed the same plan.

Christine Ladd Franklin
Johns Hopkins University