

THE Swedish government has appropriated 60,000 crowns toward the expenses of Dr. H. Lundborg's Institute for Biologic Research on Heredity and Racial Characteristics at Uppsala. Dr. Halkrantz has been appointed professor of research on heredity, and Dr. Nillsson-Ehle, professor of statistics. An experimental section for biopathology is planned, and a museum for the collection of data on hereditary factors.

THE Stanford University Medical School announces the forty-first course of popular medical lectures as follows: January 12, "Building up resistance to disease: an individual and a community problem," Dr. Philip King Brown; January 26, "Gifted children," Dr. Lewis M. Terman, professor of psychology, Stanford University; February 9, "The problem of the delinquent child," Mr. J. C. Astredo, chief probation officer of the juvenile court; February 23, "The care of the dependent child," Miss Katherine Felton, general secretary, Associated Charities; March 9, "Modern views on dental hygiene in childhood," Dr. Guy S. Millberry, dean of the College of Dentistry, University of California Medical School; March 23, San Francisco's health program for children: "The medical aspects," Dr. William C. Hassler, health officer, San Francisco; "The educational aspects," Mrs. C. W. Hetherington, director of health education, Board of Education.

UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATIONAL NOTES

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY has received a gift of \$100,000 from Henry Lane Eno, research associate in psychology, and \$25,000 from an unnamed alumnus, for the construction of a psychological laboratory.

By the will of the late William G. Vincent, a fund of \$60,000 for establishing a chair of tropical disease at Tulane University of Louisiana School of Medicine, New Orleans, will eventually be available; also, \$30,000 for the erection of an isolation building for the Charity Hospital, New Orleans.

ON the night of December 16 Robinson Hall, the main recitation building of Albion College, Albion, Mich., was almost totally destroyed by fire. The biological equipment and natural history museum suffered practically

a complete loss. The department of biology is temporarily housed in the chemical laboratory. Plans are being made to arrange new quarters for the department to be in readiness for occupation early next fall.

DR. M. A. BRANNON, president of Beloit College, formerly professor of biology at the University of North Dakota, has become chancellor of the University of Montana.

WILLIAM MAYO NEWHALL, of San Francisco, and Herbert Hoover, whose home is on the Stanford campus, have been reelected members of the board of trustees of Stanford University to succeed themselves. The Stanford trustees are elected for ten-year terms. Mr. Newhall was also reelected to the presidency of the board.

DR. A. J. GOLDFARB has been promoted to be associate professor at the College of the City of New York.

DR. SAMUEL R. DETWILER, who for the past three years has been an associate in anatomy at the Pekin Union Medical College in China, which is under the management of the Rockefeller Foundation, has been appointed assistant professor of zoology at Harvard University, to serve during the second half of the current year. Before going to China, Dr. Detwiler was an instructor in zoology at Yale.

DR. HANS ZINSSER, since 1913 professor of bacteriology at Columbia University and bacteriologist of the Presbyterian Hospital, has been elected as professor of bacteriology and immunology in the Harvard Medical School. Dr. Zinsser, who holds the bachelor and master degrees from Columbia University, as well as the doctorate in medicine (1903), will assume the work in Boston in the autumn.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

THE PROPOSED ROOSEVELT-SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK AND THE BARBOUR BILL

IN SCIENCE for December 22, 1922, on pages 705 to 707, appears an article by Dr. W. G. Van Name headed "A Menace to the National Parks." Those who are familiar with the active campaign which Dr. Van Name has

been carrying on against the Barbour bill will take the article at its true valuation. But many other readers of *SCIENCE* unfamiliar with the facts may receive the wrong impression.

Before starting on a single-handed crusade against a bill which has been carefully considered by competent Government authorities, and endorsed by practically all prominent organizations and individuals interested in the matter, it would have been well to ascertain the facts. This precaution Dr. Van Name does not seem to have taken. The very first statement which he makes is incorrect. The American Association for the Advancement of Science is not represented on the National Parks Committee.

The support of the Barbour bill comes, not from those who do not understand "what the bill will do," but on the contrary, from those who have most investigated the matter. Dr. Van Name's attacks have been effective only where the facts were not known.

The resolution quoted is so unfair and so contrary to the best conservation interests that it has called forth a number of protests, as a result of which the Conservation Committee of the San Diego Society of Natural History has decided to recommend no further action against the bill for the present.

It seems particularly ill advised to speak of the efforts of the Forest Service and National Park Service, each working in the best interests of the public, as a "factional dispute" and "internecine strife." The use of such language displays ignorance or disregard of the broader principles underlying the national parks and national forests, and fosters disagreement among conservationists, to the detriment of both the parks and the forests. The drawing of the proposed boundaries required the adjustment of conflicting desiderata in the best interests of all. We cannot both keep our cake and eat it. There is no more justification for locking up vitally needed resources in a national park with no scenic or other valid claim than there is for attacking the parks in order to exploit them for selfish gain.

