

TABLE II
COMPARATIVE RATING FOR FIRST 29 YEARS

Country	Number of winners	Ideal quota	Per cent. attainment	Rank
Denmark	4	0.83	500	1
Sweden	6	1.4	423	2
Holland	7	1.8	400	3
Switzerland	3	1	300	4
Germany	27	15	180	5
Great Britain ..	14	8.4	167	6
France	13	9.3	140	7
Canada	2	2.3	87	8
Austria	3	3.7	81	9
Belgium	1	1.8	55	10
Italy	2	9.3	21	11
United States ..	5	27	18	12-13
Spain	1	5.4	18	12-13

the postwar populations of the countries in each table and dividing this sum by the total number of prize winners for that period. This gives the population corresponding to one prize winner. The post-war population of each country divided by the prize winning population gives the ideal quota for the respective countries.

The results calculated in this manner are tabulated in Tables I, II and III.

TABLE III
COMPARATIVE RATING FOR LAST 10 YEARS

Country	Number of winners	Ideal quota	Per cent. attainment	Rank
Switzerland	2	0.43	465	1
Holland	2	0.92	217	2
Great Britain ..	7	4.0	175	3
Austria	3	1.8	162	4
Germany	10	7.4	135	5
United States ..	10	13	78	6
France	2	4.5	44	7
Italy	1	4.6	22	8

The true leaders in the sciences now appear since the smaller countries are no longer handicapped by their small populations. Four of the smaller countries lead in Tables I and II. Great Britain and Germany have had very uniform records. In the last ten years the United States has shown a distinct improvement. Her performance is four times as high as it was in the first twenty-nine years.

HARVEY C. BRILL

MIAMI UNIVERSITY

THE WITCH OF ANDOR

IN a letter to SCIENCE (Lancaster, Pa. and/or Garrison, N. Y.) of September 13, 1940, it is stated that "The use of the form 'and/or' in legal practice is well established." So is the expression "to-wit," if we mean widely rather than wisely established; but, if both these expressions can be restricted to legal usage, the English language will be better off. With a little better grasp of language, the original perpetrator would have avoided the fractional form (which as read aloud may be either "and over or" or "and-orths"). Accepted English practice is to place an alternative term in parenthesis, as "and (or)." The chief abuse, however, is not in using the expression awkwardly and inaccurately but in using it at all. We have far too much of such writing as "You may have sugar and/or cream in your tea and/or coffee, and/or pepper and/or salt on your meat and/or potatoes." When really necessary, the idea is best conveyed by saying "or either" or "or both."

E. H. McCLELLAND

CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

THE GEOLOGY OF CHINA

The Geology of China. By J. S. LEE. xv+528 pp., 93 figs. London: Thomas Murby and Company. New York: Nordemann Publishing Company. 1940. \$9.00.

THIS book grew out of lectures by the author in British universities during 1934-35 under the auspices of the Universities China Committee in London. It contains much valuable material, especially for those who want a rapid oversight of China's geology before studying intensively from sources of detailed information. For the geologist, the book is too brief, too inconclusive, too speculative. For the layman, it is far too full of technicalities, many of which are not needed to convey the meaning clearly. The book could be used in China as a text for students who have had their general physical and historical geology.

By far the most serviceable portion is the tenth chapter; a summary of the stratigraphy of China by

regions, defining the formations and listing their chief fossils. All who are interested in the geology of Asia will welcome this chapter, which extends through 100 pages.

A lack which every geologist will immediately feel upon reading the book is the absence of a brief chapter on the history of geology in China. Strangely enough, the author gives a history of China as a nation, plausibly defending his course by claiming to show "the influence upon human geography of the natural regions which have been defined." But his history is political and cultural, and his interpretation of history—to say the least—is his own.

Lacking an account of the development of geology in China, the book gives no picture of the work of such men as Pumpelly, Richthofen, Obruchev, Loczy, Willis, Blackwelder, Fuller, Clapp, Andersson, Ting, Grabau, Wong, Berkey, Black, Teilhard—to give only a partial list. These men are casually referred to for local details; the reader must learn from other sources