

cal chemistry provided by the J. T. Baker Chemical Company, which is of the value of \$1,000, should be made before February 13. The fellowship is available for students in any institution conferring the doctor's degree in chemistry in the New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland. The committee on award is as follows: N. H. Furman, Princeton University, chairman; Gregory P. Baxter, Harvard University; Philip E. Browning, Yale University, secretary; E. M. Chamot, Cornell University, and H. A. Fales, Colum-

bia University. The Mid-Western Fellowship will be available for students in any institution conferring the doctor's degree in chemistry in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin. Applications may be sent by any member of the teaching staff who is qualified to supervise a doctor's dissertation. Further information may be secured from the committee: H. H. Willard, University of Michigan, Chairman; C. W. Foulk, Ohio State University; Stephen Popoff, Iowa State University; G. F. Smith, University of Illinois.

## DISCUSSION

### THE CENTRAL ASIATIC EXPEDITION

WE have been sorry for controversy which arose from the case of the Central Asiatic Expedition led by Dr. Roy Chapman Andrews, and the interpretation given to this by Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn as he wrote it in the September 27 issue of *SCIENCE*. We shall be much obliged if you can publish this letter and the accompanying statement for the information of American scientific public.

The meaning and the reason of the proposed agreement (text already reported by Dr. Andrews) put forward by the Chinese committee are already explained in our statement of April 19, and need not be repeated. Certain restriction of extensive collection by foreign expeditions and of the export of large amounts of scientific material is not without precedent in scientific world, and does not mean anti-foreignism. The opinion of the Chinese committee is that such large expeditions should be allowed only on the condition of a close cooperation with Chinese scientific bodies and the retention of complete representative collection in China. Such has been the principle in the committee's action dealing with all other foreign expeditions, while Dr. Andrews has tried to avoid Chinese participation before the autumn of 1928 and always to obtain unconditional authorization.

The committee is always ready to consider any practical proposal toward the solution of the problem and regrets to see the exaggerated meaning purposely given to the incident in order to disturb American opinion. It is hoped that Dr. Osborn, well known for his broad mind and sane judgment, and other American scientists will find no difficulty in understanding the true Chinese attitude.

The statement follows:

Public opinion in China was aroused against the export of a large amount of important scientific material by the Central Asiatic Expedition from Chinese territory without any Chinese control or participation in preceding years. The case is the more surprising that such extensive excavations were done under the cover of a

passport for hunting only. Some negotiations took place and an agreement was reached in October, 1928, between this committee and Dr. Andrews, the leader of the Central Asiatic Expedition, providing certain conditions for the return of duplicate specimens and casts and the possibility of organizing future expeditions under new conditions of cooperation to be agreed upon.

At the beginning of February, 1929, Dr. Granger on behalf of the Central Expedition in a letter approached this committee for permission to launch a new paleontological expedition to Inner Mongolia and proposed on his own initiative (1) to take two Chinese scientists on the expedition and (2) to return after study a complete set of duplicate specimens or casts of vertebrate fossils.

These proposals were carefully considered by this committee in a full sitting of all its members present in Peking together with the members of the Peiping local committee. It was then decided that a draft agreement be made which, while giving full consideration to the scientific interest of the expedition, tries to provide for necessary safeguards of Chinese interest and cooperation in this important scientific enterprise.

The full text of the proposed agreement is herewith appended. From the Chinese point of view a complete set of the fossils collected including unique specimens should be kept in or returned to China after study. But in view of the large expenses borne by the expedition and the scientific interest of the American Museum of Natural History in having representative specimens kept in New York, the proposed agreement is so worded as to still make possible the transport of the bulk of the collection to America for scientific study on the condition that representative duplicates of each species shall be returned to China which together with the casts (of those specimens which have no duplicates) will constitute a complete representation in China of the whole fauna collected.

As it was admitted by both sides from the beginning that some Chinese paleontologist shall take part in the field work on one hand, and on the other hand the bulk of the collection should be scientifically studied and described in America, the difficulty was immediately felt that there would be no scientific interest for the Chinese specialist who would only help in the collection and have no opportunity of taking part in the real scientific work.

