

creased. The loud conversation, and also the loud noise, actuate the cochlea of the normally hearing individuals with much greater intensity than they do the cochlea of the individual with a conductive impairment. Therefore, because of the non-linear response of the ear, the cochlea of the normally hearing individual will be overloaded and hence will suffer both a relatively greater interfering effect from the noise and also a greater distortion of the speech than will the person with a conductive impairment.

There is another factor, which, though irrelevant to the experiments and conclusions described in this communication, contributes immensely to the advantage enjoyed by a person with a conductive impairment when he converses in the presence of a noise with a person with normal hearing. The normally hearing individual hears the noise with its full intensity, and therefore will increase the loudness of his voice relatively more than will the individual with a conductive impairment, who hears the noise with greatly diminished intensity. This also is the reason why, in a noise, it is difficult for a person with normal hearing to hear the conversation of a person who has a conductive hearing impairment.

In contrast to those who have conductive hearing impairments, persons with perceptive impairments claim they hear less well in the presence of a noise than in the quiet. Many observations upon individuals having perceptive impairments confirm this claim.

It is well established that individuals with nerve deafness suffer a much greater loss of acuity for the high-pitched tones than for the low-pitched tones. Further, the defect is one of the end organ and not of the transmitting mechanism. These two facts, together with the contrary of the facts stated in "1" and "2," explain why this type of "deaf" person does not derive the benefit from a noise that the person does who has a conductive impairment.

VERN O. KNUDSEN

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SOUTHERN BRANCH

THE BARRO COLORADO ISLAND LABORATORY

MANY biologists and other scientists probably do not yet realize how easy and safe it now is to visit a new tropical world in Panama. To one like the writer, whose experience had been limited to the temperate zone, it is a revelation to observe what nature can do under constant summer temperatures and ample rainfall in the torrid zone. The vague qualms one may feel about fevers, dangers, snakes,

insects and the heat are found to be largely unfounded when he reaches the Canal Zone; he finds that he may comfortably and safely wander along the jungle trails of the island. While my own interest in visiting the Isthmus was especially the fungi, I found upon arrival that, abundant though the fungi were, there was an even greater interest and value in observing the broader phases of plant and animal life. Incidentally, there are also the canal, the quaint cities and country and many other excellent reasons which make the trip profitable as well as pleasant. The National Research Council, Dr. Barbour, of the Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass., and Mr. Zetek, the resident custodian, deserve the thanks of all of us for the opportunity they have provided.

G. R. BISBY

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
WINNIPEG, CANADA

EVOLUTION AND THE BIBLE

THERE have recently been held in several of our Pacific Coast cities debates between the Reverend W. B. Riley and E. A. Cantrell on the question of evolution *versus* the Bible. The evolution side of these debates has been argued by Mr. Cantrell, who, according to press reports, is a representative of "The Science League." The public and press seems to be of the opinion that said Science League is a part of the American Association for the Advancement of Science or has some connection with it, though this is not the case.

In the above-mentioned debates, according to press reports, Mr. Cantrell attempts to reconcile the tenets of the Bible with the fundamental principles of science. He naturally fails to make a case and at the close of these debates a vote is taken with a result of about five to one in favor of the anti-evolution side.

As a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science I wish to protest against such methods. The cause of science is in deplorable straits when it must be defended by such so-called scientists who would attempt to reconcile it with primitive Jewish folk lore.

Nothing has happened in a decade (in half a dozen decades) calculated to harm the cause of science more than the equivocal position of certain scientists of high station, who state that there is no conflict between science and religion (meaning, of course, the Jewish-Christian religion). Their stand in this regard has been followed by various publicists equally devoid of moral courage.

IRA D. CARDIFF

YAKIMA, WASHINGTON