Snyder; *Secretary and Treasurer*, Will. C. Ferril; *Executive Committee*, George L. Cannon, Ellsworth Bethel, Charles I. Hays, and *ex officio*, A. M. Collett and Will C. Ferril.

Sections and chairman of each, as follows: *Botany*, Ellsworth Bethel; *Zoology*, Alva H. Felger; *Geology*, George L. Cannon; *Microscopy*, Dr. J. B. Kinley; *Meteorology and Physical Science*, N. M. Fenneman; *Nature Study*, S. Arthur Johnson; *Anthropology and Ethnology*, Dr. A. L. Bennett.

The Colorado Academy of Science is limited in its membership to those of the State Historical and Natural History Society, who may be engaged in scientific work and study.

WILL. C. FERRIL,
Secretary.

THE ELISHA MITCHELL SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

THE 140th meeting of the Society was held on March 11 at the University of North Carolina.

The following papers were read:

'Enzymes': Dr. A. S. WHEELER.

'Reversible Action of Enzymes': Dr. R. H. WHITEHEAD.

'Molecular Attraction': Dr. J. E. MILLS.

CHAS. BASKERVILLE,
Secretary.

NEW YORK ASSOCIATION OF BIOLOGY TEACHERS.

THE first meeting for the current year of the New York Association of Biology Teachers was held at 43 Hancock Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., on January 31, 1902.

The following officers were elected for the year:

President, Dr. H. R. Linville, DeWitt Clinton High School; *Vice-President*, Dr. E. F. Byrnes, Girls' High School; *Secretary*, George W. Hunter, Jr., DeWitt Clinton High School; *Treasurer*, Miss M. F. Goddard, Peter Cooper High School.

Two papers were read, entitled, 'The Pedagogical and Ethical Content of Biology,' by Miss E. F. Byrnes, and 'The History of Zoology in the Secondary Schools of the United States,' by Miss Marion R. Brown, of the Erasmus Hall High School.

The purpose of the club is to discuss and, if possible, to determine, the best methods of teaching biology in the secondary schools. The club is now entering upon the third year of a very successful existence with a much increased membership.

G. W. HUNTER, JR.,
Secretary.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

MOVEMENTS TOWARD UNION AMONG GEOGRAPHERS.

THE recent publication in SCIENCE of letters from Professor Russell, Professor Davis, and Mr. Stanley Brown recalls various other movements toward union among geographers. One of the earlier of these led to the founding of the American Geographical Society in New York; another to the institution of the National Geographic Society, with headquarters in Washington; others to the establishment of geographic clubs or societies in several centers; and still others to the enlargement of the geographic organization in Philadelphia first from a club to a society, then to a geographic institute. At least two of these organizations (those headquartered in New York and Washington, respectively) were originally designed to meet precisely such needs as those outlined by Professors Russell and Davis, together with the equally obvious need of diffusing the elements of geographic knowledge through public meetings and periodical publications; yet in both cases the latter function assumed such prominence as measurably to divert attention from the primary purpose. In both societies the modification in plan came about gradually—and it is probable that in both the changes grew out of the natural effort to balance income and expenditure in such wise as to please the majority of the members at each stage of progress. It is true, as the recent correspondents have pointed out, that the present organization of American geographers in a number of societies fails to meet all professional requirements; but it would seem to be an open question whether the needs might not be met more effectively and economically in some existing organization than by adding another to the already overwhelming list of American scientific societies.

Some of the events in the history of the National Geographic Society seem peculiarly

