

positions must be on file with the Civil Service Commission at Washington, D. C., not later than March 13. The examinations are to fill vacancies occurring in the Engineer Department at Large, War Department, throughout the United States, and in positions requiring similar qualifications. At present there is a vacancy in the associate grade in the Chattanooga, Tenn., district of the Engineer Department. Higher-salaried positions are filled through promotion.

THE first International Congress on Mental Hygiene, of which Clifford W. Beers has been elected secretary-general, will be held in Washington, D. C., from May 5 to 10, 1930.

THE seventy-fourth annual exhibition of the Royal Photographic Society of Great Britain will be held this year from September 14 to October 14. The secretary wishes a strong American representation, since active support from representative scientific workers in this country contributes largely to the success of the exhibition. Exhibits intended for the scientific section may be sent to the secretary of the Royal Photographic Society Exhibit, care of The Eastman Kodak Company, Rochester, New York, and should reach there not later than July 15.

DR. EDWARD WESTON has established the Edward Weston Fellowship with the American Electrochemical Society. The candidate will be selected by the society and selection will be based on marked capacity in carrying out research in the science of electrochemistry or its applications. The award will be made without distinction on account of sex, citizenship, race or residence. The successful candidate may carry out his research at any university or institute approved by the society. The date of the first award (approximately \$1,000) is not definitely fixed but will probably be in the fall of this year. Those interested should apply to the office of the American Electrochemical Society, Columbia University, New York City.

THE American Society of Clinical Pathologists has announced an annual award to be given to the best work in clinical pathology by one of its members. The prize will be known as the Ward Burdick Research Award of the American Society of Clinical Pathologists and is intended to perpetuate the memory of the deceased secretary and co-founder of this organization, who carried the society to a successful status and useful functioning in the medical field. The prize will be in the form of a gold medal. It will carry the profile likeness of Dr. Ward Burdick and the nature of the award on its face, while on the reverse side will be the seal of the society, the name of the recipient and the date of presentation. The award is to be made to the successful candidate by the president of the society at the annual convention

on the evening of the banquet. All candidates for the award must present their thesis at least two months prior to the annual meeting to be held in Portland, Oregon, July 5, 6 and 8, 1929. Correspondence should be addressed to the American Society of Clinical Pathologists, Metropolitan Building, Denver, Colorado.

### UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATIONAL NOTES

MR. AND MRS. PERCY S. STRAUS have made a gift of \$1,000,000 to the unrestricted endowment of New York University. The donation is to be used as the Edith A. and Percy S. Straus Fund at the discretion of the university council. Mr. Straus is a member of the university council and is chairman of the Centennial Fund Committee. A building worth nearly \$2,000,000 has been given by Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Brown to the university. It is situated at the northwest corner of Washington Place and Greene Street, New York City, and has been rented for about ten years by the university at a cost of \$92,000.

EDWARD S. HARKNESS, of New York, has given \$200,000 to the endowment fund for the College for Women of Western Reserve University. One half the amount is given outright, the remainder to be turned over when the drive reaches its goal of \$1,000,000.

A GIFT of \$200,000 from Charles Lathrop Pack, president of the American Tree Association of Washington, to Yale University will establish a foundation for the advancement of applied forestry. Mr. Pack is the founder of the Charles Lathrop Pack Forestry Trust, a foundation through which aid has been extended to a number of schools and other agencies engaged in forestry work. As part of his educational work Mr. Pack has given three million forestry primers to schools throughout the country.

H. S. JACKSON, who has been since 1915 chief in botany at the Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station, has been appointed professor of mycology and cryptogamic botany at the University of Toronto.

CLARA S. STOTTENBERG, in anatomy, and Waldemar Fenn Dietrich, in mining and metallurgy, have been promoted to full professorships at Stanford University.

D. F. HIGGINS, JR., of Loveland, Colorado, has been appointed lecturer in petroleum geology in Northwestern University for the second semester of the current year.

DR. JESSIE Y. CANN, associate professor of chemistry at Smith College, has been promoted to a full professorship.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR ELIZABETH B. COWLEY, of Vassar College, who is at present on leave of absence

teaching in the Pittsburgh public schools, has been promoted to a full professorship of mathematics at Vassar College.

