and involved evidence. It asks only recognition of the fact that over the years public respect for informed opinion has developed surprisingly, and hence will probably continue to rise. This in itself is a singularly notable phenomenon. No longer is the expert, and particularly the expert in science, the object of disdain or suspicion. Rather he is the medicine man of the present epoch and his word is usually accepted as authoritative. In other words the pragmatic success to which science and organized knowledge have attained has established a tradition that what counts in the world to-day is accuracy and truth, not guessing. This represents progress of the highest order. It means that the public mind is ready to accept a wider application of the scientific method—or the nearest approach to this method which is practicable in the affairs of state—and would bestow upon the information and conclusions thus provided the same high regard that it metes out to the more ordinary applications of logical investigation. In a word, that all-important person, the man-in-the-street, has become intuitively aware of a golden truth attributed to Marcus Aurelius, namely "To change thy mind and follow him who sets thee right is to be, nonetheless, the free agent that thou wast before."

However, it should be emphasized that there is still much room for progress in this respect. The many methods of inculcating a popular understanding and respect for the value of unbiased inquiry should receive even more earnest support than heretofore, and doubtless outstanding among these are the science columns of the daily press, the popular science journals and the science museums.

The Machinery for Political Investigation

It is not the present intention—nor indeed would space permit—to venture any detailed suggestion as to the various organizational mechanisms which might be set up to procure the knowledge which must be procured if the liberal form of government is to maintain its workability. At the same time nothing said here is intended to imply that the practical problem which must be solved is anything short of extremely difficult. Its solution will quite obviously call for a very high order of statesmanship and political invention.

Let us note, however, that suggestive models and experience are already available. As regards certain fields of science, routines are now in existence whereby an independent and highly competent group of experts may render advice to the Federal Government. These routines had their origin in problems arising during the Civil War, and with certain additions the routines have remained in effect. The body of talent which is on call for consultation is the membership of the National Academy of Sciences or such other experts as the Academy may choose to select. During 1917 the pressure of war work became such that need of closer advisory routines led to the creation of the National Research Council, a body subsidiary to the National Academy and one which has had a continuing existence. Finally, as a result of the present crisis, the machinery of cooperation between the Federal Government and the nation's scientists has been further enlarged by an Executive Order creating the National Defense Research Committee. It is interesting, but perhaps not overly significant, that it has been war or the threat of war which has led to the creation and the elaboration of this machinery as well as to the periods of its extensive use.

In conclusion, it seems likely that we are well launched upon an era during which all the existing advisory aids to the government, as well as others still to be created, will have to function with increasing vigor. Such an arrangement need not savor of bureaucracy. The sovereign people will still remain sovereign. But belated and constructive recognition will have been given to the fact, now abundantly clear, that the day is gone, and probably forever, when a successful state can base its policies upon clamor of pressure groups or upon the uninformed beliefs of the majority, even though measured numerically by tens of millions.

OBITUARY

FRANCIS HOBART HERRICK[1]

Francis Hobart Herrick was born in Woodstock, Vermont, November 19, 1858, the son of the Reverend Marcellus Aurelius and Hannah Andrews (Putnam) Herrick. He attended St. Paul's School at Concord, New Hampshire, was graduated from Dartmouth College in 1881, earned the degree of doctor of philosophy at the Johns Hopkins University in 1888, and received the honorary degree of doctor of science from Western University of Pennsylvania in 1897 and from Western Reserve University in 1936. Immediately after having received his doctorate at the Johns Hopkins University he came to Western Reserve University as instructor in biology, to found what has since become a great university department of biology, including zoology, physiology and botany with their allied specialties. In 1891 he was appointed professor, and assumed permanent directorship of the laboratory. He retired from active service in 1929, becoming professor emeritus.

[1] From a tribute at memorial services in Amasa Stone Chapel, Western Reserve University, September 14, 1940.

