

disease that a speedy recovery might be expected. Indeed, I have already begun to receive letters from these unfortunate diabetics who have thus had their hopes falsely raised.

FRANCIS G. BENEDICT

NUTRITION LABORATORY,
CARNEGIE INSTITUTION OF WASHINGTON,
BOSTON, MASS.

THE LATE PROFESSOR PACKARD'S "GUIDE TO THE
STUDY OF INSECTS"

My father, Professor Alpheus Spring Packard, had purposed to rewrite and bring the "Guide to the Study of Insects" up to date, as soon as he had finished Part II. of his "Monograph of Bombycine Moths," which was going through the press at the time of his death. He left many notes and references in regard to the "Guide," which we had intended to use as a preface, but we find they can not be edited properly by another hand.

ALPHEUS APPLETON PACKARD

NEW LONDON, CONN.,
January 2, 1909

QUOTATIONS

THE ADMINISTRATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS

THE University of Illinois has been coming to the front in the last few years more rapidly than any of the other state universities. It now ranks eighth among the great universities of the United States in the number of students, and is receiving large appropriations from the legislature, for the people of Illinois are determined that their own institution shall not be surpassed by any within the state, especially one founded by John D. Rockefeller. More important than its growth is the raising of the standard of scholarship, the introduction of new men of ability and promise, and the opening of a graduate school. This rapid progress is to be credited chiefly to the energy and initiative of President Edmund J. James, who left Northwestern four years ago to take charge of the state university.

But the University of Illinois is suffering somewhat from the twinges of growing pains. Such a radical and rapid transformation can not be effected without hurting the feelings of

some one or several. One such, Dr. George T. Kemp, has made his grievance a public question by his articles in the local papers and in SCIENCE of October 9, charging President James with duplicity, dishonesty and abuse of official powers. Dr. Kemp does not ask for sympathy on personal grounds. If his manner of leaving the university has impaired his chances of getting a position in another college, he can fall back on his profession, and make more money by the practise of medicine. But he holds that the question of academic freedom *versus* presidential tyranny is involved in his case, and it is therefore of public importance.

The essential facts seem to be as follows: When the graduate school was established a year ago, certain departments were selected for development, as it was impossible to bring them all at once to this rank. Professor Kemp was not one of the professors promoted, his salary was not raised to the prevailing rate, and his department did not share in the general prosperity. He felt, doubtless rightly, that this indicated that he was not in favor with the administration, and, being a high-spirited man, he resented it as a slight upon his honor and ability. He forced the issue by demanding "a court-martial" before the board of trustees and the formulation of specific charges. This mode of procedure was not adopted, but Dr. Kemp appeared before the board two or three times, presenting witnesses and papers to prove his success as a teacher and investigator, and calling attention to alleged defects in the organization of the university. Then finding the opposition to him still undefined and undiminished, he resigned his position and has since been waging war from the outside against President James and "the system." The board of trustees, regarding his resignation as voluntary, refuses to reopen the case and holds that he had no just grievance against the administration.

Dr. Kemp bases his charge of duplicity and unfair treatment chiefly on the fact that after his last appearance before the board his case was discussed by the president, who at that time stated his opinion of Dr. Kemp and why he did not regard him as worthy of promotion.

We do not see that this charge is well founded. We do not see why the technicalities of legal procedure should be followed in such cases. Certainly our courts are not so prompt and efficient in their action as to commend their methods for extension into academic circles. It is the business of boards to talk over freely the qualifications and defects of the professors, and they would be seriously hampered in their consideration of the subject if the individuals discussed had to be present or represented by attorney.

The reason why no definite and serious charges such as would necessitate his dismissal were brought against Dr. Kemp was probably because there were none to bring. The president seems to have objected to him on the ground that he was not a first-class teacher or administrator and that he was a hard man to get along with. These are as intangible as they are important, and it is difficult to see how they could be proved or disproved by any form of court-martial. President James practically appealed to the trustees to express their confidence in his judgment of men, and this is what they have done. Since to be a good judge of men is one of the most important qualifications of a college president, they could hardly have decided against him if they thought him worthy of office. It may be that President James underestimated Dr. Kemp's ability and overestimated his incompatibility, but the error, if it were such, does not involve any moral obliquity. The University of Illinois should have the best physiologist it can find, and it is not clearly demonstrated that Dr. Kemp is that man.

We believe that the board of trustees are right in holding that further discussion of the case is unnecessary and detrimental, although we do not regard their resolutions, reported in *The University of Illinois Press Bulletin* of December 16, as satisfactorily worded. We do not find in Dr. Kemp's letter of resignation the reasons they quote as his. The letter as published in *SCIENCE* gave altogether different reasons. And the statement made by the board that Dr. Kemp's resignation was not even suggested at the board meeting is quite too sweeping an assertion.

On the whole, we fail to find evidence to prove that academic freedom is in danger in the University of Illinois or that President James is more autocratic than other successful presidents, as, for example, our revered President Eliot. He certainly is less inclined to be arbitrary and dictatorial than his predecessor, President Draper. We can not here enter upon the wider question of whether a more democratic system of government, such as is advocated by Professor Cattell, is desirable. At present the tendency is to regard a stronger centralized and personal administration as best for universities and cities. The liability to abuse such power is checked by the watchfulness of supervising boards and by the fact that an aggrieved party may appeal to Cæsar, *i. e.*, *SCIENCE*.—*The Independent*.

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Essays on Evolution, 1889-1907. By E. B. POULTON, Hope Professor of Zoology in the University of Oxford. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1908.

Professor Poulton is well known as an ardent neo-Darwinian and as one who has made the subject of insect mimicry his own, the wonderful collection illustrating this interesting phenomenon in the Hope department of the Oxford Museum being a monument to his enthusiasm, energy and information in this field of investigation. In the volume of essays now under review these two topics are very much in evidence, the essays being for the most part addresses delivered by the author on various occasions, now brought up to date and reprinted. Inasmuch as the essays dealing with the Darwinian theory were originally written before the theory of mutations and Mendelism had become important factors in the question of the origin of species, Professor Poulton has added an introduction to his book dealing with these topics and protesting against the extreme position taken by those whom Professor Hubrecht, himself an upholder of the mutation theory, has lately characterized as "silly antagonists of Darwinism and evolution, who have thought fit to proclaim with a loudness that is in inverse ratio