by a single polar flagellum. It is therefore referable to Cohn's Bacterium as amended by Smith and is given the name *Bacterium tabacum.* The detailed account of the cultural studies and inoculation experiments which have been made, and of the distribution and dissemination studies which are in progress, is reserved for subsequent publication.

F. A. Wolf,
A. C. Foster
North Carolina Experiment Station

PLANT DISEASES IN CANADA

To the Editor of Science: Two plant diseases have recently been observed in the Dominion of Canada which have not been recorded before, viz., *Dothichiza Populea* Sacc. et Briard, on Lombardy poplar, St. Andrews, N. B., and *Colletotrichum cereale* Manns, on spring wheat, Charlottetown, P. E. I.

A third disease affecting seed pods of turnips grown for seed in P. E. I. caused by *Leptosphaeria Napi* (Fuckel.) Sacc., of which the conidial form *Sporidesmium exitiosum* was found, does not appear to have been recorded as causing trouble on the continent of America. It is well known in Europe, where it is disastrous to seed turnip cultures.

H. T. Güssow

COMMON PLANT NAMES

To the Editor of Science: May I draw attention to a point in the discussion on popular names of plants, which M. A. Bigelow, in Science of July 6, seems to ignore; that is, the great literary value of a good common name and the danger that such names may be lost through being ignored by teachers. Of course children can learn any name—they memorize far more easily than grown people—but do not let us give them scientific names to learn as a part of nature study, unless they are going in for botany as a science. Scientific names are usually clumsy and pedantic, almost always lacking in character, and often can not be gracefully absorbed into the English language.

The names which Professor Bigelow cites as being both popular and scientific are sufficiently euphonious, but are almost all those of garden plants, which may be allowed to bear florists' names. The few wild flowers he mentions all have good common names, which apparently he is willing to discard. Primrose is an older name than *Primula,* I fancy, and for the matter of that, surely rose, lily and violet antedate the systematists! *Clematis* and *Trillium* are pretty enough, but virgin's bower and wake-robin are names to make a poet sing for joy. Most eastern wild flowers have fairly good names and even in the west—a young civilization is apt to be content with variations of "bells" and "roses"—they have some fine names, such as "our Lord's candle" (*Yucca Whipplei*), "sweet-after-death" (*Achlys triphylla*) and "flaming sword" (*Fouquiera splendens*). Such names as these enrich our language and should be preserved at all costs.

Shall we encourage children to gather nosegays of *Blepharipappus, Mesembryanthemum* and *Malacothrix?* Heaven forbid! Only give them time and children will evolve good names for all conspicuous wild flowers, if we do not thwart them by teaching the scientific ones unnecessarily. Cat's breeches, named by Utah children, may not be elegant, but it is quaintly appropriate and is certainly better for everyday use than *Hydrophyllum capitatum.* Let us go slowly in these matters and so long as men like Dr. Jepson are continually on the lookout for good common names we need not despair.

Margaret Armstrong

A SIMPLE EXPLANATION

In Science, August 31, 1917, page 212, Professor C. A. Mooers writes as follows:

> The writer has assumed that Dr. Hopkins could give a simple explanation for his conflicting estimates, as given in Science, November 3, 1916, p. 652, and in Science, March 2, 1917, p. 214. In the former article he says: "For each dollar invested rock phosphate paid back $2.29," but in the latter article he says, with regard to the same data, "Easy computations show profits per dollar invested of . . . $1.29 from phosphate rock."

The "simple explanation" is that these are not conflicting statements. Each dollar invested in raw rock phosphate paid back $2.29; and, when the dollar invested is subtracted from this amount, the profit is found to be $1.29.

In this article Professor Mooers bases his opinions in part upon "observations" and "hay data . . . not given in Bulletin 90," states that in his conclusions he "was governed chiefly by a consideration of the soil conditions and the results of the individual series"; and he criticizes my use of a summary table which he prepared and which he also used in his bulletin[1] and in his former SCIENCE article.[2] His present opinion is that this summary table is not fairly representative of the results secured, and I must bear his criticism for having used it.

CYRIL G. HOPKINS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

QUOTATIONS

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY AND PROFESSOR CATTELL

IT is contrary to the academic traditions of six hundred years to dismiss a university professor on account of his opinions expressed in a proper way to experts in the subject. It is illegal to dismiss a professor in the middle of the academic year on false and libelous charges, without payment for the year and without the pension which he had earned by twenty-six years of service.

I am opposed to war and to this war, but I have undertaken no agitation against the government nor against its conduct of the war. I have written nothing against the draft law or against sending armies to Europe, although I regard both measures as subversive of the national welfare.

It is because I care for my country that I deplore its entry into a war of aggression and the government's policy of strangling democratic principles at home. For the same reason I have in the journals which I edit done what I could to promote national efficiency. I am a member of the Psychology Committee of the National Research Council and spent a large part of last week drawing up for the War Department plans for the scientific selection of aviators.

In August, 1914, when President Wilson was telling us to be neutral in thought as well as in speech and in act, and Mr. Roosevelt and Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler were "pussy-footing," I wrote in one of the journals that I edit:

> The official German justification of the mad and wanton European war is that it is in defense of the Teutonic culture and people against the semi-Asiatic and barbaric Slav hordes. The verdict of history will probably be that it was a war of calculation for caste and national aggrandizement, and a war of miscalculation. The German emperor and his bureaucratic military entourage probably held that the time was ripe for an extension of German influence in the Balkans and towards Asia Minor with an increase of its African possessions at the expense of France. But it is not clear why, if the serpent was prepared to use its fangs, it did not show its alleged wisdom. . . . We may look for a second Napoleon the little rather than for a second Napoleon the great.

In June, 1917, I began a letter to the New York *Evening Post* with the words:

> An emperor, driven by the militaristic and capitalistic classes of his people and "by God demented," must accept responsibility for the great crime.

The letter that I wrote on August 23 to members of the Congress, on account of which I have been dismissed from the chair of psychology at Columbia University, asked support for a measure then before the Senate and the House to prohibit sending conscripts "to fight in Europe against their will." There is no law requiring or permitting the President to send "conscientious objectors" to fight in Europe. To do this would be contrary to the intent of the constitution and to the uniform policy of the nation. It would provide a less efficient army and might cause disorder and possible revolution at home. Surely this should not be done without careful consideration by the Congress after efforts to learn the

[1] Bulletin No. 90, Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station.

[2] SCIENCE, January 5, 1917.