When once these rules are put in force, we can rest assured that the southwestern scientist in good standing will be courageously doing fine work, regardless of all sorts of prejudices. He will not be maliciously criticizing his colleagues nor will he have stolen their mental offspring or their means of subsistence. In fact he will be wholly respectable, scientifically speaking. His pay will be adequate and he will enjoy administrative authority of a sort. His publications will be prompt but not too prompt and the public will be in his confidence, for he will have learned that the public pays the bills. He will be conversant with politics, religion and economics, but it will be useless to approach him on literature, history or philosophy, for these have been left to the charlatans as unworthy of ethical scientists.

With all this careful charting of the course of the true scientist the rules committee unfortunately neglected the all-important matter of a distinctive name and appropriate insignia for these new paragons of scientific virtue.

As any realtor could have told them, rules are all right as far as they go, but the important thing is for the paying public to be able to discriminate between those who have a framed copy of the rules and those who have not. The southwestern scientists, having aped the realtors to the extent of adopting a code of ethics, should go the rest of the way and grasp the substance of reform by choosing a name.

The writer, ever anxious to encourage and aid in the salvation of southwestern science suggests "Scientor"[2] as a designation for those very earnest-minded practitioners seeking a way out of the wilderness—or what have you?

J. H. KEMPTON

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

A DAYLIGHT METEOR

I READ with great interest the note of William L. Bryant, entitled "A Daylight Meteor," which appeared in the issue of SCIENCE of July 22, 1927. Several years ago, about four o'clock in the afternoon of a beautiful October day, while walking in the open country just north of the city of Stamford, Conn., I chanced to see at an elevation of about 30° above the horizon a veritable "ball of fire" moving in a northerly direction with an exceedingly high velocity. The brilliance of the moving body, which I immediately assumed to be a daylight meteor, was fairly dazzling notwithstanding the fact that the sun was shining brightly in the western sky. During the brief interval that the meteor was visible its trajectory appeared to be nearly horizontal. Unlike the luminous body observed by Mr. Bryant, the daylight meteor which I chanced to see did not leave a train of sparks in its wake. Unfortunately, I was alone at the time when this phenomenon occurred and hence was unable to compare my observations with those of an independent observer.

FREDERICK H. GETMAN

[2] Lest I be accused of transgressing Rule 10 of the southwestern code I hasten to admit having read a series of letters, appearing in *Nature* a year or so ago, in which the question of a proper designation for men of science was discussed. Although I am not conscious that Scientor was among the suggested appellations, it may well have been, and ethically I can claim credit only for appreciating its appropriateness for the group of men in question.

QUOTATIONS

SCIENCE FOR CITIZENSHIP

OF the importance of science in any modern system of education there can here be no question: but there is danger of a certain confusion of thought. The value of the practical application of science was fully brought out during the war; it has been apparent in many of the problems which have arisen since the war; while scientific men have repeatedly and justifiably urged upon the public and the government the fundamental importance of the promotion of scientific research for all departments of the administration and life of the community and the British Empire. This insistence upon the value of science, aided by a confusion between instruction in science and a technical training, has obscured its true function as an element in the training of the average individual in preparation for his duties as a member of the community. Now that science enters so widely and so intimately into every department of life, especially in all questions relating to health and well-being, it is essential that both the individual who ultimately through the vote will control policy, as well as those by whom that policy will be framed and carried out, should have a general knowledge of the scope and aims of science, as well as of scientific method and the mode in which science envisages and attacks its problems. It is, however, beyond question that it should be a general knowledge on broad lines: a specialized training in some highly technical branch of science is neither needed, nor indeed is it desirable. The educationist need feel no alarm.

As a medium of culture, the history of scientific discovery opens up to the imagination vistas of man's endeavor which place it in the front rank of humanistic studies. Through a general familiarity with the