

foliæ to be a synonym of *cardui* L. His name, however, must be applied to the apple-grain species to which we are in this country giving the name *avenæ*.

In Europe it is known that the name *avenæ* is a synonym of *padi* L. and that the primary host of the oat aphid is the bird cherry from which it migrates to grains and grasses. *Avenæ* is, however, employed here for the species living upon the apple. To use the names correctly then *padi* L. should be applied to our apple-grain aphid. But this would not be correct, for *padi* winters on cherry and migrates to grass. It is evident that our species is not *padi*.

Fitch described a species on choke cherries under the name of *cerasifoliæ*. This species curls the leaves of the cherry and suggests the work of *padi* in Europe. Transfers made by the writer prove that this species alternates between chokecherry and grasses in the same way that *padi* migrates in Europe. It is not impossible that they are the same species. We have then to deal with this species also on grains and grasses in the *avenæ* mix up. It is noteworthy that the cornicles of the chokecherry species are sometimes slightly swollen in a way similar to those of the common oat aphid. The second fork of the wing is also very close to the margin of the wing and rusty patches are present at the base of the cornicles of the individuals feeding on grains and grasses.

Some authors have expressed the opinion that our apple-grain insect is biennial. The experiments conducted by W. F. Turner and the writer prove that it is annual. It is not improbable that the difficulty in transfer arose, in that more than one species was concerned and that the apple was in reality not the winter host of the specimens transferred.

From the evidence in hand it appears:

1. That more than one species occurs upon grains and grasses under the name *avenæ* Fab.
2. That one of these species migrates to apple and related trees where the eggs are laid. This species must be known as *prunifoliæ* Fitch.

3. That another species, the oat aphid, migrates to bird cherries in Europe and must be known as *padi* L., of which *avenæ* Fab. is a synonym.
4. That the species now known as *cerasifoliæ* Fitch migrates to grains and grasses as does *padi* and is possibly the same species.
5. That the present placing of the name *prunifoliæ* as a synonym of *cardui* L. is not correct.

A. C. BAKER

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

QUOTATIONS

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY AND PROFESSOR
CATTELL

I SHOULD think that the New York newspapers would be as tired of me as I am of them. As, however, you have devoted another editorial article to Columbia University and to my case, I beg permission to state certain facts.

My relations with the university were not considered by the department or faculty of which I was a member, or, contrary to your statement, by any faculty committee. At a meeting of the Columbia trustees on March 5 a resolution was introduced retiring me on account of a frivolous but truthful remark that I had made concerning the president of the university in a confidential letter to members of the Faculty Club. At the same meeting of the trustees a committee was appointed to ascertain whether doctrines contrary to the Constitution and the laws were being taught or disseminated at Columbia.

This latter resolution raised a storm of protest, the faculty of political science voting that it "betrays a profound misconception of the true function of a university in the advancement of learning." After passing resolutions of protest, the council, itself primarily an administrative body, appointed a committee of nine to defend the interests of academic freedom. This was not a committee of the faculty, but a Butler-Seligman committee, containing six deans, who are appointed by the president, and, according to the statutes of the university, must "act in subordination to the president." From this committee Professor

Dewey has recently resigned as a protest against the general situation.

The resolution retiring me was referred to the committee, which unanimously recommended that no action be taken. They, however, asked me for an apology for my ironical remark about the president, and I signed the statement which Professor Seligman wrote, on the assurance that this would be of great service to the committee in maintaining the rights of the faculty and of freedom of speech, and on the promise that it would be shown to no one except the committee on inquisition of the trustees, and only to them if necessary. When the apology was sent out by Professor Seligman to officers of the university and printed in the newspapers I wrote a letter to members of the Faculty Club telling how it had been obtained. I thought I owed this to them, as many had approved of my remark about the president, one professor, for example, having written: "Let me first of all thank you for saying so well some of the things that I and many others dare not say for fear our families would be left without support if we did say them."

Professor Seligman then wrote a letter to me, copies of which he sent out by the hundred, stating that I did not "respect the ordinary decencies of intercourse among gentlemen" and that my "usefulness in the university has come to an end." As I understand it, Professor Seligman claims that he only broke the promise of a gentleman and I had no right to reveal the fact. I hold that it was the promise of the acting dean of the graduate faculties and of the chairman of the committee of nine of the council, made officially in the dean's office, and that secret diplomacy should have no place in a university.

Whatever may be the rights and wrongs of this petty squabble, seven of the nine members of the Butler-Seligman committee on June 18 recommended that I be retired from active service with the pension due me. The trustees, however, chose to dismiss me for maintaining academic freedom in the classical sense, not for resisting academic slavery as it exists at Columbia.

