

## UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATIONAL NEWS

IT is reported that Yale University will appropriate from \$60,000 to \$80,000 a year for the increase of salaries of professors.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY has been admitted to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

DR. ROBERT KENNEDY DUNCAN, professor of industrial chemistry at the University of Kansas, has accepted a call to the University of Pittsburgh.

CHARLES H. SHATTUCK, Ph.D. (Chicago), has been appointed professor of forestry in the University of Idaho.

DR. JAMES F. ABBOTT has been promoted to a professorship of zoology in George Washington University.

At Cornell University promotions to full professorships have been made as follows: J. I. Hutchinson and Virgil Snyder, in mathematics; A. W. Browne, in chemistry; E. M. Chamot, in sanitary chemistry; E. H. Wood, in engineering, and H. D. Hess, in machine design.

MR. NATHAN C. GRIMES, instructor at the University of Wisconsin, has been appointed professor of mathematics in the University of Arizona.

At Stanford University, Dr. E. C. Dickson has been appointed assistant professor of pathology and Mr. Thomas B. Hine, acting instructor in chemistry.

MISS ANNIE LOUISE MACLEOD, of Nova Scotia, has been appointed resident research fellow in chemistry at Bryn Mawr College.

At Haverford College, Professor A. H. Wilson, of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, has been appointed associate professor of mathematics, as successor to Professor W. H. Jackson, who returns to England.

CLINTON R. STAUFFER, Ph.D., instructor in geology at Western Reserve University, has been appointed assistant professor of geology in the School of Mining (Queen's University) at Kingston, Ontario.

DR. E. J. GODDARD, Linnean Macleay fellow in zoology, Sydney, has been appointed by the

council of Stellenbosch College, South Africa, to the chair of zoology and geology in succession to Professor R. Broom.

## DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

THE LENGTH OF SERVICE PENSIONS OF THE  
CARNEGIE FOUNDATION

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: So many errors have been put forth under the protection of anonymity, and this is deservedly in such disrepute, that the only excuse I can give for not signing my name to this note is the self-evident one that some of those to whom I refer might thereby be recognized.

I have read with interest the rather caustic criticisms on the change of the policy of the Carnegie Foundation with reference to voluntary retirement after twenty-five years of service, and must confess that some of these criticisms read to me, doubtless wrongly, as though they proceeded by some process of indirect inspiration from persons who had hoped to give up their teaching duties and that this disappointed hope had rendered them somewhat acid.

As a comparatively young man (38) whose twenty-five years of teaching and scientific work will not end for nine years more, may I give my opinion on the new ruling?

I regard the Carnegie Foundation as one of the most signally useful methods that could be devised to elevate the dignity and honor of the profession of teaching. I do not see how any teacher can fail to feel more assured as to his own future and that of his family as a result of these rather generous provisions. Very few of us save anything and it certainly gives one a sense of greater ease and freedom from worry to know that when those days come when one must perforce feel that advancing age renders impossible the old-time efficiency, provision has been made for the passing of the closing years of life in dignity and honorable independence; would that the provisions of the foundation could be extended to every teacher in state, church, city and country schools.

Why should any one *wish* to retire after

twenty-five years of service? If disabled or incapacitated the foundation makes such retirement a possibility, and doubtless a welcome one to some few to whom fate has been or may be unkind. But the average professor after twenty-five years of service is at his best as regards maturity, solid productive ability, and influence over youth through the poise and weight given by years and experience. Personally, I should hate to retire after twenty-five years of work, though I admit that the power thus to enjoy one's *otium cum dignitate* as a well-earned reward, and the possibility of doing just the work one likes best without hampering scholastic duties appeals strongly to universal human nature, and confess that it might conceivably appeal very strongly to me.

I know of several men, personally in one or two cases and by hearsay in other cases, who had hoped to take advantage of the twenty-five-year provision within a few years. As far as I know, they are all doing good and valuable work, are all in good health, are under fifty-five—in one case by a considerable margin—and I do not believe that they are worked too hard. All are thoroughly honorable, upright men, and are honest with themselves in believing that they are justified in trying to take advantage of this provision. Personally, and perhaps wrongly, I feel that their retirement at this time would be to some extent a misuse of the foundation, and amounts almost to a desertion of their post of duty. Were we in a Utopia where all, business men, mechanics, professors and scientists, could rest and play after reaching fifty, we as a world might be much happier. By "rest and play" I mean working hard at the work we love best. Till we reach that Atlantis, however, our thanks for the blessing of work as long as we can work.

Doubtless the men to whom I have referred will continue their productive work, though one had no definite plans other than retirement to his farm. Now I may not know all the circumstances which prompted these men to seek retirement after twenty-five years of service, but I can not feel that the purposes of the foundation would have been strictly

adhered to should this be granted them. I can not feel that the withdrawal of the privilege of retirement after twenty-five years works any injustice; the error came in lack of foresight in announcing this provision at the start. We need vigorous, young, enthusiastic men, but the more respected, well-poised, experienced men between fifty and sixty-five *plus* we can keep on our faculties, the better for our institutions. Z.

#### SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

*The Gulick Hygiene Series.* By LUTHER HALSEY GULICK. Book One: *Good Health.* By FRANCES GULICK JEWETT. List price 40 c. Book Two: *Emergencies.* By CHARLOTTE VETTER GULICK. List price 40 c. Book Three: *Town and City.* By FRANCES GULICK JEWETT. List price 50 c. Book Four: *The Body at Work.* By FRANCES GULICK JEWETT. List price 50 c. Book Five: *Control of Body and Mind.* By FRANCES GULICK JEWETT. List price 50 c. Boston, Ginn and Co.

The editor states the objects and general plan of these books as follows:

The objects of this series of books on hygiene is to teach the fundamental facts of health in such a way that the teaching shall result in the formation of health habits by the children. . . . In order to maintain the interest and avoid the deadening effect of the annual review of identical subjects, I have endeavored to supply each year some distinctive and separate line of thought in hygienic directions. . . . The style of the series is rather that of the story than that of the textbook.

In four respects we have attempted in this series to do what so far as we know, has not been attempted before. (1) We have endeavored to present to children a series of texts in which the central theme shall be hygiene. The current text books treat of physiology and anatomy primarily. . . . (2) It is the purpose of this series to treat each subject in a purely scientific as distinguished from a philosophical manner. . . . (3) We have presented a new point of view in each volume. . . . (4) These little volumes have been prepared with the same kind of utilization of original works as if they had been intended for adult scientific workers.