

liam Leishman, Professor Graham Kerr, and others. The officers of the Section of Anatomy have chosen the following preliminary list of subjects for discussion: (1) "The relation of the urethra to the vagina," by Professor J. C. Brash (Birmingham); (2) "The naked-eye anatomy of the bone marrow, with age changes," by Mr. Piney (Birmingham); (3) "The teaching of anatomy by radiology in the anatomy department," by Dr. J. M. Woodburn Morison (Manchester); (4) "The problem of the structure of the vertebrate head," by Dr. W. B. Primrose (Glasgow); (5) A discussion on the administration of the Anatomy Act will be opened by Dr. Alexander Macphail. Dr. Adam Patrick (16, Buckingham Terrace, Glasgow, W.), one of the honorary secretaries of the Section of Medicine, writes to say that he or his co-secretaries will be glad to hear of any members who might wish to submit short papers in the section, in addition to having the names of any who desire to take part in discussions. The meetings of the sections will be held on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, July 26, 27 and 28.

### UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATIONAL NOTES

It is announced that the contest of the will of Amos F. Eno will be settled out of court by the payment of about four million dollars to Columbia University. The 1915 will, which has been twice broken by juries but both times upheld by courts on appeal, gave the residuary estate to Columbia University. The will made bequests of \$250,000 each to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the American Museum of Natural History, the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, and the New York University. Had the will been broken finally, these institutions would have received nothing. Whether they receive the full \$250,000 each under the settlement, or what proportion of the total they receive, is not disclosed. The Society of Mechanics and Tradesmen received \$1,800,000 under the 1915 will, and had that will been broken would have received \$2,000,000 under an earlier will. This institution could not therefore be called upon to sacrifice anything in order to satisfy the heirs, and will receive the full \$1,800,000.

DR. SYDNEY WALKER, JR. has provided \$200 per annum for a scholarship for the furtherance of research in physiology at the University of Chicago in memory of his son.

DR. HERBERT W. MUMFORD, who has been away for a year on leave of absence from the University of Illinois as director of live stock marketing for the Illinois Agricultural Association, has been appointed dean of the College of Agriculture as successor of Dr. Eugene Davenport, who retires after twenty-seven years service at the end of the present year.

DR. WALTER R. MILES, research psychologist at the nutrition laboratory of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Boston, has been appointed professor of experimental psychology at Stanford University, to fill the vacancy created by the retirement of Professor Frank Angell at the close of the present academic year. Dr. Angell has been professor of psychology at Stanford almost from the time of the opening of the university, having joined the faculty in 1892.

DR. HARRY D. KITSON, professor of psychology at Indiana University, will lecture at the summer session of New York University School of Commerce and Finance, giving courses on employment psychology and the psychology of advertising and selling.

### DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

#### THE WRITING OF POPULAR SCIENCE

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: I have read with much interest Dr. Slosson's letter<sup>1</sup> referring to my recent remarks<sup>2</sup> regarding the writing of popular science. I fear that Dr. Slosson has missed the main object of those remarks. They were not primarily intended to discourage the presentation of "mere information," though they did aim to discourage the practice of calling such matter "science," and of describing it as "scientific," but they were especially intended to point out the need of driving home to the layman the fact that science does not consist in the accumulation and cataloguing of such information, but in the establishing of relations between observed facts.

<sup>1</sup> SCIENCE, 55: 480, 1922.

<sup>2</sup> SCIENCE, 55: 374, 1922.

The layman has for so long been fed, under the guise of science, upon mere information that has, so far as he can see, no significant use or relation to anything with which he or his neighbors are in any way concerned, that he has acquired a false idea of what science really is. He is prone to regard scientists as visionary, unpractical freaks who spend their time in hunting up queer facts and in dreaming fantastic dreams, as harmless imbeciles who putter around at things that are of no interest to any one else, who from a depraved taste talk a jargon that others can not understand, and who once in a while by pure chance stumble upon something that some more sensible individual is able to put to some real use. This false conception should be rectified. In my opinion this can not be done by the simple process of offering the layman a larger or a more varied diet of mere information, even though this diet is guaranteed to conform to all the pure food laws. It must be done by driving home the fact that the prime object of science is the establishing of relations between facts, the facts themselves being merely incidental to that, and in many cases of no other interest whatever; and by showing him that the facts that are presented for his consideration have significant relations to those he already knows and of which he appreciates the importance.

I realize that the preparation of articles suited to these purposes is difficult, and I sympathize with Dr. Slosson in the difficulty he is experiencing in getting them; but the presence of difficulties should not deter us from facing the issue squarely and trying to meet it. Articles setting forth relations between facts can not be reeled off by the yard, their preparation is slow and laborious; also it is a work purely of love, other recompense than the joy of the work being insignificant. Consequently, such articles can be expected only from those scientists whose daily work of getting a living is such that they have considerable leisure. Does this not in part explain why Dr. Slosson finds more writers of good popular science in England than in this country?

