

which occurred during my mound-work in Florida.

At one time I had almost completed the slicing-down of a large mound in which no object in any way connected with Europeans had been found.

While my back happened to be turned I heard a cry and went to the colored digger from whom it came and who, I found, held in his hand an iron spike—a sure sign of European contact.

“From where did this come?” I asked.

The digger did not seem to comprehend my question and, as time pressed, I asked a leading question, which no investigator should do. I inquired again, “Did it come from the base?”

“Yes, sah, from de base,” replied the digger.

I was somewhat nonplussed, for I never had (and never have) dug down a mound of any size where artifacts of white origin were present other than superficially.

Suddenly an idea struck me. “Where is the base?” I asked.

“Why, at de top, sah,” replied the digger.

Once in conversation with a very intelligent man, the leading citizen of a town on the Ocklawaha river, I was somewhat startled at the information that the speaker had in his house a grooved stone axe found on his place.

I pointed out that no report had yet appeared as to the discovery of a grooved axe in Florida. The speaker was positive. He *knew* he was right. I asked him, as a favor, to consult with his family at dinner as to the matter and to let me know later on.

In the afternoon he called on me and stated that the grooved stone axe was a present from a friend in Alabama and that the implement found on his place had no groove.

CLARENCE B. MOORE.

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION AND A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY.*

SINCE our conversation about the organization and purpose of the Smithsonian Institution I have been thinking much about the matter.

* A letter addressed by Professor Benjamin Ide Wheeler, of Cornell University, to the Hon. Gardiner G. Hubbard, Washington, and published here with the permission of Professor Wheeler and Mr. Hubbard.

Certain things seem clear. The Institution is at the National Capital; whatever it does must represent the best there is in the country. The plan of its foundation and the purposes of the founder were broad; it ought, if it can be found in any way practicable, to represent more than one, two or three branches of scientific knowledge. The problem is how, with the limited fund at disposal, to combine the two things, supreme excellence and wide scope.

I think I can conceive of a plan. Whether it is practical or not will be for others who are nearer at hand and better acquainted with the details to determine.

Since the Institution began its work the conditions of scientific work in this country have radically changed. There were then but few recognized departments of scientific endeavor; now the differentiation of the sciences has advanced into great multiplicity. Then a single man was able to cover a large field and there were Humboldts in the land; now a man may not venture to call himself a chemist, but defines his specialty as Physical Chemistry, Agricultural Chemistry, Chemistry of Gases, Inorganic or Organic Chemistry, etc. Then there were no universities in the present sense. There were no institutions where any large number of different scientific fields were occupied by advanced investigators. There were colleges which taught, not universities which learned.

It is now no longer possible for the Smithsonian Institution to compete, even in a single department, with the larger universities. According to its present organization it has, and can have, but one or two men for one or two departments. There are now a half-dozen universities that can and do employ a considerable force of men for each of a large list of scientific departments, each of which is equipped with laboratories, apparatus and collections. A man who permanently establishes himself in residence at Washington at the Institution cuts himself off from many associations he would find at a university. He loses the opportunity of laboratories and carefully assembled collections of the literature of his subject. He loses the stimulus of teaching and of working with investigators and of directing investigations. The Smithsonian Institution is not a university and

cannot become one. It would be vain for it to attempt to duplicate the outfit of a modern university.

Its mission and its opportunity is to utilize the existing mechanism of the scientific departments of all the different American universities. In some sense also it may coordinate them and unite them.

At present, at least, there seems to be no place for a National University at Washington, certainly not in the sense that another university should be added to those that now exist in the country, like them or only a little better than any one of them.

By coordinating and uniting what now exists, the Smithsonian Institution may well furnish, at least in reference to the aggressive scientific work of the country, the beginnings of such a National University as is really needed.

I think it would be practically possible to make a beginning in this direction in the following way :

1. Establish and recognize a certain number of scientific departments, say fifteen at the start. Let all these be recognized as constitutive parts of the Institution.

2. Appoint, by careful selection, a committee of three men, the most eminent in their lines to be found in the country, to represent each department. (This the least essential part of my suggestions.)

3. Make one man the chairman and assign him a salary appropriate to the work expected of him.

4. Let these men, the chairmen, remain, if so already, professors in active service in the universities where they belong. Secure for them, from these universities, the right to spend a certain portion of each year at Washington, say six to ten weeks, in some cases perhaps much less. Let their salaries be additional to their university salaries, in case their universities consent to allow them the time as a vacation; otherwise make these salaries a portion of their university salaries. The latter course may be necessary in cases where a man is regularly absent from his university work as much as one-third of the university year. This plan would be of advantage to the men, because of the opportunity and the prestige; to their universities,

because of the advantage it would be to the men themselves; to the Institution, because of the work they would do, better and larger than the Institution could secure from men whose entire services it would be able to obtain.

5. Each man put in charge of a department would do such work in upbuilding and helping his department as he, in consultation with his committee, found practical and advantageous to do. Some could devote themselves to the collections; some would lecture or arrange courses of lectures; some would organize, stimulate and assist work in their departments going on in different parts of the country. Some would use the opportunity to interest the National Government in enterprise akin to their work, and to influence the conduct of those already undertaken.

This is a suggestion of a way to begin what would, I believe, develop into something of great use to the country, and would furnish a true and fit utilization of the existence of the Institution in its present habitat and with its present conditions.

Sincerely yours,

BENJ. IDE WHEELER.

SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE.

Outlines of Psychology. By WILHELM WUNDT. Translated by CHARLES HUBBARD JUDD. Leipzig, Wilhelm Engelmann. 1897. 8vo, pp. 342.

An Outline of Psychology. By EDWARD BRADFORD TITCHENER. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1897. 8vo, pp. 352.

The fundamental aim and interest in both these treatises is the instructional one; while by no means limited to this phase of utility, the volumes are primary text-books and may be judged by their fitness to increase the efficiency and attractiveness of the teaching of psychology. Such a verdict would be much easier to reach were there a more complete agreement as to the content or the methods, the order of exposition or the perspective of importance, of the several trends of investigation that lend diversity as well as frequent confusion to psychological discussions. But the 'psychologies' are unmistakably converging both in matter and manner, and it is becoming less