We are continuing this work, and hope to report later, giving photomicrographs, and showing as well the appearance of casts and mucin in the dark field, after they have been acted on by reagents, stains, etc.

JEROME ALEXANDER
JOHN M. CONNOLLY

50 EAST 41ST ST.,
NEW YORK

THE STANDARD POUND

IN the letter of Mr. Alexander McAdie, published in SCIENCE on February 23 ultimo, under the heading "The Depreciation of the Pound," Mr. McAdie states that the provisions of the Corn Sales Act of 1921, effective January 1, 1923, and prescribing that sales of grain, seeds and potatoes in Great Britain shall be by weight only and in terms of the *hundred-weight of 112 pounds,* have the effect of reducing or depreciating the pound from 7,000 to 6,250 grains weight. This is upon the gratuitous assumption that the absolute weight of a hundred pounds or of 700,000 grains is by the Act to be divided into 112 parts to produce a new or "depreciated pound" of 6,250 grains weight. If one were to indulge in assumptions as to the effect of the Act, it would be more legitimate to argue or conclude that the effect of the Act is to divide the absolute weight of 112 pounds or 784,000 grains which constitute the English hundred-weight, into 100 parts to produce an appreciated or enlarged pound of 7,840 grains. But there is neither need nor excuse to indulge in assumptions as to the English *hundred-weight,* because the *hundred-weight,* as specified in the Act of 1921, and as otherwise defined by law, and as long established by custom, consists of 112 standard pounds of 7,000 grains, and is divided into 8 stone of 14 standard pounds. The Act merely declares and confirms the custom of England and establishes uniformity of practice throughout the realm. It imparts nothing new as to the value of the standard pound or as to its division into 7,000 grains, as legally recognized and established in both the United Kingdom and the United States.

The English use and will, under the Act of 1921, continue to use precisely the same pound as the Americans. We, however, use a *hundred* of 100 standard pounds, whereas the English use a *hundred-weight* of 112 pounds. The Englishman wants to divide his *hundred-weight* into 8 equal parts. He can not divide the cental of 100 pounds into 8 equal parts, and he therefore persists in using the *hundred-weight* of 112 pounds, which he can divide into 8 equal parts, each of which he calls a stone. But he nevertheless uses the same standard pound which is used in the commerce of the United States, and certainly no American would deny him the privilege or right to use the *hundred-weight* of 112 pounds, if for reasons which satisfy him, he finds it preferable or convenient to do so, just as the Englishman has no objection to the use of the cental of 100 pounds in Canada, in the British Dominions and in the foreign trade of the Empire.

SAM'L RUSSELL

WASHINGTON, D. C.

APPLIED SCIENCE AND SCIENCE APPLIED

"To be an industrial psychologist one must first of all be a psychologist." "Hardly more than one or two men are earning a livelihood in industry to-day as *psychologists*" (W. V. Bingham). These sentences appear in a modest advertisement of "psychology as a life work" in SCIENCE for April 13.[1] The writer of them believes that "industrial psychology" offers to men with psychological training and possessed of certain assets a career among "fascinating practical problems." The "three outstanding assets for a career" are named by him as "a sound training in scientific method," genuine interest in "all sorts of people and the personality to deal effectively with them," and, finally, "superior practical judgment, especially where money values are concerned." When these assets produce an "output of cash value to industry" they may be expected to bring proportionate "financial rewards." It is exceptional, however—as it appears—for an industrial psychologist to earn a living *as a psychologist.*

In the same article "educational psychology" is declared to show "an increasing demand for experts in psychological and educational measurements." Here "the most necessary qualifications are listed as "general scientific ability, knowledge of educational practice, industry, adaptability and good sense" (E. L. Thorndike). Again, "clinical psychology," which offers to suitable persons opportunities "not surpassed financially," etc., is said to demand acquaintance with the facts of disease and of treatment as well as the "physician's mental attitude" (S. I. Franz). And, in more general terms, "for those who possess the requisite qualities and training there is no limit [in "applied psychology"] to public service and financial rewards" (R. Dodge).

Does this announcement by "experts" persuade the reader that there are "applied psychologies"? Does it not rather call attention to the well-attested fact that scientific knowledge and training may be found to be useful (provided the individual meets certain other requirements) in many practical tasks far removed, in spirit, problem and point of view, from psychology or from any other single science? The article makes it abundantly evident that, where these

[1] SCIENCE, 1923, lvii, no. 1476, pp. 429–431.