tific library of the Bureau of Science in the Philippines, which "the Japanese wantonly destroyed," suggests that there is an additional way in which libraries damaged by the aggressor nations could and should be repaired. Germany and Japan, to be sure, can not make adequate financial reparation, but their surviving scientific books and journals can replace at least some of those that they have destroyed in allied and "neutral" countries. The control that we now possess over the resources of these two countries should make it feasible to bring about this adjustment. Possibly this reparation in kind is already being arranged—if so, so much the better. If not, let us hope that it will be urged upon the allied governments by appropriate scientific organizations.

E. B. KRUMBHAAR
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

OSTEOPATHY AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

To the Signatories to the Petition to President Truman for the Deferment of College Science Students

DEAR SIRS:

IN the November 16th issue of SCIENCE appears a letter signed by you and seven other educators appealing to President Truman to alter certain current Selective Service practices. Although I am in hearty sympathy with the motives which undoubtedly prompted your action, I am, nevertheless, impelled to protest vigorously about one element in your statement which casts a serious shadow over the entire document.

In the second paragraph you mention, as deserving deferment, students of "osteopathy" in the same general category with students in such recognized disciplines as medicine, dentistry, pharmacy and engineering. To do so stultifies the entire argument because no American university recognizes osteopathy as a scientifically based healing art, and there is no reason to believe that the biological science faculties of the institutions you represent consider the system of osteopathy to be other than a fraud upon a gullible public. The stupidity or cupidity of some Selective Service official in originally classing students of osteopathy with the others you have listed in granting deferment several years ago is not an adequate excuse for responsible officials of respectable institutions of learning to compound the error now. When university and college heads plead for special consideration for students in the various cults of this type our academic standards and ethics have fallen to a new low. Since when has expediency superseded principle in academic practice? And since when have the institutions you represent and administer given their academic blessing to medical cultism? If those universities, including California, Cincinnati, Cornell, New York University, Vanderbilt and Yale, among others, intend to promote osteopathy it is certainly time for American medical and other biological scientists to take stock of their position.

Actually I am confident that the unfortunate implications of the naming of osteopathic students in this way were not apparent to most of you. Nevertheless, the seriousness of its occurrence, even by inadvertence if such it was, can not be over-emphasized in a world in which the layman looks to science for miracles and can not distinguish between scientific fancy and fact because of an inadequacy of background information which, right or wrong, he looks to persons like yourselves to possess and use.

MAURICE B. VISSCHER
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSIOLOGY,
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

THE NATURE OF SPECIES

Experimental Studies on the Nature of Species. II. Plant Evolution through Amphiploidy and Autoploidy with Examples from the Madiinae. By JENS CLAUSEN, DAVID D. KECK and WILLIAM M. HIESEY. Carnegie Institution of Washington Publ. 564. vii + 174 pp. 86 figs. 1945. Paper, $1.25, cloth, $2.00.

THE purpose of this valuable and stimulating contribution is the classification of polyploids in terms of the "biosystematic" categories already made familiar by the same authors: the ecotype, the ecospecies and the cenospecies. The origin and characteristics of three synthesized amphiploids are first described, one of which is found in nature. Then follows an examination of other polyploids and the classification proposed. This in turn is followed by discussions of the ecological characteristics of both autoploids and amphiploids and the course of evolution when polyploidy is involved.

The authors "propose to limit autoploidy to the multiplication of genomes within the limits of one ecospecies. By this definition, *autoploidy* applies to cases ranging from the homozygous individual with multiplied chromosome number, at one extreme, to the polyploid derivatives of a hybrid between subspecies or ecotypes of a species of the other. *Amphiploidy,* in contrast with autoploidy, is the addition of all the