To remedy this difficulty, it was thought desirable that one Chinese specialist shall be offered the opportunity of going to the American Museum to describe a part of the material which he has helped to collect.

These proposed terms with the underlying ideas were put before the leaders of the Central Asiatic Expedition on March 26. These gentlemen, after some discussion and explanation, agreed in principle and went on discussing the details, in the subsequent two meetings, as to how many (two or three) Chinese representatives the expedition can take and how long (one or two years) would be necessary for the Chinese paleontologist to stay in America in order to accomplish some real work. The details of these questions were also mainly agreed upon and it was already understood that the expedition was making necessary preparations to leave, when Dr. Andrews, at the meeting of April 16 which was understood to be final, brought up the proposal that Article IV of Clause A (providing for the leaving in China of specimens which can be readily recognized as duplicates without special study) should be entirely omitted unless an additional clause be inserted that Dr. Granger is to be the only judge of what is duplicate or not. In an extremely conciliatory spirit, the representatives of the committee assured Dr. Andrews that the committee already admits the necessity of studying most of the specimens in America; that the scientific authority of Dr. Granger in this matter is unquestioned by the Chinese committee, and in any unlikely case of divergence of views full consideration will be paid to his opinion. But they felt it beyond their power to accept any insertion which will admit absolutely no saying from Chinese side although they were quite willing to consider any other wording. On this point Dr. Andrews refused further discussion.

The committee was surprised to read the news in Wednesday's newspapers evidently given out from Andrews which is in many points contrary to facts. The committee has fully considered the scientific interest of the American Museum; there was never question of paying as many as three Chinese scientists in America, and there was absolutely no new demand besides the agreement provisionally reached a fortnight ago. The committee can not but feel sorry for the deadlock of the negotiations for which only the unexplainable sudden change of Dr. Andrews' attitude is responsible and the utter distortion of facts in his news communication which will not contribute to mutual good feeling.

SIN PINGCH'ANG,  
General Secretary

*For the Chinese Committee of the Preservation of Archeological Objects*

#### THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

THE National Institute of Psychology was incorporated in the District of Columbia on June 29, 1929, by Hugh S. Cumming, E. E. Slosson and Knight Dunlap. The steps which led up to this incorpora-

tion were initiated by the Conference on Experimental Psychology, held at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, under the auspices of the division of anthropology and psychology of the National Research Council, and composed of representatives of the principal psychological laboratories in the United States, which included among its final recommendations the following:

*Be it resolved:* That the Conference on Experimental Psychology of the National Research Council approve in principle the establishment of a National Laboratory of Experimental Psychology, and the establishment of further Institutes of Psychology connected with universities.

To this end, be it further resolved, that this conference recommends that a Committee on Experimental Psychology be set up in the Division of Anthropology and Psychology of the National Research Council to promote intensive and continuous research on fundamental problems.

It shall be the duty of this committee:

1. To formulate plans and to seek financial support for a National Laboratory of Experimental Psychology on a scale adequate for attacking fundamental problems of psychology calling for extensive equipment and special technique.
2. To support the efforts of universities to establish research institutes of psychology, each of which may be expected to study one of the fundamental problems of experimental psychology.
3. To consider any other means for the promotion of psychological research.

This resolution was duly presented to the division at its annual meeting on April 21, 1928, and approved by the following actions:

*Voted:* That the chairman of the division recommend the appointment of a Committee on Experimental Psychology under the division.

*Voted:* That the recommendation of the Carlisle Conference, looking toward the establishment of a National Laboratory of Psychology, preferably in the District of Columbia, and the furthering of psychological institutes under the auspices of the universities be approved.

The first of these two votes was in accordance with the usual procedure by which the establishment of new committees is recommended by the chairman of the division to the executive board or the interim committee of the council. It was understood by the division that while the National Research Council might be willing to hold funds temporarily for the laboratory, it could not, in consistency with its general policy, undertake the organization or control of any such laboratory.

The committee on experimental psychology was duly established, its members being Madison Bentley,