

It harks back to the old-world ideas of nobility and caste to insist upon a separation of the cultivation of the intellect, and the use that may be made of such cultivation.

Why should it be unworthy or undignified, and devoid of intellectual profit, to teach carpentering and plumbing, cooking and dressmaking, etc., instead of *manual training*, and *domestic science*? Is it not a foolish remnant of old-world pride, a relict of false aristocracy to which we feel we must cling, for fear the old world may sneer at our democracy?

A president of a university once said to me:

If any one in speaking of our department of domestic science should call it a cooking school, just take a club to him, in my name.

In discussing some elaborately concocted dish, with a graduate of this department of domestic science, I remarked that too much time and labor were consumed in its preparation to justify its place in a menu, and she replied:

O, I just learned how to make it in order to be able to teach in a domestic science department in some college, you know!

So it seems that our manual training is more or less entangled with the prevailing ideas about intellectuality and—the trades.

It is considered actually dangerous to open our curricula doors to the great arena of practicability, for fear of the over-cultivation of the material nature at the expense of the *inner life*. Let me quote from a recent university commencement address:

Educational science regards the development of the inner life as the true course, and yet it is almost entirely neglected in both common school and college. A material education is the one sought, and though this is against all philosophy, it is kept up by the clamor and clatter of the world's perverted ideals. The true doctrine is preached in the halls of education and finds eloquent advocacy in school literature, but when it comes to real experience it recoils before the money-making, pleasure-getting and fame-achieving anxieties of the schools.

The energy of the school purpose is diverted almost wholly to how to make a living, while how to live, which is the greater quest, is quite neglected.

In this age of the world it seems utter folly to philosophize about the outer and the inner life, as if they were two separate and distinct entities.

Imagine the world intent upon the cultivation of the inner life—having renounced its worldly zeal in making a material living! Commerce would go to sleep and civilization would drop back into barbarism. The consensus of opinion of the thinking world to-day is that the status of commercialism in any country is an index to the condition of civilization in that country. Every kind of labor may be the means of the cultivation of the outer and the inner life, but the inner life will never be lifted to a higher, spiritual plane by decrying what is popularly called the money-getting-sin. The inner life can only develop as the outer life prepares the way; the two are bound together and no philosophy can rend them asunder.

Only by teaching honestly what the world needs, and can use, may the schools accomplish their lofty aims.

It is a slow and wasteful method to try to help on the progress of general education by forcing an overflow of the *liberal arts* down into the trades, by way of the public schools. The better way would be to help the trades themselves to climb to more and more increased proficiency by the aid of the public schools and higher institutions of learning.

STELLA V. KELLERMAN

PROVINCIAL MUSEUMS

PROFESSOR C. C. NUTTING has recently written a very suggestive paper entitled "The Function of the Provincial Museum,"¹ which the writer has read with great interest. On page 169 the following statement occurs, which requires emendation:

One has to look in vain for such a museum in our central states, the nearest approach to it being our own museum at Davenport. But the time is coming when such institutions will rank in importance with either of the other classes enumerated above.²

¹ *Proc. Daven. Acad. Sci.*, X., p. 167.

² Referring to the University and Metropolitan museums.

It is possible that Professor Nutting excluded from his consideration all museums which were wholly or partly supported by public funds, but the inference drawn from the paragraph quoted above is that there are no museums in the central states which are following along the lines indicated in his paper. There are at least two museums which should be classed as provincial museums which are now doing (and have been for some time past) the work outlined in Professor Nutting's paper, viz., the Public Museum of Milwaukee and the Chicago Academy of Sciences.

Both of the institutions mentioned are making extensive local collections, the exhibits are arranged and labeled with special reference to the education of the public, loans of material are made to the schools and large study collections are being acquired for research work. Free public lectures are maintained in the latter institution.

This statement is made with no desire to criticize Professor Nutting's very excellent paper, but simply to rectify a manifestly misleading statement, the inaccuracy of which doubtless escaped the notice of the author.

FRANK C. BAKER

MILK PROTEINS

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The October number of the *Journal of Biological Chemistry* contained an article entitled "Milk Proteins," by Geo. A. Olson, and written as a "Contribution from the Agricultural Chemical Laboratory of the University of Wisconsin." It is generally assumed that when articles appear under the above caption they have received the sanction of those in charge of the laboratory from which they emanate. I desire to state that in this case Mr. Olson is entirely responsible for the material of his article and that those in charge of the laboratory assume no responsibility whatever for the deductions therein stated. I trust you will find a place in an early issue of SCIENCE for this note.

E. B. HART

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
November 2, 1908

QUOTATIONS

THE RETIREMENT OF PRESIDENT ELIOT

THE announcement that President Eliot is to retire next March will come as a shock to thousands of persons who have never even seen University Hall. The country has come to look upon him as a great natural force, like the Gulf Stream, unwearied by the flight of time, unworn by incessant activity. Yet at the age of seventy-five even the strongest man is entitled to throw off some of his burdens. This is not the occasion, however, to review President Eliot's career as a whole; for he has, we trust, years of beneficent toil still ahead of him; our purpose is merely to touch on a few of the aspects of his administration at Harvard, and the causes which have made his the most notable career in the history of American education.

President Eliot would be the first to point out that he was fortunate in both the place and time of his labors. Harvard was the oldest college in the United States; it had the longest tradition of culture; it was at the center of the most highly educated and thoroughly civilized part of the union. Then, too, he assumed the presidency in 1869, just at the beginning of that period of enormous agricultural and industrial expansion which followed the civil war. America was growing rich rapidly, and Harvard has shared this prosperity. Other colleges have also had their part in this general advancement: why has Harvard taken the lead? Why is it the foremost university in America to-day? There can be but one answer: Because President Eliot has displayed in extraordinary measure the qualities of a great leader. When the graduates of Harvard addressed him in a formal letter on his seventieth birthday, they said: "With prophetic insight you anticipated the movements of thought and life; your face was toward the coming day." This is perhaps the best definition of a leader—that he is a man who sees in the long march of events the coming of the inevitable, and sets himself to hasten it.

President Eliot foresaw the coming of the elective system. It had, indeed, already come, here and there, in a limited way. Many edu-