that cellulose had a vitamin B and G sparing effect.'' In this connection it is assumed that these authors were referring particularly to the following conclusion drawn by us (p. 418): ''Increasing amounts of fiber in the form of agar and Cell-U-Flour possessed a definite sparing effect on vitamins B and G utilization. The beneficial effect of fiber is thought to be due to the production of more favorable conditions for the growth of microorganisms in the digestive tract.''

A re-examination of the original data as well as those presented in Tables 1 and 2 (pp. 402, 403) and Figs. 5 and 6 (pp. 411, 413) seems to us to justify the above conclusion. (It is well to remember that at the time our experiments were carried out (1933) ''Vitamin B'' had not been subdivided into the numerous fractions known today.) To substantiate our contention, however, certain data taken from the original records (essentially as given in Table 2 of the above publication) are hereby presented:

Diet No.	Agar (%)	Cell-U-Flour (%)	Total food intake during depletion period (gm)	Growth during depletion period (gm)	Food intake per gm growth (gm)
337	0	0	73	4	18.25
338	2	.	76	7	10.86
339	4	.	77	10	7.70
340	6	.	86	13	6.62
341	8	.	79	17	4.65
342	10	.	75	16	4.69
345	..	2	65	7	9.29
346	..	4	67	13	5.15
347	..	6	69	13	5.31
348	..	8	74	19	3.89

These data show the average food intake and weight increase of the several groups of rats employed in this particular phase of our studies during that period (21-day depletion period) when no supplementary vitamin B or vitamin G was fed. Also, the relative amounts of the respective diets (including fiber, where the fiber replaced an equal weight of sucrose) ingested per gram gain in body weight are given. It is to be noted from these data that the rate of growth increased with an increase in the fiber content of the diet until 10% of the fiber (agar) was used. Since these diets had been proven to be deficient in the B-vitamins (Fig. 1), it seemed to us that the increased growth was due either to the sparing effect of the higher fiber diets on the body reserve of these vitamins or, more probably, to the increased intestinal synthesis of these vitamins in the presence of roughage. The authors favored the latter explanation.

When one considers the above data from the standpoint of the amounts of the respective diets ingested per gram increase in body weight, it is readily observed that the high fiber diets (8%) were more efficient in producing growth than was the basal diet (Diet 337) or the low fiber diets (Diets 338 and 345). This was previously shown by the relationship of caloric intake to growth (Table 2). This increased rate of growth per unit of food intake cannot be explained on the basis of the contention of Hoelzel and Carlson that ''the replacement of glucose by cellulose therefore reduced the carbohydrate content or increased the proportion of protein, fat, and other constituents of the utilizable part of the diet, and this may explain the results attributed to the cellulose.'' In fact, the replacement of 5–20% of sucrose by an equal weight of fat (Diet 319–323) failed to produce weight gains comparable to those obtained on diets in which 2–8% sucrose was replaced by a comparable weight of agar or Cell-U-Flour. Thus, the mere reduction in the proportion of the digestible carbohydrate content of the diet to the other digestible nutrients does not in itself explain the improved growth rates observed on the high fiber diets.

While the two sets of experiments were not carried out with the same objective in view or under comparable conditions, the writer has detected no conflict between the experimental findings reported by Mannering, Orsini, and Elvehjem (*J. Nutrition*, 1944, 28, 141) and those previously published by Guerrant and Dutcher (*J. Nutrition*, 1934, 8, 397).

N. B. GUERRANT

Department of Biochemistry,
The Pennsylvania State College

The Scientist and Social Issues

The excellent paper by Alfred B. Bonds, Jr., on ''Some Recommendations of the President's Commission on Higher Education'' (*Science*, April 16, pp. 379–383) contains a suggestion which leaves one with some misgivings. On page 381, this statement appears: ''In the physical and natural sciences, the Commission has put forward proposals aimed at equipping the prospective scientist with a broad understanding of the social issues related to his subject-matter field.'' One would hope this pronouncement does not in any way suggest that scientists be expected or urged to suppress or distort facts in such a way as to make them conform to a political or social ideology. The current effort in one of the totalitarian countries to shape scientists in this sort of mold will, one trusts, be forever frowned upon not only by scientists but by all thinking people elsewhere.

P. J. OLSON

The University of Manitoba