Professor Herrick was a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and of the American Ornithologists' Union; he was an associate of the American Museum of Natural History; he held memberships in the American Society of Naturalists, the American Society of Zoologists, the Boston Society of Natural History and the Wilson Ornithological Club; he was a founder, trustee and vice-president of the Cleveland Museum of Natural History.

His bibliography, published in 1938, includes approximately 130 titles, beginning in 1883 with his "Prairie Warbler in New Hampshire" and closing in October, 1937, with two articles on Audubon. This covers an active productive period of fifty-four years. Professor Herrick's intimate associate, Professor Visscher, calls my attention to the fact that this entire period falls roughly into three epochs so far as specialized interest is concerned. The first, devoted to the development and morphology of crustacea, comprises his important publications on the American lobster; the second may be called the Audubon period, in which was produced his definitive biography of Audubon; the third and final period was devoted to a study of the American eagle, which in many ways epitomizes his life-long work on the habits, the origins and the development of instincts of wild birds.

Such are the brief but pregnant annals of his rich life. They give but an imperfect picture of the teacher, the scientist, the cultured gentleman, the friend whom we knew and loved.

Immediately upon his coming to Western Reserve University certain traits and ideals became instantly apparent, of which evidence is seen again and again in his writings, in his addresses and in what we remember of his conversations. I refer particularly to his insistence upon the educational principle that the way to know nature is to observe her face to face, to his appreciation of knowledge of nature as an important cultural element in the life of our great city as evidenced by his early proposals in 1890 for the establishment of a museum of natural history, to his interest in art and his own fine performances in line and color as shown for example in his classic volume on the American lobster, to the high quality of his literary expression, as evidenced particularly, I think, in his life of Audubon, to his sense of humor and his kindness of heart, to his love of animals (Can we ever forget his favorite dog, Douglas?), to his ceaseless urge to intellectual activity, and to the breadth of his reading and the philosophical depth of his thinking.

In his foreword to Howard Corning's edition of "The Journal of John James Audubon, 1840–1843," he emphasized in Audubon what he himself exemplified, namely, "his indefatigable industry, his singleness of purpose and his kindness of heart."

And so finally, using words with which he closed his account of the life of Audubon: On the eleventh of September, 1940, Francis Hobart Herrick died "as gently as a child composing himself for his beautiful sleep."

WINFRED GEORGE LEUTNER

MARY VAUX WALCOTT

MARY VAUX WALCOTT (Mrs. Charles D. Walcott) died in her sleep on August 22 at the home of her dear friends, the Henry Phipps Rosses, at St. Andrews, Canada. She had just passed her eightieth birthday, when a warning heart attack made her realize her long life of activity and independence was closing down.

She was an extraordinary woman. In early years she was a well-known glaciologist, studying the recedence of glaciers on the North American continent. She was the first woman to climb Mt. Stephen in the Canadian Rockies and did so much toward the development of that beautiful country that a mountain was named for her, Mount Mary Vaux. She was director of many charities in Philadelphia, with a full and active life of varied interests, including a successful dairy farm, when, at the age of fifty-six, she married Dr. Walcott.

Then followed thirteen years of perfect companionship in a life of different activities, of wide social contacts, of scientific interests. Dr. Walcott encouraged her to continue her hobby of painting wild flowers and finally to publish the beautiful books of North American Wild Flowers, which will always be a lasting memorial to her name.

The friends she made, the associations she formed during those years were continued and added to, after Dr. Walcott's death.

Instead of a lonely widow marking time, she pushed ahead her forceful life of usefulness and accomplishment. Her church, the Society of Friends, had no adequate meeting house in the nation's capital. The newly elected President, Herbert Hoover, was a Friend. So she decided to have a Meeting House built in Washington. She raised the money, bought the land, and built the beautiful building that will always stand as a symbol of the quality and character of the Quakers.

Mary Walcott had the simplicity and naiveté of a child, with the business astuteness and driving force of a master of men. Entirely self-reliant, she drew people to her by the force of her independence and character. She helped, materially and inspirationally, all she came in contact with who needed help, and