would be subgenera) in the relation of a supergenus to a genus. Suppose we apply this to the well-known genus *Panicum* among the grasses. There has been a tendency in the historical development of this Linnæan genus to split off one after another species or groups of species to form new genera. Even as limited by the avowed "splitter" the genus still includes hundreds of species. The more conservative botanists include as subgenera, *Digitaria* (*Syntherisma*), *Echinochloa, Trichachne* (*Valota*), *Thrasya, Echinolæna, Hymenachne, Sacciolepis,* and several more, in some cases, even *Setaria* (*Chætochloa*). I should be willing to use *Panicum* in the broader sense, but for the sake of consistency I should want to include under *Panicum* such genera as *Paspalum and Ichnanthus.* I think that the technical characters that separate these last from *Panicum* are no greater nor more important than those which separate *Digitaria* and *Echinochloa* from *Panicum.* But *Paspalum* and *Ichnanthus* have been considered distinct genera by most botanists for over 100 years. *Paspalum* is a Linnæan genus and includes probably more than 200 species. The practical question then arises, if the grasses are arranged in genera which are really supergenera on the basis of the relative importance of technical characters, the more technical groups appearing as subgenera, will the layman—or the botanist who is a layman in relation to the taxonomy of grasses—gain in convenience. Many well-known genera will disappear. *Bromus* and *Festuca, Sporobolus* and *Muhlenbergia, Trisetum* and *Deschampsia* (*Aira*), are as closely allied as *Panicum* and *Digitaria.* If *Digitaria* is placed as a subgenus of *Panicum* then one feels as if he must place *Sporobolus* as a subgenus of *Muhlenbergia* and so on. The layman is chiefly concerned with the stability of the names he uses. The method just outlined would, I think, be just as confusing to him as the "splitting" of which Dr. Stone speaks. It is very difficult to devise a nomenclature which shall adapt itself to the normal growth of a living science and yet have the kind of stability that the layman wants.

It has been assumed by some that the Linnæan concept of genera was a broad one, that his genera are what we are calling supergenera, and that later botanists have been splitting off fragments, or dividing along convenient cleavage lines, to form our modern genera. This assumption scarcely accords with the facts. He seems to have established genera according to his knowledge, his convenience, or sometimes apparently by a mere whim, if one is to judge by his grass genera. *Bromus* and *Festuca* are Linnæan genera that remain much as he left them; *Panicum* and *Andropogon* are supergenera; *Holcus* and *Aira* are assemblages of unrelated species or groups of species.

I believe there would be considerable confusion in the application of the concept of supergenera; and the names of the supergenera would be subject to continual change as our knowledge of relationships increased. Nevertheless, as a general principle, I think it is desirable to retain minor groups of species as divisions of genera rather than to recognize them as genera.

A. S. Hitchcock

Washington, D. C.

THE SITUATION OF SCIENTIFIC MEN IN RUSSIA

To the Editor of Science: In your issue of April 23 there is reproduced a letter from Professor Babkin, of the University of Odessa, in which the following statement occurs:

> The bolshevic revolution has brought Russia into such a state that not only has scientific work come to a standstill, but even our lives are in danger.

One is very much tempted to discuss the situation of scientific men in Russia, but it is perhaps better simply to quote testimony from impartial sources. There is, however, one remark which must be made with regard to Babkin's statement, namely, that Odessa is very far removed from the limits of the Federated Soviet Republic, being in the region (Ukraina) dominated by the anti-bolshevic forces.

I happen to have before me a book published recently by Gauthiers-Villars et Cie,

Paris, entitled "Etudes de Photochimie" par Victor Henri. The front page of the book bears this further legend: Professor Henri, formerly assistant director of the "Ecole des Hautes Etudes" (Sorbonne), and much to my amazement at present "Directeur de laboratoire à l'Institut scientifique de Moscou."

I open the book with curiosity and read in the preface that this great work on photochemistry was begun by the author in Paris but since the war "la photochimie fut oubliée." In 1915 it was Henri's good fortune to be dispatched to Russia on an official war mission. Then the revolution broke out and —but here I make room and let Professor Henri tell his own story:

La révolution russe arriva avec toutes ses phases. Un souffle de vie nouvelle se leva. Un espoir d'organization scientifique générale amenant le progrès, c'est-à-dire augmentant la somme de bonheur de l'humanité, se réveilla et une période de vie active commença en Russie, à laquelle je fus mêlé à Moscou. L'Institut scientifique de Moscou me donna un accueil très chaleureux; l'Université de Moscou m'offrit une chaire; la Commission de l'Académie des Sciences de Russie pour l'étude des richesses naturelles de la Russie me demanda d'être le secrétaire scientifique de la section de Moscou.

S. MORGULIS

THE CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY,
OMAHA

CONCERNING OUR RELATIONS WITH TEUTONIC SCIENTISTS

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: I fear that Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn's letter in SCIENCE, June 4, 1920, quoting from and commenting upon letters from my esteemed friend Arrhenius and another colleague, will convey to many readers an erroneous impression in one very important particular, namely: that there are scientists in the entente countries who would restrict the interchange of publications with scientists in the Teutonic countries. If there are any such entente scientists, I have not heard of them. I can safely parallel Professor Osborn's statement, "We paleontologists welcome the works of Othenio Abel," by saying that "We astronomers welcome the works of Struve (Berlin) and von Hepperger (Vienna); we shall read these works as carefully as we have read those issued by them in 1913 and earlier; and as soon as peace is declared we shall unreservedly do our part in arranging that Struve and von Hepperger and their colleagues receive the published writings of American astronomers.

In the relief of present-day distress and suffering in enemy nations, to which the quoted Stockholm and Vienna letters refer, I feel sure that all American scientists are glad to contribute in accordance with their abilities, and without question as to what occurred in 1914–18. I doubt if any appeal for assistance from this country has been made in vain.

There still remains the question of personal relationships in the future. Professor Osborn has quoted from one of the European letters as follows: ". . . *every German believed [in 1914] a war would be much cheaper than the steadily increasing military expenses.*" This undoubtedly assumed, on the part of "every German," that the war would be short, that Germany would win it, and that Serbia, France, and Russia would pay the bills! In this precise connection should the world be permitted to forget that Germany would not consent to a reduction of armaments when the other nations at the Second Hague Conference in 1907, made and urged this proposal?

Professor Foerster, of the University of Munich, was quoted throughout the world early in 1919 about as follows: "We Germans have only ourselves to blame for the *moral blockade* which hems us in, and the raising of this blockade depends upon ourselves alone." Whether the quotation is correct or not, it faithfully represents widely prevailing opinion in entente scientific circles.

W. W. CAMPBELL

MOUNT HAMILTON,
June 11, 1920

QUOTATIONS

MEDICAL EDUCATION

DURING the last thirty years the feeling has become increasingly insistent, both in this