time it has proved itself to be so. But the price of its authority is the rigorous standards it has set for itself. No industry or group of professional men which may, through one body or another, chance to be represented on the Committee acquires thereby any right to call upon the Committee to sponsor any demands it may have to make upon the Government. It may put its case to the Committee, but that case will be most acutely examined, and it will be only where considerations of scientific or national importance are clearly shown to be involved that the weight of the Committee's support will be given. It is by such selective advocacy that the Committee has developed its authority in the eyes of the Government and its true value to those who support it.

The foregoing account of some of the work of the Committee up to the present time will indicate the lines along which it pursues its aims. It has been greatly encouraged by the creation in Canada of a corresponding body, the Canadian Parliamentary and Scientific Committee, formed at Ottawa on April 25, 1947. That organization is in course of development through an Interim Committee consisting of representatives of the Professional Institute of the Civil Service of Canada, the Engineering Institute of Canada, the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers and Scientists, the Canadian Mathematical Congress, and the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers, together with Members of Parliament representing the four different parties in the Canadian Parliament.

No account of the British Committee would be complete without a reference to its secretarial arrangements. Such a committee cannot flourish, nor can the interest of a couple of hundred busy men be retained, without central organization and direction of high quality. The drafting of reports, the documentation connected with meetings, and the briefing of the parliamentary Members would seem to require an elaborate secretariat. In fact, the Committee has been able to deal successfully with a wide range of problems with the minimum of organization, largely through the energy and ability of its secretary, Cdr. C. Powell, R.N. (ret.), whose office is at 6 Queen Anne's Gate, London, S.W.1.

Great Britain's future is dependent upon the extent to which she can retain and develop her capacity for industrial production and upon her power to foster and exploit scientific research. In these vital fields there is a clear interlocking of science and politics. The task of the Parliamentary and Scientific Committee over the next few years is therefore clear. It is to unite the forces of politics and of science to ensure that government policy is shaped and carried through with these vital objectives constantly in view.

Obituary

Rollin Thomas Chamberlin
1881–1948

Rollin T. Chamberlin, professor emeritus of geology at the University of Chicago, died March 6, 1948, following his third coronary thrombosis within four years. His age was 66. The son of a great geologist, he was great in his own right in the field of earth science. He was internationally known from his writings, and he had acquaintances and friends throughout the world, for he had traveled extensively on all the inhabited continents.

He was born in Beloit, Wisconsin, where his father was professor in Beloit College. As his given names indicate, the long-time association of Thomas C. Chamberlain and Rollin D. Salisbury had already begun. Before his college years arrived, the University of Chicago opened, with his father and Salisbury on the newly recruited staff. Rollin Chamberlin's B.S. and Ph.D., therefore, were from Chicago, although he did some work in the Universities of Zurich and Geneva. His early interests were geochemical, his doctor's thesis being on "The Gases in Rocks."

Later, his chief interest swung to structural and dynamic geology, in which he became an outstanding and widely quoted authority in both laboratory experimentation and broad field investigation. His bibliography shows, however, an exceptionally wide range of investigations and critical studies. He is known among glacialists for his studies of glacial erosion and his field demonstration of the actuality of glacial shearing. From such, in part, flowed his study of glacial ice as a dynamically metamorphosed rock. He was one of the field investigators of the once widely heralded Pleistocene Man of Vero, Florida, and he contributed to the elucidation of the Pleistocene stratigraphy of the north central United States. He also wrote an authoritative paper on the origin of the coral reefs of the South Pacific. His work on gases in coal resulted in the present generally used rock-dust treatment of the entries to reduce the inflammability of

the unavoidable coal dust. In the field of physiography he wrote a significant paper on an overlooked but fundamental item in the concept of base-level. His knowledge of recurrent orogenies in earth history made papers on geologic classifications and correlations inevitable. An Alpine enthusiast, he is in the mountaineer's bibliography.

Chamberlin's most important field of geologic contribution was diastrophism. In orogeny, he wrote on the structure of various mountain ranges, on the mechanics of various kinds of faults, on the depth of folding, and on mountain ranges as deep wedges in the "crust." Volcanism, closely associated with orogenesis, had his attention; "Whittling Down the Batholiths" was one particularly catchy title. The close relationship of epeirogenic diastrophism with orogenesis was another theme. He had little toleration for the theory of continental drift, believing in deeply rooted continental and oceanic units through geologic time. With a share in field measurements as a part of his background, he somewhat sharply criticized the more enthusiastic applications of the theory of isostasy. Diastrophism and volcanism in making the moon's topography is the subject of his most recently published paper.

Chamberlin wrote less for students than for researchers, but, with Paul MacClintock, he twice revised the college text of T. C. Chamberlin and R. D. Salisbury. He also wrote a chapter in *The nature of the world and of man* (there were 16 authors) and its later revision under the title *The world and man, as science sees them.*

Among scientific organizations Chamberlin worked in close association with, or under the direction of, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the U. S. Geological Survey, and the National Research Council and held official positions in Sigma Xi, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Geological Society of America. In addition, he was a member of a number of other scientific organizations, including the National Academy of Sciences and the American Philosophical Society.

Chamberlin taught in the Department of Geology of the University of Chicago from 1912 until 1947 and was editor of the *Journal of Geology* from 1922 until his retirement from the faculty in 1947. His career was a normally long, very busy, and unusually fruitful one. His was the happy blending of the teacher and researcher, with that otherwise unattainable result: his students were fired by his own enthusiasms for pushing back the darkness bordering the periphery of his problems. He sired more doctors' theses in his department than has any other staff member during its existence. His was a certain boyishness that delighted in fun with his students. His was the gift of friendliness. Few members of the University of Chicago faculty knew so many others so well.

Chamberlin, after his first and second heart attacks, refused to surrender and retire before the obligatory age of 65. He finished successfully and had a few months more, although much writing he planned after laying down the teaching and editorial duties now never will be done. Geology has lost an outstanding figure and his colleagues an irreplaceable comrade.

J HARLEN BRETZ

The University of Chicago