National parks are created in order to preserve certain scenic or other features of *national* importance. Since these parks must be

kept free from commercial use, the features must be of such outstanding interest as to justify abandoning the resources included within the boundaries of a park. The Sequoia National Park was created in order to preserve the giant redwoods remaining in public control. Unfortunately a large portion of these trees had already passed into private hands; the trees on interior holdings can be cut whether they are surrounded by a national park or a national forest. The publicly owned redwoods will be just as safe under the Forest Service as under the National Park Service. The Forest Service, under its policy of the highest use of all resources, has consistently protected the sequoias under its jurisdiction as being of far more value to the public as monuments of nature's handiwork than as sawn lumber. If further security than the public commitment and consistent policy of the Service were necessary, the redwood groves left outside of the new boundaries could be made National Monuments. Once the protection of the sequoias has been assured, there is no justification for retaining the southern half of the present Sequoia Park. This area is three quarters open hillside of no particular scenic attraction, but of great value for grazing.

The strip of the Yosemite which the National Park Service has asked to have eliminated has been giving the park authorities constant trouble because they have been unable to exclude grazing without undue expense. This is purely a matter of efficient administration; the timber is unimportant and does not enter into the question as Dr. Van Name implies.

Dr. Van Name says (p. 706, first column), "Designs on the fine forests of the national parks are not confined to those of the Sequoia Park." He is laboring under the impression that the Forest Service is deliberately scheming to gain control of all timber on the national parks for exploitation, and that the supporters of the Forest Service are its tools or its dupes. He has stated that the Service is the bitterest and most merciless enemy of the national parks, and has attributed the origin of the Barbour bill to a sinister plot between the Forest Service and the lumber-

men. This firmly rooted delusion seems to be the moving force in Dr. Van Name's opposition to the Barbour bill.

The statement near the bottom of page 706, first column, about the forests of the Pacific states will be recognized by those familiar with these forests as wholly misleading. He says, "The immense trees of those forests * * * * * were never found except in tracts of limited extent where they had good soil and other conditions and had escaped serious fire damage for long periods. Those few that still survive are mainly in the hands of the lumber interests and a few years will see the last of them." Obviously he has never traveled through the national forests of the Sierra Nevada Mountains where for mile after mile one passes beneath giant sugar pines, western yellow pines, Douglas firs and incense cedars. Nor has he seen the stands of immense Douglas fir, western hemlock and western red cedar on the national forests of Washington and Oregon. True, these large trees will eventually be cut, such of them as survive storm and decay. But has Dr. Van Name never heard of the Mount Rainier National Park with its primeval forests of Douglas fir and associated species, and of the Yosemite with its Sierra forests of sugar pine and other trees?

The Forest Service is in complete sympathy with the movement for preserving areas of virgin forest for esthetic or scientific reasons. Along lakes and much used routes of travel provision is made for leaving sufficient untouched forest to maintain the natural beauties and charm. Undoubtedly, sample tracts of the various kinds of forest will be preserved for scientific and educational purposes.

When the Barbour bill, in its original form permitting water power development, came up for a hearing before the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, the strongest statement in favor of complete preservation of the national parks was made by Colonel Greeley, chief of the Forest Service. The bill was amended to exclude water power, and obtained the support of the National Parks Committee and other friends of both parks and forests.

The reasons why the Barbour bill has secured such widespread support, outside of the water power interests, may be briefly stated.

There will be added to the already existing Sequoia National Park 961 square miles of land now in a national forest, and there will be returned to the national forest 105 square miles. This represents an exchange very favorable to the national park. As mentioned above, the sequoia groves placed under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service will be amply protected; the land eliminated is about three fourths open and without scenic attractions.

On the other hand the land added to the National Park contains *more publicly owned redwoods exceeding ten feet in diameter than the area returned to the national forest*. The present Sequoia Park contains 1,214 of such trees, and the Roosevelt-Sequoia Park will contain 1,304, a net gain of ninety trees, besides those outside the boundaries which will still be protected. Aside from the giant redwoods, the 961 square miles to be added contain three or four times as much of the main forest belt, at from 4,000 to 9,000 feet elevation, as the area eliminated, with larger and finer trees. The fact that these trees may be located in mountains difficult of access for logging operations, and may therefore be of little commercial value, does not detract from their scenic and scientific interest.

The jog in the boundary, against which Dr. Van Name protests, was made to leave out lands which do not properly belong in the Park. How this perfectly natural condition, over which obviously man has no control, can injure the new Park is difficult to see.

The Roosevelt-Sequoia National Park will contain, in addition to Mt. Whitney, Mt. Tyndall, and other magnificent peaks, the superb canyons of the Tehipite and Kings River, considered by many as equal in grandeur to the Yosemite. This fact Dr. Van Name has persistently ignored. Water power interests are eager to dam and flood these canyons and have already filed applications for this purpose. Dr. Van Name's activities, though doubtless from an entirely different motive, play directly into the hands of the water power interests and other enemies of the National Parks. If he should be successful we will see these beautiful canyons ruined by dams, conduits, power lines, etc., instead of included in one of our finest National Parks.

BARRINGTON MOORE

NEW YORK, N. Y.