

probable *existence* of innate differences between socioeconomic strata but when he discussed the problem of estimating relative to environmental differences the *size* of such a difference. Again, *ad* (2), his footnote regarding the testing of preschool children has no implication of a "warning" and refers not to the *fact* of differences but to the numerically somewhat different scale of scores from preschool as compared to older children. In principle, differences in the same direction were recorded for both young and older children of different socioeconomic groups. *Ad* (3), that infant mental tests in 1938 were of doubtful value, it may be replied once more that the unsatisfactory nature of these tests concerns rather their exact quantitative aspects than the qualitative establishment of test differences. Finally, *ad* (4), Bernhard Stern's reference to my having abandoned certain data as unsatisfactory is inadmissible. The data may be found on page 516 of my book unchanged from their presentation in the *Science* article. They were neither abandoned nor called unsatisfactory.

My interpretation of the evidence may not be shared by some or many, but, contrary to a claim made by Davis and Havighurst, it is at least fully compatible with our knowledge of human genetics. These authors say: "From what is known about genetics, the children of a man who was well favored with innate intelligence would have very little chance of being better favored than the children of a man who was less well endowed genetically in these respects." This statement is based on the arguments that "both men carry many latent characteristics as well as manifest ones" and that their wives contribute half the genes to the offspring. But these facts bear only on the *degree* of heritability, not on the genetically expected existence of heritability. Given the premises made by Davis and Havighurst of the existence of men favored with innate intelligence and of others less well endowed, genetic knowledge leaves no doubt that, on the average, the children of the former are again innately more favored than the children of the latter.

I should like to conclude these comments with a general remark. It is one thing to express an opinion on the weight of scientific evidence and another to draw practical conclusions from one's judgment. In my published discussions I have pointed out repeatedly the preliminary nature of the conclusions reached, their very limited eugenic significance, the lack of urgency of the eugenic problem, and the great importance of the environmental component. The censure of my judgment as manifesting "conventional biases" seems based primarily on the potential sociological misuse of such judgment. Censure of this kind is contrary to the essence of free inquiry and implies a desire to impose doctrinal limitations to the study of observable phenomena. We must be free, however, to reach conclusions, preliminary or supposedly final, regardless of the misuse to which they may be subjected. In the condemnation and combat of their misuse we all can join hands.

CURT STERN

Department of Zoology  
University of California, Berkeley

## American Men of Science

There has been much interest in the letters which the undersigned sent to those included in *American Men of Science*. Because a number of persons completely misunderstood the purpose of the letters, as editor, I shall try to clear the matter for all concerned. The directory has a great value and fills a great need to American men of science.

Your editor set the advance paid price at \$9.50 when it should have been \$12.00. On the \$11.00 advance unpaid orders, the same situation exists, as the \$1.50 difference is almost entirely consumed by additional accounting costs. In three years costs increased that much. It cost \$200,000.00 to put out the eighth edition of the directory. There were 50,000 names listed and editorial costs came to \$100,000.00, which is \$2.00 each.

There were two letters sent out: one was a letter to those who bought a copy and they were asked to pay \$2.00 additional to cover the increased cost of their copy; the second was a letter to those who did not order a copy. This group was asked to help defray the costs of editorial work in connection with their biography. Almost everyone uses either someone else's copy, or a library copy, so it was felt that most of this group would be glad to help to the extent of the \$2.00 editorial costs.

However, a few persons have inquired about the intent of the second letter, believing that if no \$2.00 were sent, biographies might be omitted. This is quite erroneous. Nothing was further from that thought when the letter was mailed. If such a letter were sent to those being considered for inclusion in the directory there might be cause for concern. But everyone who received the letter is already included in the directory.

No record is being kept for editorial use of those who sent \$2.00. If anyone sent \$2.00 for the reason of editorial influence they should ask for a refund.

Obviously, had it been a money-making scheme more than \$2.00 would have been asked. It was hoped that a sufficient number of those who received the letters would contribute enough to make the directory secure, but it will fall short of that figure, unless more are received.

The fact that we returned over 200 \$9.50 advance paid orders of those who in our judgment were not eligible for inclusion proves that inclusion cannot be bought.

We are grateful to the many thousands who understood our letters and helped us with our financial problem. The book will be priced higher for the ninth edition; we hope this will take care of all expenses.

We want to assure all those in science in America that the high plane of editorial policy will never change so long as the undersigned is editor. He has been editor for over 20 years.

JACQUES CATTELL  
Editor, American Men of Science

## Committee for Aid to Foreign Physiologists

A committee was set up in September, 1948, by the American Physiological Society to aid foreign physiolo-