## DISCUSSION

### THE PLANETESIMAL HYPOTHESIS

It is with much regret that I have read the long article by Professor F. R. Moulton in *SCIENCE* for December 7. I am deeply sorry that it was ever written, and still more so that, having been written, it was not withdrawn when the death of Professor T. C. Chamberlin occurred between writing and publication.

Professor Moulton sees in various passages from the writings of Sir James Jeans, Professor Eddington and myself a deep-laid scheme to rob Professor Chamberlin of the credit of the notion of disruptive approach of two stars, which is fundamental in both the planetesimal hypothesis and its derivative, the tidal hypothesis, and to claim this credit for England. When his grounds for this charge are examined, they are found to amount to (1) my omission to mention the two papers by Chamberlin and himself that contain the first accounts of the planetesimal hypothesis, or to give the dates of the three text-books quoted for fuller accounts, (2) my treatment of this hypothesis in an appendix, (3) the fact that Jeans discussed it explicitly in only one place in "Problems of Cosmogony" and did not give the original references, (4) Eddington's mention of Jeans alone in a recent article.

Now I say that to write a lengthy polemic, full of accusations of bad faith against fellow workers ("astounding tactics" is one of Moulton's expressions), on such grounds as these, is entirely indefensible. In most cases where inadequate mention of relevant work is made in scientific publications the reasons are entirely different. Usually an author simply has not seen the work at all, or has missed a point through its being in a foreign language. It has even happened that continental writers have for these reasons omitted to notice work written in English, and that the resulting work has been copied by British or American writers without addition. Often it is due to culpable, but remediable and forgivable, forgetfulness. Sometimes two authors may quite honestly differ about what is in fact relevant. In practically all cases an author is willing to repair such omissions when they are pointed out to him privately, either by immediate acknowledgment in a journal or by mention in a subsequent paper. In this I speak from experience. But in the present instance Moulton has deliberately chosen the worst interpretation and insulted his col-

leagues in print without the slightest preliminary effort to settle the matter in an amicable way.

The matter is made worse by the fact that the charges are, as a matter of fact, entirely trivial. Jeans and I both acknowledged indebtedness to the planetesimal hypothesis for the idea of tidal disruption, and Moulton admits this. We both gave references, Jeans to one, I to three, of the places where it is most fully treated; Moulton admits this also. Moulton's only complaint is that we did not indicate that the earliest papers appeared in 1901. But when acknowledgment of indebtedness is once made, I fail to see any circumstance that would make the interval of time of any scientific interest. Had another worker made relevant advances in the meantime it would be important to get the steps in the right order, but that does not arise in the present instance, and any one interested could extract the information by means of the clues we gave. As Moulton desires it, the first references will be inserted in the next edition of "The Earth," but they are less full and less useful than those given already. If Moulton thinks that any injury is done to Chamberlin's reputation by omission to mention his name in the Smithsonian Report, he makes an accusation of ignorance against American astronomers and geologists that would be hard to substantiate. Chamberlin, in his review of "The Earth,"<sup>1</sup> says that I "frankly acknowledge the parental relations of the planetesimal hypothesis to the tidal theory. This gives his [*i.e.*, H. J.'s] views good ethical standing, and with that goes unquestionable liberty to try to splice a new top on an older stump." There is no indication here of any sense of inadequate recognition. Chamberlin's objections to the tidal theory are to the nature of the alterations and not to any lack of recognition of previous work. It is strange that in Moulton's article this review and my reply to it<sup>2</sup> are not mentioned.

Moulton, in accusing me of having adopted the planetesimal theory as my own, says that "in every essential concept the two theories are identical." His remarks just before state, nearly correctly, the differences between the theories, and it may be inferred that he does not consider them essential. Now in this point it happens that Chamberlin agreed with me and not with Moulton. In the review mentioned above he made it perfectly clear that, whatever the differences might be, he considered them serious and fundamental: so do I. This is perhaps less surprising than might at first appear. Chamberlin and I were both interested primarily in the geophysical implications of the theory, and it is chiefly in these that the differences

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of Geology*, 32: 696-716. 1924.

<sup>2</sup> *Amer. J. Sci.*, 9: 395-405. 1925.