

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,

Harvey A. Carr, Knight Dunlap, Samuel W. Fernberger and F. Lyman Wells. At a meeting held on April 11, 1929, the committee agreed upon the organization and incorporation of a National Institute of Psychology as a controlling body for the projected National Laboratory.

This action was reported to the annual meeting of the division on April 12, 1929, but no further action was requested from the division, since it seemed that the division had gone as far as it could officially go in endorsing the project.

The details of incorporation were left by the committee to the chairman of the division, the committee itself being precluded from acting as incorporators by the requirement of the District of Columbia that the majority of incorporators must be residents of the district. The committee prepared for the incorporators an initial list of members and cooperated with the chairman and the legal adviser in drawing up a set of by-laws for the institute.

The incorporators met on August 30, in Washington, elected the initial list of members which had been prepared by the committee, elected a board of directors, consisting of the members of the committee on experimental psychology, with a president and secretary to serve until the organization of the board, and adopted the by-laws which in principle and in most details had been approved by the committee. The incorporators thereby relinquished their control over the corporation.

The directors met at New Haven on September 4, 1929, and elected officers as follows: *President*, Knight Dunlap; *vice-president*, F. Lyman Wells; *secretary and treasurer*, S. W. Fernberger. These with Madison Bentley and Harvey A. Carr are the board of directors.

The essential provisions of the by-laws (which may be modified after one year) are as follows:

1. Active membership is restricted to fifty, who shall be qualified by research in experimental psychology.
2. Members beyond the initial group elected by the incorporators must be nominated by 80 per cent. affirmative vote of the active members, and elected by the directors.
3. Members reaching 60 years of age cease to be active, and become honorary members. Other honorary members may be elected by the same procedure as that for the election of active members.
4. Active members who fail to publish significant research within a certain period of time become associate members.

These provisions are somewhat drastic, and are frankly experimental. It is easy to widen qualifications for membership, extend age and number limits and otherwise lessen restrictions when such lessening

is clearly advisable. The opposite procedure, however, is much more difficult, and the committee desired to be on the safe side.

It should be said that before setting the numerical limit of 50 (which includes associates, but not honorary members), the committee canvassed the list of American psychologists, and taking into account the ages of the initial group of members and their dates of elevation to honorary membership, saw no prospect of the membership of 50 being filled for many years. The nominating requirement of 80 per cent. affirmative vote of the members may be too high: that point can be determined in practice.

The authority of the directors, as granted by the articles of incorporation, is high and may be said to be autocratic. This feature is the result of competent legal advice, which has pointed out that no corporation otherwise constituted could command financial confidence, or be able to function adequately in case of war or other emergency. It is clear, however, that the affairs of the institute are really in the hands of the membership as soon as the members are organized, and no directorate would be able to maintain a policy opposed to the will of the membership. The institute, in short, is republican, so that the members are guaranteed the continual dignity and responsibility of the institute and satisfactory guardianship of its property and policies.

The ultimate plan of the directors of the institute, subject to approval by the membership, is the establishment of a laboratory either in the District of Columbia or immediately adjacent thereto, in which there shall be provision for a permanent staff and adequate equipment for research in human and animal psychology. It is deemed possible through such provision not only to undertake the solution of problems too large in time and equipment required to be handled by university laboratories, but also to foster the development of a real comparative psychology. Provision for temporary staff appointments are also contemplated, so that integration with other laboratories will be promoted, and individuals can be offered opportunities to complete at the National Laboratory research which has been begun elsewhere. If, eventually, temporary appointments from abroad can be provided, the institute should become maximally efficient in the promotion of research in the United States. The institute is legally empowered to advance scientific work in psychology by publication and all other appropriate means.

KNIGHT DUNLAP

THE BRIGHT METEOR OF JANUARY 3, 1930

At approximately 5:50 A. M., Eastern Standard Time, on January 3, a brilliant meteor or fireball