

## Book Reviews

**No Frontier to Learning.** The Mexican student in the United States. Ralph L. Beals and Norman D. Humphrey. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1957. xi + 148 pp. \$3.25.

This is fascinating reading. Ten Mexican students at the University of California (Los Angeles) were intensively interviewed and tested (from 4 to 20 hours) about such things as their motivations in coming to the United States, their attitudes toward American culture before, during, and after their period of study, their problems of linguistic, academic, and social adjustment, and their beliefs about the value of their foreign study upon returning home. An additional 42 Mexican students supplied supplementary information. Twenty-six Mexican students who had returned were interviewed in Mexico. The methodological approach is anthropological; a senior author with over 25 years, and a junior author with 15 years, of firsthand acquaintance with Mexico and Mexican culture worked intensively with relatively few subjects. I believe that the conclusions reached are accurate and that extensive use of questionnaires among a larger sample would have produced few differences. Nevertheless, a follow-up in other parts of the United States would be of interest: only eight of the 52 students resided outside of California.

Some of the findings are as follows: most of the students come from middle- and upper-class urban backgrounds; all reflect considerable anti-American feeling, in considerable measure because of historical reasons rather than personal experiences; the desire of many to study in colleges in the United States is motivated by a sense of social obligation and the wish to do something for Mexico; most students would have preferred to study in Europe; most students adjust to United States culture more readily than does the average foreign student. The students' attitudes became modified in the direction of greater egalitarianism, increased cooperativeness, greater open-mindedness, and more feelings of social responsibility. Many shifted from a position of hostile criticism to friendly criticism, but all continue to believe in the

basic superiority of Mexican life goals, "with their emphasis on spiritual and humanistic values." Discouragingly, most returned students find a cultural climate in which they often must be overtly anti-American in order to be accepted and to get ahead in their fields. The authors point out that if the major objective of exchange programs is to secure wholehearted approval of the United States by foreign students, the Mexican experience indicates that this goal is not reached. In broader perspective, the reader is left with the conviction that both Mexico and the United States profit from the presence of the Mexican student in this country.

Would it be in order to suggest that a companion study, "The American Student in Mexico," would be equally desirable?

GEORGE M. FOSTER  
*University of California, Berkeley*

**Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Zoology.** Copenhagen, 5-12 Aug. 1953. Danish Science Press, Copenhagen, 1956. 567 pp. Illus. Paper, Kr. 100.

The proceedings of the 14th International Congress of Zoology, held in Copenhagen in 1953, were published last year but only recently received wide distribution. Delegates from 34 countries and three international institutions were present. It may be of interest to note that 501 members took part, in contrast to the 707 who participated in 1927 in Budapest, where the tenth congress was held.

A casual reader may well ask: What goes on at an international congress of zoology? By way of answer, this volume clearly says, "All sorts of new and old biological ideas are discussed, and many viewpoints are interrelated." In addition to the general meetings, which covered subjects such as fauna protection, improving zoological nomenclature, growth of marine populations, paleoecology and adaptation, and thinking without words (precursors to language), and films on the Galathea Expedition, the history of the eel, and the flight of insects, there

were 16 sectional meetings, at each of which some 10 to 25 papers were presented. Some sample groupings are paleozoology, evolution, cytology, morphogenesis, psychology, comparative physiology, serology, parasitology, nematology, hydrobiology, and anthropological systematics.

It would be all too easy to suggest that this eclectic collection is without great permanent value, or that zoological congresses are scientifically passé. A brilliant defense of general meetings is found in Professor Spärck's presidential address of welcome. He faces the problem courageously: "Some people are of the opinion that in zoology specialization has now developed so far, that we should stop having general congresses of zoology, and only have congresses of specialists. . . . It is important not to forget that the animal Kingdom is a part of nature, that a zoologist is a naturalist, that the problems of cytology, biochemistry, physiology concern living animals, reacting as a whole organism against ecological factors and other organisms. . . . Apart from the lectures, excursions, and personal contacts, the congresses are a very important factor in international cooperation. They are a counterweight against isolation, which is so dangerous to the progress of Science."

Brief mention of a few of the subjects discussed and of their proponents may illustrate the true value of this triennial meeting: the giant mitochondria of insect muscles (C. Williams); representative Mediterranean fauna in the Caspian Sea (L. Zenkevitch); radiation effects on regeneration of invertebrates (E. Wolff); nucleolar extrusion in amebae (D. L. Ray); olfactory sense of dogs in relation to fatty acids (T. Uchida); proposals for international agreement on normal stages in vertebrate embryology (E. Witschi); control of tube-worm growths in a British tidal harbor lake (N. Tebble); tumorigenesis in invertebrates (J. Wautier); the biology of Atlantic seals (a new color film, presented by L. H. Matthews); taxonomic characters of Old World monkeys (M. Friant); specificity of food plants for insects (G. Fraenkel); and ways of stabilizing zoological nomenclature (C. L. Hubbs). Unfortunately, many papers were not up to the standards of these.

The congress was convened under the auspices of the Danish Government and the University of Copenhagen. Financial aid was received from the Carlsberg and Tuborg brewing industries. The volume contains a few figures and an index and has a paper cover of good quality. One may well ask why some 13 authors could not take the trouble to submit abstracts. Biologists generally, and zoologists in particular, should do some