NAME

The conference recommends that this oceanographic undertaking be known as the Maury U. S. Naval Oceanographic Research, in honor of Lieutenant Matthew Fontaine Maury, U. S. Navy, whose pioneer work in practically all branches of oceanography entitles him to this distinction. It is further recommended that the major ship that is assigned to this work be named the U. S. S. *Tanner* in honor of Commander Zera L. Tanner, U. S. Navy, whose long-continued oceanographic work has contributed much to the advance of this science.

CONTINUING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

It is recommended that, in order to carry the project through the initial stages, to properly present this case to the Navy Department, the Budget and the Committees of Congress, and to develop the organization of the first cruise, provided funds and ships are available, the Secretary of the Navy appoint a continuing advisory committee consisting of representatives of governmental and other institutions interested in the investigations to be undertaken, and that Captain F. B. Bassett, U. S. Navy, and Lieutenant-Commander George E. Brandt, U. S. Navy, respectively, be the chairman and secretary of this committee.

The continuing advisory committee recommended by the conference was immediately appointed by the Secretary of the Navy.

CONCLUSION

No plan for broad cooperative work which has been proposed in recent years offers such possibilities of benefit to all as the Navy's plan for oceanographic work. No precedent is involved in its adoption, for in times of peace oceanographic studies heretofore have always been an important part of the Navy's duties.

With these closing words I commend the plan to you as most worthy of your consideration and support.

AUSTIN H. CLARK

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM OF TEACHING IN SCIENCE

THE American Association of University Professors, at its recent meeting in Washington, endorsed the appended statement of Committee M on "Freedom of Teaching in Science." This committee was formed on account of efforts which have been made to suppress the teaching of doctrines which incurred the disapproval of some organized groups. It can not be denied that a private institution is within its legal rights if it does not tolerate any of its members who do not believe that the world is flat, although such a policy might be inimical to progress and suicidal in the long run for the institution itself. It is, however, a different matter when a public institution becomes guilty of a similar policy of suppression in regard to any sort of theoretical question.

The situation that has arisen in America has been commented upon with some amusement by several writers abroad as a very anomalous development among a people who do so much talking about liberty. It indeed seems necessary to call attention to some fundamental principles by which the people of a democracy should be guided in the toleration of opinions. It is for this purpose that the following statement was formulated.

S. J. HOLMES

The Statement of the Committee

The last few years have witnessed a revival of the spirit of intolerance which has asserted itself especially in the opposition to the teaching of evolution. Attempts have been made to secure the passage of laws forbidding such teaching in state-supported institutions of learning, and teachers of biology in a number of colleges have been dismissed on account of their promulgation of evolutionary doctrines. These occurrences have aroused in the teaching profession, and also in the general public, considerable concern over the maintenance of that freedom of thought and speech which Americans have regarded as one of their most valued possessions. Recent events have demonstrated that public opinion in several parts of the United States is considerably less enlightened than had commonly been supposed, and manifestations of intolerance which we had generally come to believe were no longer possible have been of not infrequent occurrence. There are, in the opinion of the Committee on Freedom of Teaching in Science, certain general principles by which we should be guided in regard not only to the teaching of evolutionary theory, but in all other fields of inquiry. Notwithstanding the fact that the doctrine of evolution in some form is accepted by practically all competent investigators in every branch of biological science, it is not so much for this reason that the attempts to suppress the teaching of evolution should be condemned as the fact that such attempts strike a blow at the fundamental principle of freedom in teaching and research. Opposition to the teaching of evolutionary theory is based mainly on ignorance and groundless fears. But the worst feature of the opposition is not that it is unscientific, but that it is un-American.

It is, we believe, a principle to be rigidly adhered to that the decision as to what is taught as true, or what should be presented as theory in science or in any other field of learning, should be determined not by a popular vote nor by the activities of minorities who are persuaded that certain doctrines are inconsistent with their beliefs, but by the teachers and investigators in their respective fields. It would be absurd for the laity to attempt to dictate to the teachers of medical science what should and what should not be taught as facts in colleges of medicine. Teachers and investigators may teach doctrines in

one decade which are discarded in the next; nevertheless, there is no body of individuals more competent than they to decide what doctrines are right, and if mistakes have been made, as they are bound to be with the best of intentions, the teachers and investigators have proven themselves to be the first to discover and to rectify the errors without the assistance of uninformed outsiders. We are never absolutely certain as to what constitutes truth, but if there is any method of insuring that what is taught is true better than that of giving investigators and teachers the utmost freedom to discover and proclaim the truth as they see it, that method has never been discovered. If those who know most about a subject sometimes decide wrongly, matters are not likely to be mended by putting the decision into the hands of those who know less.

