Letters

Women Scientists

The editorial "Science for the misses" [*Science* **129**, 749 (1959)] leads me to believe that your readers will be interested in some data which I have assembled (with the help of Barbara Drew Atwood). Graduates of seven women's colleges who are included in *American Men of Science* were counted, and the numbers were expressed as percentages of total living graduates of the respective colleges. The results follow (the first percentage is for the physical sciences; the second, for the biological): Mt. Holyoke, 0.46, 0.75; Bryn Mawr, 0.48, 0.57; Goucher, 0.40, 0.53; Vassar, 0.34, 0.32; Wellesley, 0.24, 0.24; Smith, 0.14, 0.25; and Radcliffe, 0.14, 0.13. The total is 532/87,012, or 0.61 percent.

Less than 1 percent of the 87,012 alumnae who were living in 1956 are in *American Men of Science*. Is this an indication of lack of opportunity for women scientists, of less innate scientific ability in women, or of women's greater interest in home, children, and cultural activities other than scientific?

I believe that both men and women can be grouped into three categories: (i) those who must be scientists at any cost; (ii) those who are not interested and who would never be scientists; (iii) a group intermediate in size—those who, under the stimulus of economic necessity, prefer science to any other field. Most men in both categories (i) and (iii) become scientists. Women in group (i) persist in their study, but most women in group (iii) work as assistants, and so on, until marriage, children, or economic improvement releases them.

I sometimes wonder, after many years of teaching college science, if it is wise to urge or to tempt persons, men or women, in group (iii) to become scientists. To give all possible aid and encouragement to those in group (i) might, in the long run, accomplish more.

ANNA R. WHITING
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Supercooled or Subcooled?

Braham's article, "How does a raindrop grow?" [*Science* **129**, 123 (1959)], is an excellent survey of our knowledge on this subject. I would, however, like to raise a question about the use of the word *subcooled* to indicate cooling of water below 0°C. To the cloud physicist and other scientists, *subcooled* and *supercooled* are generally regarded as interchangeable. It seems, however, a little unwise and completely unnecessary for scientists to use two words, which, it would seem from their structure, ought to have opposite meanings, to indicate