

like to blow a blast on a David Wilbur Horn. To him I will say merely "*Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*" Let the chemist take heed when murdering romance lest he also murder Cicero. I beg to associate myself with that veteran story-teller, T. C. Mendenhall, whose stories were so good that it never occurred to any one to doubt them.

I will take a little whack at the Galileo story myself, after relating my experience with the Wood story. In the summer of 1912 I was on the train going from London "up" to Cambridge with the guests for the quarter millenium of the Royal Society when I heard Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler telling it to Sir Oliver Lodge, and I assisted him, as Professor Wood had told it to me several years before as having happened at Easthampton. What was my surprise then at seeing Professor Campbell's account as happening later at the Lick Observatory! I immediately wrote him and Professor Wood. In my opinion Wood's story is the better, but I never could believe that the definition in that revolving mercury paraboloid could be good enough for a farmer to make such an observation. I always felt that this telescope in the well was one of Professor Wood's jokes. It was particularly wooden. Perhaps Professor Wood will pardon me if I insert some lines that I wrote in his guest book expressing my feelings on the subject. It will easily be seen that I am no great poet.

Ding, dong, bell,
Prof is in the well.
What did he put in?
Lots of time and tin.¹
What did he get out?
Nothing, just about.
What a silly prof was that,
He never knew what he was at.

I am bound to admit that the Royal Society did not agree with me when they elected him a foreign member.

As for Galileo, some years ago I was invited to deliver an address at the dedication of a new physical laboratory at a great university not a thousand miles from here. Sup-

¹ Poetic for mercury.

posing I was to be "the big noise" I prepared an address about an hour long, but was somewhat disconcerted on being introduced by the dean in an address of about half an hour, in which much of the wind was taken out of my sails. In it he used the words, "When Galileo dropped the two weights from the tower of Pisa he sounded the death-knell of the Aristotelian philosophy." Singularly enough the same sentence occurred in my address. But I had my revenge. In beginning I disclaimed all possibility of thought-transference, and when I came to the quoted words I added "as Sir Oliver Lodge says." I was rewarded with roars of laughter, and when I arrived at the club was told that the joke was much appreciated, as the dean was not popular. The joke would have been on me, however, if my manuscript had been looked at, for no more than the dean had I given Lodge credit for the remark that we both had cribbed. He laughs best who laughs last, for the dean is now president of that great university, while the subscriber is even less of a noise that he was then. However, hurrah for history! was it Napoleon who called it "*mensonges convenus*"?

ARTHUR GORDON WEBSTER

WORCESTER, MASS.,

February 13

ARCHEOLOGICAL SPECIMENS FOR MUSEUMS

THE curator of the Museum at Phillips Academy has received authority from the trustees to reduce the number of specimens possessed by the department of archeology. We have large numbers of various objects in stone, bone and clay, found during the course of our explorations in New England, the Middle West and the South. We propose assembling collections ranging from 500 to as high as 4,000 specimens, all recorded as to locality from our catalogue, etc., and to send these to museums, natural history societies, etc. There is no condition, but it is requested that certain of the specimens be exhibited. They will be found of value to students. These exhibits have cost us a great deal to accumulate, and while we ask no financial

return, we feel that those who receive the collections should pay the expenses of cataloguing, assembling, packing and shipping. The smaller collections will require several days to prepare and ship, the larger ones one or two weeks. The cost of clerical and other assistance will range from \$65 to \$200, depending on the size of the collection.

W. K. MOOREHEAD,
Curator

ANDOVER, MASS.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE VIENNA MUSEUM

DR. VICTOR PIETSCHMANN, as successor of the late Dr. Steindachner, writes of the sad plight of the museum of Vienna in having no means for publication, and no means of disposing of two works already printed. One of these is a Monograph of the Genus *Tenthredo*, the other a Monograph of the *Siphonæ Verticillatæ* from the Carboniferous to the Cretaceous with plates, by Dr. J. Pia. This great work on fossil plants is said to be of especial value, and Dr. Pietschmann has great hopes that some one in America may take fifty copies at \$5.00 each. The price is not great and the crisis is pressing. I suggest that any one willing to help this great center of scientific work to rise to its feet, may (as I have done) send a check for the equivalent in Kroner of five dollars to Dr. Pietschmann, Mechelgasse 2, Vienna 111.3.

DAVID STARR JORDAN

QUOTATIONS

THE PROTECTION OF BRITISH OPTICAL INDUSTRIES

THERE are two main objects which the Bill to be introduced should secure and reconcile. On the one hand, if the industry is to be saved, the manufacturers must be protected from foreign competition aggravated by the state of the exchange; and, on the other, the users of scientific instruments must not be prejudiced or hampered, either by being unable to obtain the best instruments or by having to pay an extravagant price for them. These apparently conflicting interests are not merely recon-

cilable; they are interdependent. If the British optical industry should dwindle and die, the scientific users of instruments will be at the mercy of foreign manufacturers, they will have to pay a heavy price for such dependence, and they will be handicapped as compared with scientific workers in foreign countries possessing a flourishing scientific instrument industry. Similarly, if the scientific users can not obtain the best instruments for their work, or if they have to pay an exorbitant price for them, their work will be hampered, their demand for instruments will decrease, and the manufacturers will ultimately suffer.

The industries, through the British Optical Instrument Manufacturers' Association, ask shortly for the following measures of protection:

1. No optical glass or scientific instruments to be imported into this country for a period of, say, seven years, except under license.

2. Such licenses only to be granted in respect of goods which are not being made in Great Britain in the required quantities or of the required quality.

3. An expert licensing committee to be set up.

4. The optical instrument manufacturers are prepared, in order to guarantee reasonable prices, to submit to a control of profits.

The manufacturers are satisfied and confident that, under such conditions for a limited period, they would be able to establish the optical glass and optical instrument industries on a sound and stable basis, and also be able at the end of the period to meet any foreign competition in the open market. On the other hand, unless they secure this limited protection, it is more than probable—indeed, it is almost certain—that the manufacture of optical glass in this country will cease, and that, in consequence, some of the largest British manufacturers of optical instruments will greatly curtail their production. The proposed measures seem to protect adequately the interests of the scientific users. Moreover,