

only the botanists had been mentioned. Later, he does give high praise to the chemists, but he makes no mention whatever of the foresters who shared the same drenching rains and muddy trails with the botanists on the field surveys.

Actually, the first survey party in Colombia whose work is discussed by Dr. Steere was supervised by a forester and included two other foresters in addition to the two botanists and one chemist. If credit were to be given or even implied local B.E.W. (F.E.A.) officials as well as many individuals of the countries surveyed should be included also for their part in the work.

None would deny that Dr. Steere and the other botanists played an extremely important role in the cinchona surveys, and it is understood that any elimination was not done purposely, but rather, unintentionally in developing the interesting botanical notes. However, this supplementary mention of the part played by the forestry profession in the surveys seemed desirable, not to change the botanical discussions, but to clarify to any one not acquainted with the makeup of the missions the greater breadth of the crews who located and moved the cinchona barks.

L. R. HOLDRIDGE

FORESTRY DIVISION,  
SOCIÉTÉ HAÏTIANO-AMÉRICAINNE  
DE DÉVELOPPEMENT AGRICOLE.  
PORT AU PRINCE, HAÏTI

### STARS IN AMERICAN MEN OF SCIENCE

I HAVE read with interest and some amusement the comments of S. S. Visher in the March 16, 1945, issue of *SCIENCE* on "Comparative University Strength in Scientists Starred in 'American Men of Science' V-VII."

It is my opinion that there is no true philosophical or scientific basis for the system of starring and, therefore, all investigations pyramided on the assumptions of starring are negative and, perhaps, even vicious. They have led, however, to many amusing conclusions, not the least of which is Visher's.

It might be more instructive to analyze the universities which Visher has selected, not only from the point of view of the relation of starred faculty members to the total faculty members, but what constitutes the universities under consideration and also their comparative endowments. For example, we see on Visher's list that Pennsylvania has fourteen starred members out of the teaching staff of 1,322, while Princeton has twenty-six starred members out of a teaching staff of 220 and Harvard has fifty starred members out of a total of 1,775.

Harvard and Pennsylvania have medical and dental schools, which Princeton has not. Harvard and

Pennsylvania have law schools and certain other graduate bodies which, so far as I am aware, do not adorn old Nassau. Therefore, I think that Visher's inquiries should be confined to the fields in which men are starred. For according to Visher's analyses the Divinity School of Harvard is a liability rather than an asset when it comes to the proportion of men starred.

Princeton has a larger endowment than Pennsylvania, although apparently it has about one sixth of the faculty of Pennsylvania. Harvard has over four or five times the endowment of Pennsylvania and about 25 per cent. more faculty members. Harvard is usually considered the wealthiest university and yet, I believe, its annual income is no greater than certain state universities, whose appropriations by State Legislatures run into the millions. Neither Harvard nor Princeton receive money, as far as I am aware, from their respective states, and although Pennsylvania is not a state university, it does receive some state aid.

I recommend, therefore, that the next analysis of starred men takes into consideration the comparative wealth of the institution, not only from the point of view of endowment but also from the point of view of annual income from state, students and endowment.

A comparative salary study of professorships and other ranks in relation to starring should afford interesting instruction. I should like to mention that there are certain personality traits in institutions which should be likewise considered. Institutions, like persons, belong to upper, middle and lower classes, and by this is meant psycho-biological classification, not a social one. It is made of such factors as age, wealth, tradition, attitudes, vitality, connections, graduates and the like which constantly change and thus change the classification. It is this psycho-biological classification to which we refer when we say that such and such a place is not what it used to be; we refer to it in such terms as "The Big Three"; fresh-water colleges; or diploma mills, etc. I should also like to observe that some universities like Johns Hopkins or the Massachusetts Institute of Technology are more "national" in personality in contrast to certain other universities which seem to be of a more "local" nature. Such personality traits work an influence in attracting men and minds, in forming opinions; and perhaps even on taxonomists of universities and their faculties.

RICHARD W. FOSTER

### EMPLOYMENT AFTER THE WAR

IN Dr. Joseph Mayer's article published in *SCIENCE* for April 13, it seems to me that two important agencies have been overlooked: (1) An organization to study the needs in goods, qualitatively and quanti-