rather than technical phraseology—will be read by the newspaper public. Many scientists are unwilling to accept a simple way of saying something and adhere closely to strict scientific terminology.

Point 3 is important because the professional science writers, to-day, are intelligent, specialized and experienced journalists who do nothing except follow and report the latest developments in the world of science. They are willing and eager to correct errors or misinterpretations which may creep into their writings, but they appreciate the courtesy of explanations for the changes in their manuscript. Such explanations are the tribute of equality from the professional man in one field to the professional man in another field of related endeavor. It is only by such mutual respect and cooperation that the great work of advancing the dissemination of knowledge of science to the public can be raised to greater heights.

ROBERT D. POTTER,
Science Editor, The American Weekly

REPRINTS FOR EUROPEAN LABORATORIES

MOST European laboratories are unable at present to obtain American (or British) scientific journals, but can receive reprints, especially if they are sent by first-class mail. In the past week I have received two letters from scientists in Denmark and Sweden complaining that their work was handicapped by unavailability of journals, and thanking me for reprints I had sent. This seems to indicate a very practical way for American scientists to aid their colleagues in Europe.

ROBERT B. DEAN

QUOTATIONS

SCIENCE SHOWS THE WAY

THE significance of the conference on Science and World Order has been two-fold. It has held aloft the torch of free scientific discussion between men of many nations on issues of vital importance to humanity—"the greatest torch," in the words of General Smuts's recorded message to the conference, "that the spirit of man has kindled in the modern world"; and it has emphasized the increasingly close relationship between science and government. The relationship has never been closer than in this war. Not only the fighting services but all other forms of governmental activity are increasingly dependent on science. This dependence has perhaps not yet been as fully realized everywhere as it should have been. There are still gaps due to obstructive traditionalism. Professor Haldane may be right in thinking that the potentially valuable services of men of science less persistent than himself are sometimes left unused; and, among lesser men, there are still too many stories of trained chemists working as orderlies or pay clerks. But in general the change in outlook has been undeniable and striking. It has not been confined to general staffs and civil servants. Men of science on their side have learned to regard themselves not as mere consultants sitting in remote laboratories but as active participants in front-line warfare and in the framing of military and administrative policy. The conference which ended last night has certainly not been "academic" in the invidious sense of the word.

More important in the long run even than relations between science and government are relations between science and the people. Much was said at the conference about planning for the future. But, as one speaker remarked, planning can never be more than an "administrative convenience" until it is brought into direct contact with human needs. The American Ambassador, who presided at one session, spoke of the "wounded world of immediate needs and crowded wants" into which we shall move when hostilities end. In this world of the future it may sometimes be necessary to strike a nice balance between needs and wants. Clearly the needs of all have precedence over the wants of some. In such fields as health and nutrition much can be done by education to make people want most what they need most. But, save where military exigencies in time of war and restricted resources in time of peace are a limiting factor, intelligent planning must make allowance not only for human needs, but for human preferences and even for human caprice. There is nothing scientific about herding together in blocks of flats the people who want their own cottages and backyards.

In fact science, if it is to fulfil its human mission, will have to concern itself in future as much with the consumer as with the producer. This implies to some extent a reversal of past attitudes. But the whole conception of the needs and wants of the consumer as the starting-point of a program of reconstruction owes much to those who in recent years have worked out, especially in the field of nutrition, standards recognized as the necessary minimum for human well-being, and have shown how far existing standards, even in advanced countries, fall below them. The recognition of such standards was rightly described by Herbert Morrison as "a new social and political factor of the first importance." It has aroused the social consciences of all classes, and has established a principle accepted by all parties as an obligation overriding selfish or sectional interests. The war has forced on this country what Sir John Orr urged as a permanent and universal objective—"a food policy