

ing picture by emphasizing antiquity and ignoring all evidence of sequence. In final analysis, relative dating of the earlier finds will always depend upon agreement among geologists, cultural and racial significance upon the findings of anthropologists. In this last regard it appears to the writer, and he believes the majority of physical and cultural anthropologists will agree, that whereas the use of the term "Amerind" is a matter of personal choice, the use of the term "Pre-Amerindian" is still unjustified on the basis of the known physical and cultural evidence. Since such usage and the selective attitude producing it seem to carry very important theoretical and methodological correlates the matter is one of far deeper significance than mere terminology.

WM. DUNCAN STRONG

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

#### ANNUAL HONORARY JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP AWARDS

THE Academy Conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Science has been deeply interested in the work of the several junior academies of science. The conference has in various ways encouraged the work of the junior groups. In 1938, the council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science voted to recognize outstanding work of younger scientists by providing two honorary annual junior memberships in the American Association for the Advancement of Science to each affiliated senior academy which sponsors a junior academy of science. The procedure in selecting the recipients for these awards was left entirely with the senior and junior academies. The only restriction imposed was that the awards were to be given to one boy and one girl in each state upon the recommendation of the senior academy. Since in some cases the senior academy as a whole is not directly connected with high-school work, the selection of the candidates for the honorary awards has been supervised by the senior sponsors of the junior academy.

In an attempt to give significance to the honorary junior membership award the advisory committee of the Pennsylvania Junior Academy of Science has evolved a procedure which might be of interest to other junior academies. At the annual state meeting of the junior academy the various clubs with their sponsors and officers listen carefully to the papers presented. On the basis of an open election by membership clubs the boy and girl candidates are nominated. Each club represented at the meeting is permitted but one vote. Following this election the advisers judge the election as to the worthiness of the candidates who have been recommended. The senior academy officials are then notified, and they make the recommendation to the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

To further the importance of the award in Pennsylvania, the chairman of the advisory committee, when he could do so, has made the presentation of the certificate of membership in person at a school assembly. Usually this is preceded or followed by a short address to the student body on some general phase of science. In this way the attention of the entire school is called to the work of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in connection with secondary schools. This method of presentation has been followed with gratifying results.

The high caliber of the students selected for the award in Pennsylvania is attested by the fact that both of the honorary members this year have received scholarships for college work. The boy recipient received his as a direct result of his fine presentation of a cosmic ray counter at the annual meeting of the junior academy.

Unfortunately, the expenses for traveling to the schools to make the presentation has come from the pockets of those presenting the awards and from an officer of the association who has been most enthusiastic about the work of the junior academies.

OTIS W. CALDWELL  
KARL F. OERLEIN

#### PEACE RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTIFIC WORKERS

MANY scientists in this country have hoped that mature consideration of the social relations of science, prior to the arrival of acute emergencies, such as those which broke the spirit of German science, would enable scientists to direct their collective influence, when crises do develop, on the side of those human and intellectual values upon which all scientific accomplishment is predicated. Such considerations have led to the formation, and rapid growth, of the American Association of Scientific Workers.

A peace resolution circulated by this organization has met an amazingly enthusiastic reception by leading scientists and other scientific workers throughout the country. It has also elicited some criticism, along the lines of Dr. Sturtevant's communication to *SCIENCE* (May 24), on the assumption that it states a position of uncompromising pacifism.

I write this letter, as a vice-president of the A.A.S.W. and as one who was active in preparing the resolution, to help allay this incipient misunderstanding. (See also letters by Drs. Carlson and Mulliken, *SCIENCE*, May 31.) As a matter of simple fact, the Chicago group of nearly a dozen scientists which, in committee, over three months ago, approved the statement in its present form, rejected another wording which implied an unqualified isolationist position. A majority of this particular committee was, even then,

prepared to consider approval of intervention by the United States in the present war, should events march in certain ways. The only legitimate objection, I believe, that might be raised to the resolution as it stands, is that it really does *not* take a very positive position one way or the other. The excuse for its existence, none the less, would be that only by starting collective thinking on this problem by scientists can one hope for a reasoned group stand by them.

