branches which have not previously been developed in Russia. Since it is generally recognized that Russian astrophysicists have obtained remarkable results in many fields of study the benefits of such an arrangement would be by no means one-sided and our own observatories would gain enormously from the contact.

O. STRUVE

YERKES OBSERVATORY,
WILLIAMS BAY, WIS.

IS TEACHING ABILITY RECOGNIZED?

LIKE a refrain one hears in current discussions of academic problems remarks like the following: "These objectives can be obtained only if the teaching ability of faculty members is given as much recognition as is given to research ability." "Teaching ability is not rewarded by our colleges as is research ability."

If some one does not soon question the accuracy of these statements they will come to be believed through mere repetition. The first time I ever heard the validity of such assertions openly and adequately challenged was during the meeting of the American Society of Agronomy at St. Louis in November, 1942. A session was being held on teaching and its problems. A guest speaker had repeated the time-worn remark that in our colleges teaching is not rewarded as is research. In the course of the discussion which followed Dr. H. K. Hayes, of Minnesota, offered the comment that teaching ability in that field was recognized and rewarded. He added that if necessary he could present the proof.

The discussion went on. As I was a visitor, only a few of the men present were known to me personally. It was, however, evident from the remarks that many of them were men of unquestioned eminence in their field. The group evidently included a good number of heads of large departments of agronomy and a sprinkling of deans of agriculture. Finally some one asked Professor Hayes for his proof. His reply, which I quote from memory, was somewhat as follows: "I have objective proof. It is here in this room. I do not wish to embarass anyone so I will not name individuals unless someone insists, but I see here a goodly number of individuals of recognized standing and influence in their fields whose positions rest on their recognized ability as teachers rather than as investigators." That ended the discussion.

One result of the discussion thus ended was that I started a survey of the teaching of botany in the United States during the past generation. Some portion of the material assembled will be published elsewhere. One of the conclusions to which I have come is a wholehearted agreement with Professor Hayes's spontaneous outburst at St. Louis. It makes little difference what objective criterion of eminence one chooses provided the list contains a fair number of names. A list of presidents of the Botanical Society of America will serve or a list of the presidents of any of the other societies concerned with plant science or the chairmen of Section G, or of those who have received the now much discussed "stars" in "American Men of Science." In any case one finds a large percentage of those who are known first and foremost as teachers. This is particularly impressive when it is realized how many of our colleagues have to give all their time to research or administration.

The same thing may not be true in fields other than those of the plant sciences. At least the question may fairly be raised regarding them. Of course I have no information as to the salaries received by these outstanding teachers; that seems to be the critical point, but it seems unlikely that they have been conspicuously less well paid than their fellows.

Apparently one source of the assertion so freely made that teaching ability as such is not adequately rewarded is the failure of those who make it to recognize that teaching ability may be coupled with other abilities. In other words, the mere fact that a member of a college faculty is unable or unwilling to carry out a research program does not constitute *prima facie* evidence of teaching ability of a high order.

NEIL E. STEVENS

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

ERUPTIVE ROCKS

Eruptive Rocks, Their Genesis, Composition, and Classification, with a Chapter on Meteorites. By S. JAMES SHAND. Second edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons. London: Thomas Murby and Company, 1943. Pp. xvi + 444; figs. 47, pls. 3. $5.00.

THIS second edition of Professor Shand's notable book has been extensively revised. The wide field and laboratory experience of the author and his many contacts with the points of view of petrologists of three continents, as a student in Scotland and as a teacher in South Africa and America, give him an unusually comprehensive grasp of the subject. This has resulted in a book which gives the best elementary treatment of the eruptive rocks that is in print. The author has a wide familiarity with the literature and lists many references at the end of each chapter. Throughout, the discussions are brief and critical, and they preserve an excellent balance between the field,