

SCIENCE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1920

CONTENTS

<i>The American Association for the Advancement of Science:—</i>	
<i>On the Relations of Anthropology and Psychology: DR. ALEŠ, HRDLIČKA</i>	199
<i>The Functions and Ideals of a National Geological Survey: DR. F. L. RANSOME</i>	201
<i>David S. Pratt: W. A. H.</i>	207
<i>Scientific Events:—</i>	
<i>The Bonaparte and Loutreuil Foundation of the Paris Academy of Sciences; Award of the Nobel Prize to Professor Haber; Dye Section of the American Chemical Society.</i>	208
<i>Scientific Notes and News</i>	209
<i>University and Educational News</i>	211
<i>Discussion and Correspondence:—</i>	
<i>A Proposed Method for Carrying Triangulation across Wide Gaps: DR. H. L. COOKE, PROFESSOR HENRY NORRIS RUSSELL.</i>	211
<i>Two New Base Maps of the United States....</i>	213
<i>Special Articles:</i>	
<i>Substitutes for Phenolphthalein and Methyl Orange: F. M. SCALES</i>	214
<i>The American Society of Zoologists: PROFESSOR W. C. ALLEE</i>	214
<i>The Mineralogical Society of America: DR. HERBERT P. WHITLOCK</i>	219
<i>The American Association for the Advancement of Science:—</i>	
<i>Section A—Mathematics and Astronomy: PROFESSOR F. R. MOULTON</i>	220

MSS. intended for publication and books, etc., intended for review should be sent to The Editor of Science, Garrison-on-Hudson, N. Y.

ON THE RELATIONS OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY¹

If we are to compare two objects and study their relations, we will naturally want data as to their dimensions, their composition, and their observed influence upon each other. In comparing two branches of science we should thoroughly know their scope, the intrinsic work and the tendencies of each, and their mutual interplay and cooperation. This stipulates, in the first place, a clear definition of both of the branches concerned; in the second, a good acquaintance with their workings and their possibilities; and lastly, a possession of some satisfactory measure of the field of activities of each of the two branches for direct comparison.

In considering the relations of anthropology and psychology, the conditions just named are regrettably, not all fulfillable. We are fairly clear to-day as to the definition of scope, and work done, as well as doing and to be done, in physical anthropology; but we are less clear in these respects when it comes to other subdivisions of the "science of man," and matters are even less satisfactory when we approach psychology.

In a general way, we all feel that psychology and anthropology are related. The very existence of this joint Section, as well as that of the joint committee of our two branches in the National Research Council, are sufficient proofs of this feeling, in this country at least. We all know also that anthropological studies of human activities, both in the far past and at present, the studies of language, beliefs, ceremonies, music and habits, as well as the studies upon the human and animal brain and on the sense organs and their functions, are

¹ Address of the vice-president and chairman of Section H—Anthropology, American Association for the Advancement of Science, St. Louis, December, 1919.