been secured. A building will be erected, but part of the money has been reserved for an endowment.

President Charles F. Thwing, of Western Reserve University, announces the completion of a $500,000 fund for additional endowment of Adelbert College and the college for women. Of this amount $125,000 was offered by the General Education Board, on the condition that $375,000 be raised by the university.

Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn., has been offered $75,000 by the General Education Board of New York on the condition that it will raise three times the amount, making a total of $300,000, a large portion of which is to be added to the permanent endowment.

The department of engineering of the University of Michigan has received a gift of the library of the late George Y. Wisner and a rotary engine of the value of $7,000 from Mr. J. D. R. Lampson.

Americans who have received honorary degrees at Oxford have made through President Butler, of Columbia University, a gift of $1,200 for the endowment fund.

Lord Winterstoke has offered to give an additional £15,000 towards the proposed Bristol University. This will make a total contribution from him of £35,000.

We are informed that the statement quoted here from the daily papers to the effect that the office of chancellor would be established at the University of Michigan for President Angell to hold after his resignation is incorrect.

The daily papers state that the presidency of Dartmouth College has been offered to Mr. S. W. McCall, member of congress from Massachusetts since 1893 and a graduate of Dartmouth College in the class of 1874. Statements in regard to college presidencies printed in the daily papers seem, however, to have a large probable error.

Dr. Fletcher B. Dresslar, associate professor of education at the University of California, has become head of the department of philosophy and education in the University of Alabama.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY AND THE MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

To the Editor of Science: I note in Science of January 29 a quotation from a Boston newspaper in regard to "Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology"; and it seems desirable that certain erroneous impressions conveyed therein should be corrected.

The important misconception in the article in question is implied in the statement: "It seems probable that the taking from the institute by Harvard of two of its leading professors will bring up again the question of a consolidation or of an alliance between these two educational institutions." This is not only not probable; it is entirely unthinkable, to those acquainted with the true situation. The opposition of the faculty and alumni of the institute to this plan is founded on good and substantial reasons, which are too generally understood and respected to be questioned again.

The Technology faculty and alumni did not oppose the proposed alliance from mere pride in the achievements of the institute, or from any narrow fear that it would lose its individual reputation. They simply recognized that Harvard and Technology represent different and incompatible educational ideals. Harvard's ideal is that of graduate scientific schools following a college course based on the elective system. This, so far as engineering goes, is an interesting and promising experiment and one to which Technology can cheerfully contribute two of her honored sons. Technology herself, however, stands for a different ideal, for a combination, from the beginning, of a broad scientific training with the elements of liberal culture, in a four years' course, laid along the lines of a carefully balanced group system of studies. This ideal has not been fully realized; few ideals ever are; yet in the flux of doubt and questioning which seems to have engulfed the world of higher education, the record of what the institute has actually accomplished stands out as one of the

clear and positive achievements of the last half century.

I almost apologize for calling attention to another sentence in the quotation: "The institute, on the other hand, is handicapped by an improper location and insufficient funds to compete successfully against Harvard."

The readers of SCIENCE ought to be assured that while Technology needs, and would gladly receive, gifts for its growing work, it has so far been able to make both ends meet without serious difficulty. The new president, Professor Maclaurin, experienced in education on three continents, comes to the institute with complete enthusiasm for its special ideals. A body of eight thousand alumni and past students stand ready for loyal service. The institute is now contemplating a move from its present location, which it will soon outgrow, to a new and ample one where a group of buildings worthy of its dignity will be erected. "The Old Technology, with its old traditions and its old ideals, new built on a new site," as acting President Noyes recently phrased it, will not "compete against Harvard"; but it will welcome the McKay school of applied science as a worthy ally in the great war against ignorance that we are all waging together.

C.-E. A. WINSLOW

THE RIGHT AND THE WRONG IN POPULAR SCIENCE BOOKS

To put in simple and elegant language descriptions and explanations of natural phenomena is to offer every one that knowledge and understanding that broadens our sympathies; that increases our interest in the world about us; that makes us more contented and more useful human beings. No nobler work than this can any man do—the work that Tyndall, that Sir Robert Ball, that Darwin and many another devoted follower of nature loved so much and did so well. The popular books that men like these produce can never be too numerous, nor can the publisher devote to them more of his beautifying art than they deserve.

Unfortunately, however, there is another class of books with natural phenomena for their titles; books, of which the one under review is typical, attractively written and prettily illustrated, but filled with false explanations—counterfeit mental coin palmed off on the innocent, to their inestimable harm. Such books do not spread knowledge, nor do they even leave the mental tablets of the uninformed receptively blank, but, on the contrary, scribble all over them an almost ineradicable jumble of errors, which must somehow be got rid of before the unfortunate victim is ready even to begin to learn the truth.

Surely the author of a book treating of a scientific subject must know that he knows what he is talking about, or know that he doesn't know. In the first case, let his explanations be simple, clear, complete. In the second let him have sufficient judgment to leave attempted explanations alone, for they are sure to be wrong, and therefore harmful.

But the fault is not alone with the author. The publisher is expected, and properly so, to guarantee, to the best of his knowledge, the accuracy of the books he offers for sale. And this, it would seem, should impose upon him the duty of submitting all manuscripts of popular nature-books to competent specialists. In this way "Water Wonders Every Child Should Know,"[1] like many another of its kind, might easily have been made the excellent book that at first glance it appears to be, instead of the thing of blunders it actually is.

This little book is beautifully got up, attractively written and filled with many of Mr. Bentley's choicest snow and frost photographs, but as it now stands it can be recommended to those only who already have a knowledge, sufficient to protect them from its errors, of the subjects, dew, frost, snow, ice and rain, of which it treats; and to them simply for its beautiful pictures. But these latter are so numerous and so beautiful that it is to be hoped that there will soon be a new and properly revised edition, one that can be recommended for the accuracy of its explanations as well as for the beauty of its illustrations.

W. J. HUMPHREYS

[1] Jean M. Thompson, "Water Wonders Every Child Should Know," Doubleday, Page & Co., 1907.