

chemical engineering. Dr. C. H. Kauffman, instructor, has been made assistant professor of botany. Aubrey Tealdi, instructor, has been made assistant professor of landscape gardening, and Dr. G. L. Jackson, instructor, has been made assistant professor of education. Dr. A. G. Ruthven, curator of the museum, has been made assistant professor of zoology.

DR. J. G. FITZGERALD has been appointed associate professor of bacteriology in the University of California.

WILLIAM H. WELKER, Ph.D., has been appointed assistant professor of biological chemistry in Columbia University.

M. TISSOT, an assistant in the Paris Museum of Natural History, has been appointed professor of physiology in the museum.

DR. WENZELL LASKA, of the Technical School at Lemberg, has been appointed professor of mathematics in the Bohemian University of Prague.

DR. ERHARD SCHMIDT, of Erlangen, has been called to the chair of mathematics at Breslau.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

THE APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND REMOVAL OF OFFICERS OF INSTRUCTION

In a recent paper under the above title¹ Mr. Sidney Gunn makes the following references to Brown University.

Another illustration of the way the public takes removals can be found in the case of Brown University. . . . Repeated complaints have been raised of men having been cajoled, crowded or thrust out of the Brown faculty with varying degrees of suddenness and consideration. In some cases the men so treated have served the university for many years without being found incompetent or even unworthy of regular promotion—something which in most institutions is regarded as establishing a claim that prevents removal on the ground of natural unfitness.

The paragraph quoted was to be sure part of the material of an argument against the contention of President Van Hise that public

sentiment would always visit speedy condemnation upon a college president or corporation if the power of removal were unfairly or unjustly used. I am not inclined to disagree with this main thesis of Mr. Gunn's paper, nor do I care to enter upon a discussion of the causes or conditions of removal of members of the faculty of Brown University in recent years. Such discussion could serve no good purpose, and would only lead to futile controversy. I do, however, deeply regret that a reference to Brown University should appear in *SCIENCE* from which every reader must inevitably draw the inference that the situation at Brown is typically bad with respect to the academic freedom and the tenure of office of its teachers; that the members of the Brown faculty do not enjoy a reasonable security of tenure but are liable, even after long and apparently satisfactory service, to be removed arbitrarily by the president or governing board.

That its administrative body has never made an error of judgment is more than can be said, probably, of any long-established institution; but all friends of collegiate education Mr. Gunn included, should be glad to know that the indictment contained in the statements and implications of Mr. Gunn's paragraph referring to Brown is not justified by the policy of the university.

The permanency of tenure of office for professors is secured by the ancient charter of the university. A professor can be removed only "for misdemeanor, incapacity or unfaithfulness." The president and governing boards at the present time also recognize the fact that security of tenure, in the long run, is to the university a financial asset as well as a necessary condition of continuous and contented scholarly work and the natural and appropriate reward of loyalty and of long and faithful service. It is the well understood policy of the university to construe the principle of tenure, in accordance with the spirit of the charter, as applying to those assistant and associate professors who have served many years satisfactorily.

Instructorships are considered to be tempo-

¹ *SCIENCE*, May 12, 1911, p. 729.

rary appointments even after the salary is increased; and the promotion from an instructorship to an assistant professorship, while it carries with it encouragement and expectation of later permanence, does not immediately commit the university to a guarantee of permanent tenure. This is reasonable, for, if the instructor for any reason does not fit the particular position, after a trial of a few years, no one interested in the welfare either of the university or of the instructor himself would desire that he be promoted to a professorial position. Similarly if, after a few years, the assistant professor fails to fulfil the expectations which accompanied his promotion or appointment or if he apparently has reached the limit of his growth in the environment of the particular institution, no one can fairly object to his being advised, or urged if necessary, to seek elsewhere to establish his permanent professional position, provided, of course, that he is given ample time and friendly assistance to make the change.

At Brown, those teachers, whether professors, associate professors or assistant professors who, as distinguished from these younger men, have served the university many years and have been encouraged to believe or allowed to suppose that their services have been satisfactory until the time is past for a reasonably fair chance of readjustment in other positions, are insured by the university's policy of tenure against being "cajoled, crowded or thrust out of the Brown faculty." Contrary to the inference which would naturally be drawn from Mr. Gunn's paragraph, such service at Brown University "is regarded as establishing a claim that prevents removal on the ground of natural unfitness." The administration recognizes its responsibility in case it fails to diagnose natural unfitness in the course of the years of probational service.

In view of this recognized policy there is in the university a feeling of security of tenure and there is also an academic freedom of opinion, utterance and action which is ideal

and is highly valued and appreciated by the faculty.

A. D. MEAD

BROWN UNIVERSITY

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

THE secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature feels constrained to invite the attention of the members of the zoological profession to an important point in connection with the subject of correspondence.

The commission is composed of fifteen members, elected by the International Congress of Zoology. The duties involve a considerable amount of tedious labor. All of the members give their time willingly to this work from a pure sense of duty to science and to their profession. They do not ask nor do they receive one cent of remuneration for the many hours of time and work they sacrifice in order to endeavor to carry out the duties imposed upon them.

At the urgent request of colleagues, additional labors have been undertaken that were not contemplated when the commission was originally formed in 1895.

With the increase of duties, the correspondence has naturally grown to not inconsiderable proportions, and this additional correspondence brings with it increased labor and increased sacrifice of time.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the fact that many of the members of the profession seek to aid the commission by valuable suggestions and it seems needless to state that this friendly cooperation is heartily welcomed and appreciated.

Some zoologists, however, appear to overlook the history, duties and purposes of the commission, and appear to assume that one of its objects and duties is to receive and read communications couched in language which is hardly within the bounds of diplomatic usage.

As the executive officer of the commission, and assuming full personal responsibility for this action, taken without consulting the other members, the secretary desires to give public notice that he insists that the same