

to abide by them, the reader is entitled to a clear statement of the reasons for divergence.

In discussing the taxonomic position of the genus, Thom and Raper (p. 6) follow E. Fischer's treatment in Engler and Prantl (1896) and list *Aspergillus* "in its proper place" among the Ascomycetes. They then proceed to define *Aspergillus*, credited to Micheli 1729, as an imperfect fungus, inserting in the description, toward the end, "perithecia found in certain groups only, unknown in most species." *Eurotium* Link. 1809 is not formally diagnosed, but is discussed in general terms and discarded "for practical purposes." No notice is taken of the fact that Fries's *Systema Mycologicum* 1821-32 is the starting point from which the application of both names must be determined, nor is the use of these names by Fries or those who immediately followed him cited. Both *Aspergillus* and *Eurotium* were adopted by Fries (1825, 1832) and previously, but after the publication of the first volume of the *Systema*, by S. F. Gray (1821). *Aspergillus* is certainly restricted, as it was originally by Micheli, to what we now know as imperfect fungi. *Eurotium* applies in large part, if not entirely, to what we now know are ascomycetous fungi, characterized by asci borne in cleistothecia, and can be readily typified so that there can be no possibility of confusion. The application of Article 57 of the rules has been all but universally followed in such cases in other Ascomycetes, and no good reason is given for making an exception in the case of *Aspergillus*. In any specific instance where a species of *Aspergillus* is known to be the imperfect stage of a species of *Eurotium*, then the species, as a unit, must be transferred to *Eurotium*. The imperfect stage will continue to be classed and keyed with the other Aspergilli, the occurrence of cleistothecia being noted only as one of its several distinguishing characters. The genus *Fusarium* affords an exact parallel. A number of species of *Fusarium* are known to be imperfect stages of various species of *Nectria* and allied genera. In every such case, the fungus, as a species, is properly transferred to its ascomycete genus. The imperfect stage remains a *Fusarium*, and since that stage is the one likely to be met with and is of dominant importance in the practical utilization of knowledge of these fungi, the species of *Fusarium* with known perfect stages will continue to be listed and keyed with the species in which no perfect stage is known. Linder's monographs of the helicosporous fungi and of *Oidium* stress the imperfect stages of these fungi and make the treatment of the perfect stages, where known, subordinate. As a result, they are much more useful than they would be had this not been done.

Thom and Raper's volume constitutes one of the most outstanding mycological contributions of recent years and will unquestionably prove to be one of the most useful. The question here discussed will seem of little or no significance to most of those who will use the work to their very great profit. It is all the more to be regretted that the attitude toward nomenclature is so dogmatically asserted and so completely unsupported by examination of the considerations involved.

G. W. MARTIN

State University of Iowa

## Replies to Dr. Visscher

Eight of the country's leading educators, mostly chancellors and presidents of great universities, addressed to President Truman an "appeal for the deferment of college science students," which appeared in *Science*, 1945, 102, 500-501. Maurice B. Visscher, M.D., addressed an open letter to these educators (*Science*, 1945, 102, 674), expressing the confident belief that the implications of what they had signed "were not apparent to most of you."

If Dr. Visscher wishes to discuss osteopathy, and has the necessary knowledge to do so, that is one thing. But when he ascribes "stupidity or cupidity" to a man of the standing and accomplishments of General Hershey because the latter included osteopathic students among those subject to deferment, he shows a total lack of knowledge both of the background of General Hershey's act, and of the established attitude of Federal and state governments for many years.

When the Selective Service law was new, the Office of Production Management studied the situation and recognized the futility of expecting the M.D. heads of the Medical Corps in the Army or the Navy to permit osteopathic physicians and surgeons to take the examinations to demonstrate their fitness for commissions as medical officers. Therefore, it recommended to Selective Service that both osteopathic physicians and surgeons, and osteopathic students, be included among the lists of persons engaged in essential occupations and subject to deferment. Selective Service issued such regulations on 16 July 1941. That it was not a matter of whim or caprice is proved further by the fact that more than 17 months later, in December 1942, when the regulations were promulgated providing for the deferment of preprofessional students—premedical, pre dental, etc.—preosteopathic students also were included.

General Hershey's recognition of the essential nature of the study and the practice of osteopathy, and of the preprofessional training of those who would be osteopathic physicians and surgeons, is not an example of "stupidity or cupidity"; it is, on the other hand, exactly consistent with the attitude of the Federal government over many years—except as its intentions are thwarted by men who hold the M.D. degree and happen to be in places of authority, as in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Navy.