I trust that Dr. Sturtevant, and the others who have made his initial interpretation of the resolution, will be reassured by the word "reasonable"—a dear one to science—in, "... all reasonable programs which seek ...," and join many hundreds of their colleagues in furthering the association.

R. W. GERARD

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ON March 4, the Boston-Cambridge Branch of the American Association of Scientific Workers passed a resolution which recommended "The wholehearted and unceasing support of all reasonable programs which seek a better understanding of the causes of war, and which will preserve peace for the United States and bring peace to the world."

This resolution was passed at a meeting attended, as is usual, by a small minority of the enrolled membership. When it was circulated among the approximately 180 members of the branch, only 62 favorable replies were received. In addition there were a number of letters of protest. It can not be stated, therefore, that this resolution expressed adequately the position of a majority of the members even in March, much less that it expresses their position now.

Recently this resolution has received considerable publicity. Among other things it has been accused of stating a "peace at any price" policy. This is untrue. It states, if anything, a "peace—it's wonderful" policy. This is at once the worst and the best that can be said of it.

Early in 1939 the Boston-Cambridge Branch of the American Association of Scientific Workers declared that "In view of the extensive and cruel persecution of scientists in Germany for religious and political reasons, of the evidence brought out by our own study that the whole structure of German science, once so notable, has been undermined and partially destroyed," it resolved "to cease as far as is possible the purchase of scientific materials and apparatus manufactured in Germany." The resolution stated further, "We believe that this action is the least that can be taken as a protest," and that it would "in its small way contribute towards the cause of world peace."

The events of the past few months have demonstrated the ludicrous ineffectiveness of such measures. The Nazi system against which the boycott resolution

was directed has since extended its dominion by brutal aggressions which feature the perversion of science and technology to promote destruction on an unprecedented scale.

In characterizing its anti-Nazi boycott as "the least" action that it could have adopted, this organization clearly envisaged the application of more powerful measures. These have since been undertaken by the Allied governments.

In pursuance therefore of this expressed policy, the undersigned members of the Boston-Cambridge Branch of the Association of Scientific Workers urge the United States Government to take all steps necessary for hemisphere defense, including such aid to the Allies as most effectively furthers this aim. We believe this now to represent the most "reasonable program . . . which will preserve peace for the United States and bring peace to the world."

No attempt has been made to canvass the entire membership on this issue. In view, however, of misunderstandings concerning the previous resolution, the fact that the organization does not meet during the summer and the critical pressure of world events, the undersigned members believe it necessary to state their personal views on this situation immediately.

(Signed)

FRANCIS BITTER, M. I. T.

WALTER B. CANNON, Harvard

ARTHUR L. COHEN, Harvard

KARL T. COMPTON, M. I. T.

ALBERT SPRAGUE COOLIDGE, Harvard

D. EUGENE COPELAND, Harvard

W. J. CROZIER, Harvard

ROBERT S. FRIEDMAN, Harvard

ROBERT GALAMBOS, Harvard

MARK GRAUBARD, Clark

DONALD R. GRIFFIN, Harvard

DAVID T. GRIGGS, Harvard

ZAREH HADIDIAN, Clark

HAROLD HASKIN, Harvard

WILLIAM C. HERRINGTON

HUDSON HOAGLAND, Clark

DAVID KAUFMAN, Harvard

G. B. KISTIAKOWSKY, Harvard

WALTER J. NICKERSON, Harvard

RICHARD R. OVERMAN, Harvard

GREGORY PINCUS, Clark

C. B. PURVES, M. I. T.

ALFRED C. REDFIELD, Harvard

GEORGE SASLOW, Harvard

H. J. SAWIN, Harvard

GEORGE T. SCOTT, Harvard

GRACE D. STERNE

KENNETH V. THIMANN, Harvard

RICHARD TITHERINGTON, Mass. D. P. W.

GEORGE WALD, Harvard