Some of the proposed laws in regard to the teaching of evolution would forbid this doctrine to be taught as fact, while permitting it to be presented as theory. If such laws are justified at all, they should apply to all theoretical questions instead of singling out the theory of evolution for special attack. A teacher in any field is under a moral obligation not to teach as a fact a doctrine which is not yet established. But who is to decide what can reasonably be held as settled fact, and what is still in the realm of uncertainty? Most well-established generalizations begin as theories before they are finally accepted as truisms. This was true of the theory of the rotundity of the earth, although a minority might protest even now against teaching dogmatically that this theory is proven. The line between fact and theory would be drawn differently by different teachers. The attempt to settle such questions by law instead of allowing them to settle themselves in the light of advancing knowledge would create only endless mischief and confusion. The theory of evolution is one of those generalizations which are so far along on the high road to general acceptance as an established truth that teachers of biology differ as to whether, for practical purposes, it should be classed as fact or theory. So long as students as well as teachers are aware that there is a small measure of uncertainty attaching to most things regarded as facts, the distinction between what is called fact and what is an extremely probable theory is not one which urgently needs to be recognized by legislative enactment, especially since there is no way in which such questions can really be settled except through the advancement of knowledge.

The attempts which have been made to suppress all teaching of evolutionary theory, even as theory, are a menace not only to freedom, but to liberal education. Whatever one may think of the doctrine of evolution, he can not fail to recognize the fact that it has profoundly influenced thought not only in the biological sciences, but in psychology, sociology, education, ethics, political science, philosophy and many other fields of human knowledge. It is a doctrine, therefore, with which every person with any pretense to a liberal education should be familiar. Efforts to keep students from knowing about it are not only futile, but they constitute a violation of the rights of students to know what is the consensus of the best opinion on a great problem. Students have a right to know the pros and cons of controverted subjects in every field. Teachers should be free to present those subjects and to express their own position in regard to them. It is only the things that are not true which have anything to fear from freedom of discussion, and it is only by the maintenance of this freedom that we create conditions under which the truth will most rapidly prevail.

JOSEPH ALLEN,
J. H. BREASTED,
G. A. COE,
E. G. CONKLIN,
JOHN DEWEY,
R. F. GRIGGS,
VERNON KELLOGG,
SHAILER MATHEWS,
R. A. MILLIKAN,
E. C. MOORE,
HERBERT OSBORN,
W. PATTEN,
A. H. TURNER,
H. E. WALTER,
W. H. WELCH,
S. J. HOLMES, *chairman*

THE SECOND ANNUAL AMERICAN ASSOCIATION PRIZE

THE second annual prize of one thousand dollars has been divided this year into two equal prizes and these have been awarded (as already announced in SCIENCE for February 13) to Dr. L. R. Cleveland, of the School of Hygiene and Public Health of the Johns Hopkins University, and to Dr. Edwin P. Hubble, of the Mt. Wilson Observatory of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. It will be recalled that these annual prizes have been made possible through the public-spirited action of a member of the American Association whose name is to be withheld. The amount available is one thousand dollars each year and the awards are to be made for noteworthy contributions to science presented at the annual meetings of the American Association and associated societies. Four more years after the present are thus far provided for. The awards now announced are for papers presented at the recent Washington meeting.

Dr. Cleveland holds a National Research Council fellowship in biology and is engaged in research in medical zoology at the School of Hygiene and Public Health of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. He received his bachelor's degree at the University of Mississippi in 1917 and the degree of doctor of science at Johns Hopkins University in 1923. He was instructor in biology in the University of Mississippi, 1916–18; in Emory University, 1918–20; instructor in zoology in Kansas State Agricultural College, 1920–21, and research fellow at Johns Hopkins University, 1921–23.