pertinent in this connection. The Society was founded in 1888, primarily to meet just such needs of working geographers as those felt to-day in Michigan and Harvard Universities; for a time the needs were met by meetings largely of technical character, and by a quarterly magazine devoted chiefly to technical papers; and in a somewhat later stage the magazine was reduced to a series of technical memoirs published in brochure form. During this early period various working geographers made important contributions to the science through this medium, technical papers by both Professor Davis and Professor Russell ranking high among these contributions. Gradually the interest of the meetings increased and extended to persons not engaged in geographic work, and to meet their desires the communications were made more popular; and about the same time the magazine was changed into a monthly of largely popular character. This transformation of the Society was never wholly acceptable to the working element, and various efforts were made to oppose it. Thus, early in the last decade, Dr. T. C. Mendenhall, then Superintendent of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey and a member of the Society's board, led a movement toward creating a class of fellows designed to include the investigating and teaching geographers affiliated with the Society; the proposal passed the Board of Managers with only two dissenting votes, but failed of adoption by the Society at large. Thus again, in 1895, some of the working geographers of the Society undertook to establish a series of more technical papers complementary to the magazine, under the designation 'National Geographic Society Monographs'; of these one volume was published—at a financial loss so serious as to forbid continuance. Thus, too, repeated efforts have been made to bring working geographers together in different centers; a well-attended meeting, devoted primarily to technical papers and discussions, was held in Toronto in connection with the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1897; another meeting was held in connection with the American Association and the Geological Society of America in Boston in 1898, at which the papers and discussions were chiefly technical and the attendance and interest were fair; yet the experiments raised a question as to whether it is feasible for working geographers to assemble in summer when so many of their number are in the field. Despite these discouragements, working members of the Society have persisted in efforts to render the organization an appropriate nucleus for the geographers and geographic activity of the United States. As a step in this direction the Society was, during 1901, rendered national in character as well as in name by merging the classes of resident and non-resident members into the single class of members, and by providing that the Board of Managers shall be chosen from the entire country rather than from Washington alone. Some of the members, including the president, Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, urged that a class of scientific geographers, to be known as fellows, should be established in connection with this extension of membership, Dr. Bell's opinion on this subject appearing in several addresses before the Society; but the majority of the board were of opinion that the two propositions had better be kept separate. Accordingly, the modification of the constitution required for establishing a class of scientific geographers was not taken up last year, but is now pending, with every probability of favorable action. Connected with this change is a proposition to provide for technical publication in the form of a series of papers to be issued in brochure form, and to be known as 'National Geographic Society Memoirs.' Should the pending changes be made, the National Geographic Society will comprise: (1) A large and distinctly national membership (at present numbering about 2,500, distributed throughout all of the States and Territories) including nearly all of the working geographers of the country, (2) a distinctly national class of fellows designed to include all scientific geographers in the United States, and (3) a board of managers selected from all parts of the country, with only a sufficient number resident in Washington to meet convenience and legal requirements as to quorum, etc.; while its work will

be both scientific and popular, the former comprising (*a*) technical meetings in Washington and such other centers as may be desired, and (*b*) a technical publication distributed primarily among the fellows to serve as a record of original geographic work, and the latter comprising (*a*) popular lectures not only in Washington, but in other cities, and (*b*) an illustrated magazine of largely popular character, but designed to serve as a convenient medium for geographic publication. Should the plan for the technical memoirs fail of approval by the Society at large, the publication committee propose including the technical matter in the monthly magazine.

It is, perhaps, unfortunate that later developments in the National Geographic Society have not been more promptly and widely announced; yet it is by no means to be regretted that the delay has led to expressions from other quarters which seem to be precisely in line with the plans and policies of this organization.

W J McGEE,
Vice-President National Geographic Society.

BALDWIN'S SOCIAL AND ETHICAL INTERPRETATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: I have received, evidently in common with many other sociological *confrères,* a printed copy of a letter addressed by Professor Albion W. Small, of the University of Chicago, to both Professors Baldwin and Giddings. This publication gives renewed impetus to the unfortunate controversy raised by Professor Baldwin in an article published in the January number of the *Psychological Review.* May I be allowed to express, on the subject, the opinion of an outsider, which is also the opinion of the majority of workers who think that the advancement of social science is in no way promoted by such personal quarrels?

The facts of the case are known. In answer to a fair and, let me say, pertinent and conclusive criticism of his work on 'Social and Ethical Interpretations' by Professor Giddings, Professor Baldwin found no better answer than to cast upon his critic the reproach of 'poaching' upon his preserves. Professor Baldwin's answer was conceived in such a way as to convey the impression that the word 'poaching' was simply a quotation from a review of Professor Giddings' 'Elements of Sociology,' previously published by Dr. Small. But the latter, besides showing that the word in question was contained only *in a private letter,* openly and frankly disclaims all responsibility for the construction placed upon it by Professor Baldwin, and clearly states that by using it he did not mean "anything more than 'out of bounds,' *i. e.,* plowing in a field that belongs more properly to another" which is *eine ganz andere Sache.*

In the face of Professor Small's statement, Professor Baldwin is, of course, left to take the whole responsibility for the offensive construction which he has placed upon the word of his colleague. That is what he has done in the 'Correction' published in the March number of the *Psychological Review.* It is to be remarked, however, that the terms of this 'Correction' are strikingly ambiguous. The reader might be led to believe that Professor Small considers Baldwin's mistake in the interpretation of his word, 'immaterial.' As a matter of fact, as shown by Professor Small's letter, he refers very distinctly the 'immateriality' of the mistake, not to the use of the word, but to its source, which is, again, *eine ganz andere Sache.*

What remains, after this, is a clear implication of plagiarism against Professor Giddings.

Let us say, once for all, that Professor Baldwin can lay no claim whatever to the discovery that has changed our view of social life by lending a definite support of facts to the psychic conception of social relations. The discovery is that of 'imitation' by Tarde. In spite of Professor Baldwin's futile attempt to minimize Tarde's merit by associating the name of the latter with that of Bagehot, Tarde is and will always be, for every unprejudiced student, the discoverer of imitation as a great psychological force underlying both social and mental development. Bagehot only gave us vague hints and tentative guesses. Tarde gave us the clear notion of the elementary social fact, the unit of social investigation. Professor Baldwin has undoubtedly the merit of