

the academy and expert engineer to the State Railroad Commission, delivered an illustrated lecture upon 'Mechanical Interlocking Devices at Railroad Crossings.' Fifty views taken in various parts of the United States were used to show the value of these mechanisms in the matter of safety to trains and in the gain of time—factors of the greatest importance in modern railroading. Dr. Eugene P. Schoch, instructor in chemistry in the university, explained from a recent point of view 'The Effect of Carbon upon Steel.'

The second formal meeting of the year was held in the Chemical Lecture Room of the university on June 10, 1903, at 3:30 P.M. The program on this occasion was as follows:

DR. HARRY YANDELL BENEDICT, Associate Professor of Mathematics in the University of Texas: 'An Ideal History of Experiments on the Regular Pentagon.'

DR. EUGENE P. SCHOCH, Instructor in Chemistry in the University of Texas: 'Two New Lecture Experiments in Physical Chemistry.'

THOMAS U. TAYLOR, Professor of Applied Mathematics in the University of Texas: 'The Northwest Boundary of Texas.'

AUGUSTA RUCKER, M.A., Instructor in Zoology in the University of Texas: 'A New Texan Kænemia' (by title).

DR. WILLIAM L. BRAY, Associate Professor of Botany in the University of Texas: 'The Vegetation of the Sotol Country' (by title).

A. M. FERGUSON, M.S., Instructor in Botany in the University of Texas: "Some Recent Discoveries Concerning the So-called Ant 'Mushroom Gardens'" (by title).

DR. FREDERIC W. SIMONDS, Professor of Geology in the University of Texas: 'Notes on the Topography of Texas' (by title).

The ballots having been counted, the following officers were declared elected for the year 1903-4:

*President*—Dr. Edmund Montgomery, Hempstead.

*Vice-President*—Dr. William L. Bray, Austin.

*Treasurer*—Mr. R. A. Thompson, Austin.

*Secretary*—Dr. H. Y. Benedict, Austin.

*Librarian*—Dr. William T. Mather, Austin.

*Members of the Council*—Hon. Arthur Lefevre, Superintendent of Public Instruction; Dr. H. L. Hilgartner and Dr. S. E. Mezes.

FREDERIC W. SIMONDS.

#### DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

##### THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: I have read with much interest the letter of Professor Dewey with respect to Professor Münsterberg's classification of the sciences. Several months ago there fell into my hands the enclosed copy of a 'Preliminary Program for the Official Addresses at the International Congress of Arts and Science' of the forthcoming exposition at St. Louis in 1904. Since this remarkable document is marked '*Confidential*, Proof under Revision,' it has been so treated by me up to the present date.

In the meantime, Professor Münsterberg, in an article on 'The St. Louis Congress of Arts and Sciences,' published in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May, 1903, has acknowledged himself as the author of the classification of the sciences set forth in the 'Program' and has led his readers to infer that this classification has been provisionally if not definitely accepted by the congress. He writes as a member of the 'Committee on Plan and Scope' of the congress and as the special representative of the 'philosophical sciences.' To quote his own words, he 'steps up to the honored platform of Park Street,' wherever that may be, 'and tells a wider circle what those plans are, and why they ask for interest and favor.'

We may perhaps doubt whether Professor Münsterberg speaks for the entire committee referred to, but since his explanation and defense of the 'Program' has been thus before the public for upwards of three months, it seems proper to assume that he invites criticism of his scheme of classification of the sciences from a larger circle of thinkers than that which centers in Park Street. I beg, therefore, to second Professor Dewey's invitation of the attention of the readers of SCIENCE to this matter and to submit a few brief remarks thereon.

The criticism which Professor Münsterberg's classification of the sciences seems to require is aimed not so much at the scheme itself as at the extraordinary claims he makes

for it. Any scheme that is workable may do well enough for the mere purposes of an international congress. But he would have us or, at any rate, the literary audience to which he addresses his exposition, believe that he has at last solved one of the great philosophical riddles. "The real interest," he says, "lies in the logic of the arrangement. The logical problem how to bring order into the wilderness of scientific efforts has fascinated philosophers from Aristotle and Bacon to Comte and Spencer. The way in which a time groups its efforts toward truth becomes, therefore, also a most significant expression of the deeper energies of its civilization, and not the least claim which our coming congress will make is that the program of its work stands out as a realization of principles which characterize the deepest strivings and the inmost energies of our own time as over against the popular classifications of the nineteenth century." Thus does the new scheme triumph over all difficulties!

If this were true, or even in part true, the scheme would be very important to men of science. Unfortunately, however, a glance at the divisions and subdivisions of the scheme seems to reveal only another of the numerous systems of *à priori* philosophy carried to the extremes which border on absurdity.

It is needless to discuss in detail a scheme at once so pretentious and so vulnerable. One should see a copy of the 'Program,' or read the exposition of it in the *Atlantic Monthly*. I will only add, Mr. Editor, that while we may not go out of our way to oppose philosophers and literary folks who indulge in such extravagances, it is our duty to repudiate them when they appear in the public press in the guise of science; for they tend only to make science and scientific men ridiculous.

R. S. WOODWARD.

#### ANTARCTICA.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: If Dr. Mill will look anew through 'Antarctica,' he will be unable to find one line criticizing him. I spoke of him necessarily in my letter (SCIENCE, July 10), because he happened to review the mono-

graph. I can assure him I am most pleased with his review and his letter (SCIENCE, August 7) for they help in forcing the facts about antarctic exploration to the notice of scientists. Gradually the truth will be recognized.

That some English geographers persist in ignoring American antarctic explorers is once more demonstrated in the July *Geographical Journal*. In the sketch map of the National Antarctic Expedition, on which the ink is hardly dry, the name of Wilkes Land is omitted as usual. Clarie Land appears once more, regardless of the fact that there is no Clarie Land. D'Urville called some ice cliffs Côte Clarie but he did not see the land behind them, which was discovered, however, a few days later by Wilkes, and which he named Cape Carr. The name of Graham Land is applied again to the land massif which was known as Palmer's Land for about ten years before Biscoe's voyage. I suggested that the name West Antarctica be given to that region, partly in the hope of reconciling international prejudices.

The final suggestion of Dr. Mill deserves unqualified approval. Would it not be possible to send an American expedition, either private or governmental, to reexplore the coast of Wilkes Land? A steamship like the *Bear*, commanded by naval officers, should be able, in the course of one southern summer, to bring back fresh data about the land discovered by Americans in East Antarctica.

EDWIN SWIFT BALCH.

YORK HARBOR,  
August 10, 1903.

#### SHORTER ARTICLES.

##### KUNZITE, A NEW GEM.

DURING an extended investigation on certain optical properties of the Tiffany-Morgan Gem and Bement Mineral Collections in the American Museum of Natural History it has been my privilege to examine the new lilac-colored transparent spodumene described by Dr. Geo. F. Kunz in SCIENCE, August 28.

Mineral spodumene is usually obtained in large opaque whitish crystals, but from time to time small specimens, often richly colored