The Federal government paid for the education of veterans in osteopathic colleges following World War I and is doing the same now.

Congress has again and again appropriated funds for the payment of osteopathic physicians as medical officers in the Navy and of osteopathic physicians to serve in Army hospitals.

Congress has just passed a bill to set up a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans Administration in which osteopathic physicians are specifically stated to be eligible for commissions.

Dr. Visscher's failure to recognize the care which university chancellors and presidents use in acquainting themselves with the implications of communications which

they address to the President of the United States, and his lack of understanding of what lay behind what he chooses to term General Hershey's "stupidity or cupidity," is matched by his evident lack of understanding of the general governmental background of osteopathy.

The U. S. Employees' Compensation Act provides for payment to osteopathic physicians and surgeons and osteopathic hospitals for the care of government employees injured in line of duty.

The U. S. Office of Education recognized the American Osteopathic Association as the accrediting agency for osteopathic colleges and includes osteopathy among the professions concerning which it issues vocational guidance booklets.

The general temper of Congress was well represented in the action of the Senate on 30 May 1940, when it passed what was to have been known as "The Hospital Construction Act of 1940," providing, among other things, for a National Advisory Hospital Council with eight appointed members "selected from leading medical, osteopathic, or scientific authorities. . . ."

As long ago as February 1929 Congress passed, and President Coolidge signed, an act governing the practice of medicine in the District of Columbia and providing that "the degrees, doctor of medicine and doctor of osteopathy shall be accorded the same rights and privileges under governmental regulations."

In a number of states the law requires the inclusion on the State Board of Health of an osteopathic physician, and there is such inclusion in states where it is not required.

Dr. Visscher lives in a land where the privilege of free speech and a free press is often abused because it is not even required that what one says or writes shall be true.

RAY G. HULBURT, *Editor*

*American Osteopathic Association, Chicago*

. . . . Dr. Visscher's protest is directed to proposed selective service deferment changes, its import is clear as are the convictions of the author. . . .

For a scientist to attack viciously a concept about which he knows nothing merely suggests that he has stepped out of his role as a scientist and has become either a politician or an evangelist, in either case his mouthings can be discounted because they represent an emotional outburst and are not a product of his scientific knowledge.

It so happens that the exemption of osteopathic students and physicians from the selective service has been a wartime necessity not only as a means of utilizing the training and skill of everyone where it would operate to the best advantage, which in this case was the care of the civilian population, but also because the medical departments of the army and navy, for reasons of their own, consistently refused to commission osteopathic physicians and surgeons as medical officers, although the congress

repeatedly implied its wish that they be so commissioned. The United States Public Health Service has commissioned a few osteopathic physicians. Because of this situation legislators and selective service officials were unwilling to draft a group of highly trained personnel badly needed, into the services as privates.

The performance of osteopathic physicians and institutions during the war has been most creditable. They stood up to everything asked of them and gave willingly as far as they were able to the war effort, without asking favor or special privilege.

Osteopathic institutions are not perpetrating "a fraud upon a gullible public," but are engaged in the serious business of training physicians and surgeons, able to meet the general medical problems of the average patient.

It is time that scientists shake themselves and keep pace with progress that is being made in allied fields before expressing themselves authoritatively about them, in terms and concepts that have long since been outgrown.

THOMAS J. MEYERS, D.O.

*Pasadena*

The type of discussion by Maurice B. Visscher, M.D., of "Osteopathy and University Presidents" strikes the writer as unfair propaganda, and as such is out of place in any scientific journal.

The article is out of place because it is an emotional and untrue discussion of matters which will stand investigation in an orderly, systematic, and scientific manner. We are not interested in the thesis of anyone who thanks God in the market place that he is holier or more learned than other men.

There is abundant evidence that there are just as many pious "frauds" in regular practice in the allopathic cult as afflict the osteopathic school of medicine. But unlike the gentleman we would not be so inaccurate or so uncharitable as to indict the whole allopathic cult because of the undoubted quacks within the fold. We believe that the great majority of the allopathic profession are just as scientific, just as honest, and just as faithful and hard working as the practitioners of the osteopathic school of medicine. . . .

CYRUS N. RAY, D.O., *Former Member,*  
*Texas State Board of Medical Examiners*

*Abilene, Texas*

#### Transposition

I am sorry that I have to call your attention to a typesetter's error in our article which appeared in the January 11th issue of *Science*. Page 51, column 1, line 2 and line 11 are transposed. It is easy to see how the error was made because both lines begin with six identical characters.

HARRY SHAY, M.D.

*Medical Research Laboratory*  
*Samuel S. Fels Fund, Philadelphia*