

work, using facts and truths regardless of their source and publishing his results for the benefit of mankind as a whole. On the other, he can not help seeing that he belongs to one particular nation and that the fate of this nation has a great deal to do with not only his personal life but the results of his research and teaching.

It is difficult to reconcile these two points of view, and for a student who is just beginning scientific work and still has only the smallest idea of its extent and implications, the problem is almost insoluble. Many such students are, in the experience of the author, abandoning science in favor of active service in the armed forces.

This trend is not particularly the fault of the draft law, which allows men to go ahead in lines of work which are deemed essential to the war effort. In some cases it arises from a desire for a secure future, the student preferring the draft to an uneasy deferment, but in most it appears to be a simple desire to get into the game and to do one's duty as a citizen. Naturally, it is often the most intelligent and responsible students who react in this way. If this situation is a general one—and the author has reason to believe that it is—there will soon be a shortage of scientists and technical men in most fields, and especially in biology and social science. Should the war last a very short time the results will not be serious, but it would be rather optimistic to suppose that the world will settle down to a prolonged peace, even if an armistice is declared within the next two years.

The importance of science in world affairs has often been exaggerated, through a tendency to posthumously canonize able inventors and navigators as scientists, but it is not too much to say that our modern technical civilization would limp along very badly without an adequate number of trained scientific workers. We are not yet in the position which English policy created in the first world war, when not only were the students taken out of the universities, but promising mature research workers were allowed to die in Gallipoli and Flanders. Nevertheless, a weakness in scientific personnel might leave us as severely handicapped for dealing with the post-war problems as the British were in the 1920's.

This may be one of the unavoidable bad effects of war, but it might be partially helped by an attempt to reassemble the split personality of scientist and citizen. In plain words, we should try to find aims common to both, and one rather obvious suggestion follows.

It is the general attitude of thinking citizens that America should play a cooperative and positive role in promoting peace, wealth and happiness in the post-war world, and the scientific worker can materially

help to provide means through which that role may be successfully played. In this way scientific research can serve both national and international interests, and every sort of scientist, from anthropologist through physicist to zoologist, can do his part. In many cases he will go on with his regular line of research and teaching.

As far as this proposition is true and acceptable to scientist and citizen, its statement and restatement should help to keep our younger scientific workers and students on the job. If so, what should these citizen-scientists do? It would appear to be a mere matter of common sense that specific research should be done on the problem which has been popularly labeled "winning the peace" and which by its nature would imply research on non-military methods of winning the war. This could be best done on a large scale and in a cooperative fashion, but even the smallest individual step will take us farther on the long road to world harmony.

J. P. SCOTT

DEPARTMENT OF ZOOLOGY,
WABASH COLLEGE

A NATURALIST CHARACTERIZES SCIENTISTS

DONALD CULROSS PEATTIE, in a recent review of Beebe's "Book of Bays,"¹ poses the recluse self-centered scientist of sixty years ago as a figure widely prevalent to-day to give emphasis to his approval of Beebe's book, which all in all does not need the support of a false contrast.

Peattie says "few scientists grow broader as they live longer; on the contrary, they tend to groove deeper until, for most of us, they are quite buried from sight at the place where, like sand fleas, they have, as they proudly say, dug themselves in."

This adverse appraisal seems to be the revival of an old quip, oft repeated by clever professors of this and that to the effect that "a specialist was a man who knew more and more about less and less." This was rated as witty or at least humorous, when all sciences were regarded as specialties, illicit, un-scholarly, materialistic, and in conflict with religion, art, taste and good manners. The science addict had good reason to be shy in such an atmosphere. Newspapers commented humorously, if at all, on his announced results, and his interest in or approval of any subject made it suspect.

Reviewing a wide acquaintance among scientists I am unable to list a dozen living "sand fleas" among them. Hence I conclude that they are as rare as left-handed snails or as Peatties or Beebes.

D. T. MACDOUGAL

CARMEL, CALIF.

¹ *Sat. Lit. Rev.*, March 14, 1942.