Be this as it may, I am convinced that the layman's keen interest in science will awake

when, and only when, he has been brought to recognize that science is concerned primarily in the establishing of relations, and that thereby he will be enabled to forecast and to control future events with ever greater and greater certainty.

N. ERNEST DORSEY

404 MARYLAND BUILDING,  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Certain scientific men are attacking us editors of daily and Sunday newspapers and charging us with fabrication and exaggeration in our presentation of scientific matter for popular reading. As the editor of the Sunday magazine section of a metropolitan newspaper which has for many years been doing its best to keep the general public informed of the latest developments in science, permit me to present the other side of the case.

In my earnest efforts to publish the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about such matters, I have over and over again asked men who are eminent in their specialties to write articles for me. But, with a few rare exceptions, the articles they have furnished me have been failures, because written in a style that, however appropriate for a purely scientific magazine, was utterly unsuitable for the average reader, because filled with technicalities which only the highly educated could be expected to understand. The fault I have to find with our American men of science when writing of their specialties is that they fail to present their ideas in the simple language and with the clarity of expression which are so necessary if one is going to awaken the interest of the "man in the street." In this respect, they are far behind their British, French and Italian fellows.

So far as the New York Sunday *World Magazine*, over which I have authority, is concerned, it has been our persistent policy for the last ten years to print nothing except that for which we have the very best authority obtainable. We devote two pages every Sunday to scientific matter, the greater part of which is quoted literally from the scientific and medical magazines. Besides this, when any highly im-

portant scientific discovery is made, we devote a special article to it, generally in the form of an interview with either the discoverer himself or the greatest available authority on the subject, and all such interviews are revised by the man interviewed and not printed until he has given them his O. K. In other cases, the facts are taken from a book or article written by the discoverer and are presented as his say-so and not as ours.

Quite recently we have received from some of the most eminent scientists in the world letters heartily congratulating us on the way in which we have presented articles that had specially interested them. I recall one from the late Professor Baskerville, another from Professor Millikan, and the most recent of all are from Dr. L. O. Howard of the U. S. Bureau of Agriculture and Professor E. L. Bouvier of Paris on a page review of the latter's book on the "Psychic Life of Insects," translated by the former, both of whom are enthusiastic in their congratulations.

I venture to ask if you can find fault with Mr. Arthur Benington's article "The Chemists' Battle with Death" on page 2 of our magazine section of Sunday, April 9? Is there anything in that which is lax, inaccurate or "falsified"? Is this a "hoax"? If so, the hoax is not ours, but that of the leading chemists of the United States. I might ask the same question about dozens of articles we have published within the last few years.

That there are newspapers which publish fake science, I know as well as you, and that there are scientists who lend their names to such fakes—at a price—you ought to know as well as I. But, in condemning the few fakers, it is unfair and unjust to condemn also those which are honestly striving to interest and inform the general public on scientific affairs.

I sympathize with Mr. Slosson in his difficulty of finding men with the ability to write on scientific matters for the general reader. I have had the same difficulty, but I flatter myself that I have a few men on the staff of the *Sunday World* whose knowledge of science may not be that of specialists, but is, what is far more valuable, broad, thorough and comprehensive,

and to this knowledge they unite an ability to convey to the man in the street a good idea of even the most abstruse subjects—witness, for example, our exposition of the Einstein theory, which was the best really popular article on the subject that it has been my good fortune to read. My long experience proves to me that the worst writers on scientific subjects are scientific men, for the reason that they do not know how to make their writings interesting and it is manifestly futile to publish uninteresting articles, for no one will read them.

J. O'H. COSGRAVE,

THE WORLD,  
NEW YORK CITY

*Sunday Editor*

### THE UNIVERSITY OF GRAZ

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: A letter was received by me some time ago, the English translation of which runs as follows:

University of Graz, Austria.

Institute for Plant Physiology.

Graz, January 22-22.

*Dear Colleague:*

Due to the collapse of our exchange, the condition of science in this country is getting worse every day. This fact brings back to me the promise you gave me last fall, at the laboratory of Dr. Went (Utrecht, Holland). You promised me to send, after your return to the United States, the *Botanical Abstracts*, possibly also reprints of anatomical and physiological work.

I am forced to bring this conversation to your remembrance because I am unable to see any other way to obtain American literature. The value of the Austrian crown is so deeply depressed that the rate of exchange, even with Germany, is 60-70 crowns pro mark. To buy foreign literature is of course out of the question. The University of Vienna enjoys the support of many financially influential persons. Our small university in Graz, however, lacks any such support. It is even difficult to produce enough energy required for scientific endeavor.

My short stay with Dr. Went has shown to me clearly the hopeless position of our Austrian institutes.

Nothing will describe the situation better than the following statement: my (recently increased) annual income is about twelve thousand crowns (about \$1.40). I hope you will not feel offended when, under such circumstances, I bring back to