

Fruits; Insects affecting Field Crops and Pasturage; Insects affecting Truck Crops and the Vegetable Garden; Insect Enemies of Greenhouse and House Plants and of the Flower Garden; Insects affecting Shade Trees; Insects affecting Man and the Household; Insects and Insect-like Animals attacking Stock and Poultry; Mill and Elevator Insects and Mill Fumigation; Our Insect Friends; The Relations of Birds to Agriculture; Some four-footed pests of the Farm.

There are four colored plates, and 414 illustrations in the text, many of the figures are from original photographs and drawings, and the others are borrowed from various sources, due credit being given.

This little volume differs from most other manuals of injurious insects in that considerable information regarding common birds and rodents may be found in the same book. Of course where so many species are treated within the limits of a small-sized volume, the account of each must necessarily be very brief. Probably the value of the work would have been enhanced by giving after each one or two references where the reader could obtain more complete information.

Nevertheless the author has condensed a large amount of information in this small volume which is well printed and supplied with index. It will prove a convenient manual for all growers of plants and keepers of live stock.

W. E. BRITTON

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH¹

At the meeting of the American Anthropological Association held in Baltimore, December 27, Professor J. C. Merriam, representing the National Research Council, made a formal statement of the plans of the council in regard to the organization of science, and requested an expression of opinion on the

¹Report of the Committee of the American Anthropological Association to Professor G. E. Hale, chairman of the National Research Council, Washington, D. C.

part of the American Anthropological Association in regard to the position of anthropology in the work of the National Research Council.

In consequence of this request and the discussion following it, the undersigned committee was appointed for the purpose of giving to the National Research Council information in regard to the work actually done by American anthropologists. A statement has been added pointing out the causes for the slow development of certain branches of anthropology.

The committee has submitted a number of questions to American anthropologists and attached to this are a number of replies to our circular letter.

The general tendency of the scientific work of American anthropologists may briefly be summarized as follows: It is but natural that in a country like our own, which contains the remains of a considerable number of primitive people, the historical interest in the aborigines, combined with the ease of accessibility of the remainder of the ancient tribes, should bring it about that inquiries relating to their customs, languages and physical types should dominate American anthropological research, and that theoretical work should be based very largely upon the results obtained from a study of American tribes. The methods which give the easiest results in regard to these problems are archeological, ethnographical and linguistic, and for this reason these three lines of inquiry have hitherto predominated in the research work of American anthropologists.

At the same time the necessity for a broader outlook is keenly felt. The Field Museum of Natural History has included in the scope of its work Eastern Asia, Malaysia and Melanesia. Harvard University has expanded its work over Africa. The University of Pennsylvania has undertaken research work in South America, the American Museum of Natural History and the United States National Museum, in Asia, and a few other attempts of similar kind for obtaining a wider basis for research in cultural history may be noted.

The field of work of American anthropologists is also in part determined by the character of the institutions that maintain anthropological work. The Bureau of American Ethnology which forms part of the Smithsonian Institution is by law restricted to work on the natives of America and the Hawaiian Islands. Most positions held by working anthropologists are museum positions, and consequently the scientific work is largely restricted to those aspects of anthropology that yield tangible specimens. University positions are on the whole of such a character that the funds necessary for the conduct of field work are not supplied by the universities, but if available at all, come from museums.

Anthropologists have felt for a long time that their work needs expansion, and many attempts have been made to free anthropological research from the restrictions dependent upon the association of anthropological work with museums on the one hand, and from those conditions that tend to give undue preponderance to work on American Indians on the other hand. Attempts have been made particularly to direct attention to African problems, which are of importance to us on account of our large negro population, and also to investigations on racial anthropology among the white and negro populations of the United States. Work of this kind needs financial support, but all attempts have failed to interest the government institutions which command considerable funds, or private individuals, to support work of this type. There is a peculiar hesitancy in regard to undertakings of this kind, which will not be overcome until more work on a smaller scale has been done. Investigations of this description have been undertaken by American anthropologists and by educators, sociologists and medical men with anthropological leanings.

Recently, biologists have also directed their attention to this subject, but methods applied and results obtained up to this time are quite unsatisfactory. Work on human paleontology is also not vigorously pursued.

The difficulty of giving anthropological research an adequate position in the scheme of

the National Research Council is largely based on the fact that the humanities find no place in the general scheme of work of the Research Council. While anthropology must necessarily be based on the one hand on biological science, on the other hand it is intimately associated with the humanities. It is impossible to treat even the biological problems of anthropology without a due regard to the cultural aspect of anthropology, because the forces which determine the development of human types are to a very large extent cultural forces.

The peculiar position of anthropology brings about close contact with a great many different sciences—biology, geology, paleontology, geography, psychology, history, linguistics and the whole range of humanities. Cooperation will be necessary according to the particular type of problems taken up, and anthropology will be best served by an entirely free association with different subjects, according to the need of each case.

It is the opinion of the undersigned committee that the appointment of a director of anthropological work, who would have a dominating influence over organized work, would not be helpful on account of the great diversity of subject matter included in anthropology, and might prove decidedly prejudicial on account of the necessity of developing this subject in different directions. Much better results would undoubtedly be obtained by regular meetings of representative scientists, and by the appointment of a secretary who would carry out the necessary clerical work.

FRANZ BOAS, *Chairman*,
ALEŠ HRDLIČKA,
ALFRED M. TOZZER

NEW YORK CITY,
March 6, 1919

SPECIAL ARTICLES

EGG-WEIGHT AS A CRITERION OF NUMERICAL PRODUCTION IN THE DOMESTIC FOWL¹

IN connection with a study of the manner of inheritance of egg-weight in the domestic

¹ Contribution 251 from the Agricultural Experiment Station of the Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I.