(Wesleyan, '09), Ph.D. (Cornell, '14); E. L. Frederick, A.B. ('11), Ph.D. (Johns Hopkins, '14); J. T. Dobbins, A.B. ('11), A.M. ('12), Ph.D. (North Carolina, '14).

NEW appointments at the Rice Institute are as follows: Claude William Heaps, B.Sc. (Northwestern), Ph.D. (Princeton), of Columbia, Mo.; formerly fellow of Princeton University; instructor in physics at the University of Missouri, to be instructor in physics; Arthur Romaine Hitch, B.A. (Washington), Ph.D. (Cornell), of Syracuse, N. Y.; formerly assistant instructor in chemistry at Cornell University, research chemist of the Solvay Process Company, Syracuse, N. Y., to be instructor in chemistry; Herbert Kay Humphrey, B.Sc., in electrical engineering (Illinois), M.Sc. (Union), of Schenectady, N. Y., consulting engineer of the General Electric Company, Schenectady, N. Y., to be instructor in electrical engineering; Joseph Horace Pound, B.Sc. in mechanical engineering (Missouri), of Pittsburgh, Pa.; engineer and instructor in the School of Apprentices of the Westinghouse Machine Company, to be instructor in mechanical engineering; Edwin Eustace Reinke, M.A. (Lehigh), Ph.D. (Princeton), of Princeton, N. J., formerly Proctor fellow of Princeton University, to be instructor in biology; Radoslav Andrea Tsanoff, B.A. (Oberlin), Ph.D. (Cornell), of Worcester, Mass., formerly Sage fellow of Cornell University; instructor in philosophy at Clark University, to be assistant professor of philosophy; William John Van Sicklen, M.A. (Stanford), of Palo Alto, Calif., instructor in chemistry at Stanford University, to be instructor in chemistry.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: In the current number of *The Atlantic Monthly* there appears, on one of the pages devoted to biographical sketches of the contributors, a statement concerning the committee on the organization of a national Association of University Professors, to which reference is made in Professor H. C. Warren's valuable article on "Academic Freedom" in the same issue. The statement seriously misrepresents the functions of the committee and the purposes of those interested in the organization of the new society; and it is published without the committee's authorization, and, as Professor Warren permits me to say, without that of the author of the article. The committee is in no sense a body for the investigation of grievances or for the examination of internal conditions in American universities. Its only duty is to prepare plans for the formation of a representative professional organization of university teachers. The committee has defined its own understanding of the purposes of the organization as follows:

> . . . to bring about more effective cooperation among the members of the profession in the discharge of their special responsibilities as custodians of the interests of higher education and research in America; to promote a more general and methodical discussion of problems relating to education in higher institutions of learning; to create means for the authoritative expression of the public opinion of the body of college and university teachers; to make collective action possible, and in general to maintain and advance the ideals and standards of the profession.

It may perhaps be well to take this occasion to report to those interested that the committee expects to call a meeting for the formal organization of the association during the last week of December. The day and place can not yet be announced. The committee, after much discussion, determined last spring that members of the profession should, at least at the outset, be asked to adhere to the association as individuals, and not as representatives of their local faculties. The committee is therefore about to send out invitations to a large number of university and college professors who are known to the committee, or to those who have been called upon for advice in the matter, as well qualified representatives of the several sciences. Doubtless, through the limitations of the knowledge of the committee and its advisers, many to whom invitations should be sent will be overlooked. It is not contemplated, however, that the eventual

membership of the association will be limited to those who will be asked to attend this meeting. The committee merely sought, by the means indicated, to bring together a body much larger and more representative than itself, which may constitute a nucleus for the association, and to whose judgment the committee may submit its recommendations.

The committee is not empowered to define authoritatively either the purposes or the scope of the association, or the conditions for membership in it. It is, however, to be expected that the association's future policy with regard to these matters will be determined at the meeting to be held next month.

Since the previous announcement of the *personnel* of the committee, the following members have been added to it:

G. B. Frankforter,
University of Minnesota,
H. B. Mumford,
University of Illinois,
C. E. Bessey,
University of Nebraska,
Samuel B. Harding,
University of Indiana,
Percy Bordwell,
University of Iowa,
T. S. P. Tatlock,
University of Michigan,
J. W. Garner,
University of Illinois,
C. D. Adams,
Dartmouth College.

The chairman of the committee, Professor John Dewey, of Columbia University, or the undersigned, will welcome suggestions from any member of the university teaching profession relating to the plan of organization and the future work of the proposed association.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY,
Secretary

BALTIMORE,
November 3, 1914

ATMOSPHERIC OPTICAL PHENOMENA

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The letters from Messrs. H. W. Farwell and A. W. Freeman, published in SCIENCE, October 23, 1914, pp. 595–596, are two of the many recent indications of the fact that more attention is now being given than formerly to the observation of atmospheric-optical phenomena. The meteor seen by Mr. Freeman was not, as he supposes, a tertiary rainbow, but the circumzenithal arc of a solar halo. This particular arc is also known as the upper quasi-tangent arc of the halo of 46 degrees.

The complex halo observed by Mr. Freeman at Fredericksburg, Va., November 2, 1913, was visible, in various degrees of development, on November 1 and 2, at a great number of places throughout the eastern half of the United States, and constituted the most remarkable display of the kind heretofore recorded in this country. It should be noted that the small arc, convex to the sun, marked "rainbow" in Mr. Freeman's drawing, was the same phenomenon as that observed by Mr. Farwell, *i. e.*, the circumzenithal arc of a halo. The term "rainbow" is highly inappropriate for this or any other halo phenomenon.

Mr. Freeman's observation is noteworthy on account of including the rare phenomenon of the anthelion—a white mock-sun directly opposite the sun in azimuth, and at the same altitude above the horizon. The large outer circle, shown in the drawing, extending around the horizon, is the parhelic circle, a well-known though rather uncommon phenomenon. The inner, partial circle, drawn parallel to this, is decidedly unusual. It appears to be a secondary parhelic circle, produced by the upper vertical parhelion of the 22-degree halo serving as luminous source. This and other secondary halo phenomena produced by parhelia have been described by Bravais and Besson.

The August number of the *Monthly Weather Review*, which has just appeared, contains a translation of a recent memoir by Besson describing all known forms of halo. No such comprehensive account of these phenomena has heretofore been published in English. The same number of the *Review* contains an extensive report on the halos of November 1–2, 1913.

C. FITZHUGH TALMAN
U. S. WEATHER BUREAU