

the "Might is Right" doctrine. The argument against which the author advances somewhat heavy guns has been previously shattered by Dr. Chalmers Mitchell and others, but it is interesting to see it crumble under French fire.

According to the theory, the power of conquering in battle is the biological basis of Right, for does not evolution mean progress, and has not selection by means of struggle been the essential factor in evolution? To this Prof. Anthony replies: (1) that evolution is not necessarily a march in the direction of progress; (2) that the selection which results from intra-specific and inter-specific struggle does not appear to have more than an accessory rôle in evolution; (3) that the selection resulting from intra-specific struggle, even when this is competitive without actual combat, tends to accelerate processes leading to extinction (progressive specialisation and progressive increase in size), and does not necessarily increase the chances of victory in inter-specific struggle; and (4) that only that form of selection which results from vital competition without combat can help a species to a more complete realisation of its intrinsic tendencies, and that what gives the victory is not superiority in the power of destroying, but superiority in utilising the resources of life.

Prof. Anthony has not taken advantage, as he might have done, of some previous analyses of the various modes of selection, nor even of Darwin's insistence on the subtlety of the concept of the struggle for existence; but his own line of argument is interesting. As it seems to us, however, he pulls his bow far too tightly in his refusal to recognise the quality of "progress" in animate evolution, in his depreciation of the importance of natural selection, and in his theory that intra-specific struggle tends to accelerate processes that make for extinction. He exaggerates elements of truth until they become positively fallacious.

J. A. T.

Founders' Day in War Time. By Sir Adolphus W. Ward. Pp. 55. (Manchester: At the University Press; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1917.) Price 1s. 6d. net.

MANY readers will be glad to have in this convenient and permanent form the address delivered by Sir A. W. Ward, formerly Vice-Chancellor of the University of Manchester, on March 23 last, at a memorial service for members of the University who have fallen in the war. After explaining the high office of education as "the drawing out, and bringing to a beneficent growth and increase, what has been implanted by nature, aided by circumstance," the address outlines the growth and development of Manchester University from the time when, in the year before that of the outbreak of the Great Civil War, Henry Fairfax petitioned the Long Parliament for the establishment of a northern university, down to the present day. The members of the University who study the address will value increasingly the privilege of their association with so worthy an institution.

NO. 2500, VOL. 100]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

[The Editor does not hold himself responsible for opinions expressed by his correspondents. Neither can he undertake to return, or to correspond with the writers of, rejected manuscripts intended for this or any other part of NATURE. No notice is taken of anonymous communications.]

Shell-shock and its Lessons.

IN NATURE of September 6 there appeared, under the enigmatic title, "The Psychopathy of the Barbed Wire," an exceptionally lengthy review of our little book on "Shell-shock and its Lessons." In it Sir Robert Armstrong-Jones makes no reference whatsoever to the main themes to which practically the whole of the book is devoted. These are, first, the vital importance, in dealing with cases of illness due primarily to specific anxieties and mental conflicts (whether these are caused by the terrifying experiences of warfare or the worries of civil life), of discovering the real nature and causes of these anxieties and conflicts; and, secondly, the urgent need for the establishment of clinics in which patients afflicted with mental disturbance can be treated while they are still sane.

This omission of all reference to the real substance of our book, to the topics with which it is primarily concerned from the first page to the last, is a curious commentary on the fairness of his review.

Instead of giving a real account of the scope of the book, he seizes upon a series of relatively unimportant points—so far as their bearing upon the aims of the work is concerned—and with almost unflinching regularity attributes to us statements which we have never made. As NATURE has given currency to these misrepresentations, we feel bound to ask for the opportunity of correcting them seriatim.

So far as the scientific readers of NATURE are concerned, we could confidently leave the inconsistencies of the review to tell their own tale; but the points at issue relate to far-reaching questions of public policy upon which action has to be taken by men who might perhaps be influenced and confirmed in their inertia by this review.

When we are accused of tending to dwell unduly upon the value of suggestion, hypnotism, and "psycho-analysis," we are forced to doubt whether your reviewer has read what we have said upon these subjects. For we took particular care to emphasise the strict limitations to the usefulness of hypnotism. Only two pages of our book deal with "psycho-analysis," and most of what we have written on the subject consists of a discussion of the various meanings of this term.

But why is no reference made by your reviewer to the vitally important subject of psychological analysis and re-education, to which a whole chapter is devoted?

As regards the question of dream-analysis, which we have also been accused of unduly emphasising, with the experience gained during the last three years in many hundreds of cases of "shell-shock" it is safe to say that the physician who does not analyse his patient's dreams in certain cases must inevitably fail to diagnose the real cause that is at the root of all the trouble. A typical instance has been reported in detail by Dr. W. H. R. Rivers in the *Lancet* of August 18, p. 237, and we could cite scores of similar cases from our own experience. Your reviewer's charge that we have dwelt unduly on dream-analysis can only mean that he is not acquainted with the important work that has been done in this field, and the extensive use that has been made of a measure proved to be quite invaluable for diagnosis and rational treatment.