When they dismissed me on October 1, without a hearing, without payment for the year and without the pension due me, it was on the sole ground that I had on August 23 addressed a letter to members of the Congress asking them to support a measure then before the Senate and the House to prohibit sending conscripts "to fight in Europe against their will." There is no law requiring or permitting the President to send "conscientious objectors" to fight in Europe. To do this, according to an opinion prepared by the Attorney General of the United States for the President in 1912, would be unconstitutional. It is also against the uniform policy of the nation. It would provide a less efficient army and might cause disorder at home. The British government does not require "conscientious objectors" to fight, and does not force conscription on Ireland. I only exercised the constitutional right and fulfilled the duty of a citizen in petitioning the government to enact legislation which I believe to be in the interest of the nation. By a curious irony the committee of the trustees appointed to guard the Constitution recommended my dismissal for using the method which the Constitution states shall not be abridged in a letter written to members of the Congress asking them to respect the Constitution.

If the president and the trustees could have found in anything else that I have said or done anything that by any possible perversion could have been made to appear unpatriotic they would have been only too glad to have adduced it. As it is, they have hid behind the flag to assassinate, relying on the prejudice and blind patriotism of war. They might have retired me for insubordination, and there would have been no public protest; but they apparently wanted to injure me and discredit my efforts for university reform. This they may have been able to do, but only by causing at the same time far greater injury to the university.

I favor peace on the Russian terms, practically adopted by the President in his reply to the Pope. But both before and since our entry into the war I have done everything in

my power to promote national efficiency. I spent a large part of the week before I was dismissed drawing up for the War Department plans for the scientific selection of aviators. My oldest son, with my approval and assistance, was one of the first to enlist in the army and go to France, where he is in charge of sanitation in the Harvard hospital recently bombed by German aviators.—J. McKEEN CATTELL in the *New York Tribune*.

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Algæ. Volume I. Myxophyceæ, Peridinieæ, Bacillarieæ, Chlorophyceæ, together with a Brief Summary of the Occurrence and Distribution of Freshwater Algæ. By G. S. WEST, M.A., D.Sc., A.R.C.S., F.L.S., Mason Professor of Botany in the University of Birmingham. Cambridge, The University Press, 1916. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. \$7.50.

The first volume of the series, to be issued as the Cambridge Botanical Handbooks under the editorship of Professor A. C. Seward and A. G. Tansley, of the school of botany of Cambridge University, is Professor G. S. West's volume on the "Algæ." A life-long interest in, and an ever-increasing acquaintanceship with the extraordinarily diversified and numerous organisms embraced within the scope of this work have qualified this leading British algologist to undertake this task. For many years father (the late William West) and son have collaborated in the publication of a long series of memoirs and monographs dealing with the microscopic flora, not only of British waters, but of those of many other lands also. The critical knowledge thus acquired of the very large number of genera and species of algæ, mainly microscopic, has made possible this scholarly and well-proportioned treatise.

Dealing as it does with the Protophytes, the work is of especial interest, not only to botanists, but also to zoologists, especially protozoologists, who have long felt the need of a work more comprehensive in scope and succinct in treatment than Oltmann's "Algen," Chodat's "Algues Vertes de la Suisse," or the authors' "Treatise on the British Freshwater

Algæ," and more critical, the Lemmermann's useful handbooks of the Brandenburg Algæ.

Professor West's work adequately supplies this need. Since the work includes the Dinoflagellata (Peridinieæ) and the Volvocidæ (Volvocineæ) flagellates familiar to all zoologists and prominent in our text-books, the reviewer takes this means to call the attention of all zoologists and of biologists generally to the mine of information contained in this work. He shares with the author the opinion that the Flagellata are a primitive group and therefore of exceptional significance to all who seek the beginnings of either the plant or the animal world, and especially to students of sex, reproduction, variation, and the processes of evolution. It is noteworthy that the classification of green algæ adopted by the author and the criteria of their chief subdivisions are based upon flagellate affinities.

It is perhaps natural that Professor West's investigations of the Phytoplankton should have convinced him that most flagellates are holophytic and that ninety per cent. of the Dinoflagellata "are true vegetable organisms with a holophytic nutrition," but students of parasitic flagellates will demur from the first conclusion. In the reviewer's experience there is abundant evidence that the Gymnodinioidæ, or the most primitive section of the Dinoflagellata, the most abundant flagellates of the sea, are predominantly holozoic, and some are even cannibalistic, while many of the deep water species are undoubtedly saprophytic.

The author's conclusions regarding polymorphism among the algæ, especially the Chlorophyceæ, will interest all students of variation and evolution. Professor West has been a champion of the view of specific stability among the unicells, as over against the view of a wide polymorphism advocated by Chodat, Playfair and others. The results of the pure culture method in the hands of Klebs, Beijerinck, and others, have in the main supported the conclusion that specific stability is quite as constant among the algæ as it is among higher plants. It is doubtless true that much of the so-called evidence for polymorphism has rested upon misjudgment as to the rela-